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Meeting Synopsis:
1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda
2. Approve minutes from May 2009 FCR meeting
3. Announcements
4. Requests for Information and Updates  
   • Office of Research (Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, Office of Research)  
   • Congressional Liaison (Jonathan Nurse)
5. Old Business  
   • FCR Issues for 2009 - 2010  
   • ORU Draft Document (Haselkorn, Eaton, Nihan, Barnett, Harris)
6. New Business  
   • End of year summary and look forward
7. Adjournment

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda

Chair Mark Haselkorn called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

Haselkorn welcomed everyone to the last council meeting of the year, and his last as chair. He asked to make an amendment to the agenda, specifically to move the topic on Organized Research Units (ORUs) to follow after announcements, and to add a topic on the Research Advisory Board to new business. The amended agenda was approved.
2. Approve minutes from May 2009 FCR meeting
The minutes for May 11, 2009 were approved as submitted.

3. Announcements
Haselkorn reported on two items from the Research Advisory Board (RAB) meeting. The first issue is that they are moving into the final stages of renegotiation of the Indirect Cost Rate (facilities and administrative costs (F & A). He noted the importance of having faculty input in the conversation about maintaining, if not increasing, the indirect cost rate. The next RAB meeting is scheduled for July 10, 2009, 9:00 a.m.

The second item concerned a presentation by Ed Lazowska on the University’s eScience Institute, an ongoing effort to provide central capabilities for large data analysis and advanced visualization. His concern is that most of the effort has taken place at the department chair and dean levels and that this is a facility that is supposed to serve faculty. Mary Lidstrom noted that the institute’s steering committee makes all the decisions regarding funding and research priorities. Special guest Nancy Nihan noted that there may be some centers that are duplicating efforts because they don’t know enough about eScience, and she suggested they partner with them. Lidstrom gave an overview of the eScience effort. Haselkorn felt that the council should have a representative on the eScience steering committee. Lidstrom noted that it’s a technical group and perhaps it might work better to have someone from the steering committee on FCR. The council will add to the draft list a more general issue about providing “input to central campus initiatives on research initiatives.” Lidstrom suggested that Haselkorn would be a good representative on the steering committee, and he agreed to it.

4. Old Business

- ORU (Organized Research Unit) Draft Document (Haselkorn, Eaton, Nihan, Barnett, Harris)
Haselkorn explained that he invited three people to review the ORU draft document as part of the council’s interest in the issue. Present today were Nancy Nihan, TransNow Director, Civil and Environmental Engineering, and Gerry Barnett, who works for the Dean of Engineering on fostering interdisciplinary activity on campus. Haselkorn stated that the goal is to decide where to place the issue on next year’s council issues. He noted that Jeff Harris, (Director of the Health Promotion Research Center, School of Public Health) who couldn’t attend today, said he welcomed the idea of definitional work on the nature of a research unit, and the kind of names used for them. Harris would also encourage more detailed guidance on the percentage of returns in both normal and atypical situations.

Nancy Nihan noted that she reviewed the document and liked that they are defining research units. She explained that her unit is classified as an Institute and fosters interdisciplinary and inter-university research. It is a transportation center that supports education and outreach. Her interest is that her unit pays full indirect costs on campus and she would like to see centers get special consideration. Haselkorn noted that last week the council got clarification that while facilities and administrative (F & A) costs justify indirect cost returns, there is no legal restriction on how the money is spent. Sue Camber pointed out that they should be careful how the money is spent because the next time they do their F & A proposal they will have difficulty in recovering their costs the next time if the money was not spent on research. Haselkorn inquired if department chairs must report separately how they spend their indirect cost return money. Camber replied that there is no report that tracks how departments spend RCR funds. Haselkorn noted a second issue that impacts the total amount of spending on research. He pointed to the situation in which departments use RCR funds to supplement their loss of state funding, and the impact on units that must then cut back on staff because they are not receiving their distribution of indirect costs. Lidstrom clarified confusion between indirect costs and the administrative cap (about 26%) that limits the amount for which the university can get credit. Haselkorn stressed his concern about the kind of rights available to center directors in negotiating with department chairs for indirect cost returns.

Haselkorn asked if the document could be honed to address more specifically the issues concerning indirect cost returns. Lidstrom noted that the intent is that any centers that get central support would be
required to follow the guidelines, which then places pressure on the other centers as to why are they treated differently. As part of the plan to get people onboard, it is hoped this becomes an expectation.

Gerry Barnett shared his thoughts on the ORU document. He noted that it seemed to focus on the control of the name of the center rather than on the dynamics of how the centers create new money or foster new scholarship. Barnett suggested that the document’s current focus could be simplified, and developed more in how to govern a center and finance its strategic initiatives. He pointed to the distinction between the UC system’s complex ORU policy and that of Stanford University’s open ended policy. He suggested that where the document says “encouraged” it should state “required.” Lidstrom agreed that it needs to be clarified.

Haselkorn asked Barnett to consider the larger question of why they should pursue the ORU guidelines (possibly as class C legislation). Barnett noted that he is currently working on looking at innovation in innovation management and how to adapt administrative structures for changing conditions. He explained that the role of an ORU is to create a mix of talent that creates something new that gets recognition. Barnett feels that a dean looks for money, recognition, and talent. He assessed the draft document, noting that it does not directly encourage the creation of ORUs, but rather implies it. The policy is an advance of the Research Cost Recovery (RCR) issue but not a complete statement. He suggested that as a strategic part of an elite research university like UW, a fuller statement could be made that would encourage the creation of centers, define the limitation on the number of centers that could be maintained, and address how they would be financed.

Haselkorn noted that what they are doing is taking a pretty successful enterprise and making it better, by making it a more competitive, exciting, and productive environment in which faculty are collaborating on strategic guidance of this enterprise. Lynne Chronister noted the differences between ORUs in the UC system and the University of Washington. Barnett expressed his concern about whole sections of the UC report being used in the UW’s guidance policy. Haselkorn thanked Dave Eaton (not present) and Mary Lidstrom for opening up a discussion to faculty and administrators to help guide and clarify how the University makes strategic investments in research. Lidstrom noted that strategic investment is only in the hands of the deans, which leaves very little role for the central administration. She pointed out how the University is different from other institutions. Lidstrom explained that the document is an administrative document that provides guidance, rather than a strategic document. The recent financial crisis has prompted the issue to re-emerge because of the way RCR funds are being viewed as discretionary money.

She noted that there is only one major research unit that will report centrally (Applied Physics Laboratory) and the other units have dual reporting lines to the Provost. Barnett suggested that they build out guidance to show center directors how to manage sponsored projects using direct costs on grants. Camber noted that they are working on an overall policy. Lidstrom noted that the document is not a handbook for center directors.

- **FCR Issues for 2009-2010**

Haselkorn proposed several topics for the faculty council to take up next year. He suggested they focus on the RCR issue and faculty rights in negotiating with chairs and deans. He also pointed to the naming issue as one they could take up with the Provost’s office in the form of class C legislation. Haselkorn also proposed the idea of working with the Office of Research to set the requirements for centrally funded centers that will potentially have a ripple effect on all other centers. He felt the council could help clarify the policy to make it happen.

Lidstrom noted an issue that has emerged because of the budget crisis in which the University is moving toward activity-based budgeting. In activity-based budgeting each unit typically gets its funding and buys services back. Lidstrom noted that it works similarly to RCR, so that a unit that has more students taking its classes will generate more tuition. She raised the question of what this change will mean for centers, and suggested that it deserves discussion. Haselkorn suggested that the council add the impact of activity-based funding on the research entity to their list of council issues next year. Members discussed
using the OR guidelines as leverage to help change the way RCR funding gets distributed, and using the activity-based budgeting model to fund the research enterprise, so that the more research done the more money is earned. Lidstrom noted that the university administration will discuss this summer the direction of the University in light of the budget cuts, which will include discussion about activity-based budgeting. She clarified that the requirement about following the guidelines if you receive central funding has been removed, and must be put back in. She noted that the language was softened in part, because of the various ways that disciplines handle these kinds of ORUs, and the different funding sources. Daniel Vogt asked about the transparency of the way in which funds are being used.

Haselkorn noted that they will add to the council list a general statement of clarification of the nature and policy overseeing faculty led research entities. Miller suggested that the issue on RCR be moved up a level on the list to a separate issue (2.e), rather than as a subset of cross-campus and interdisciplinary research. Haselkorn proposed that they start a joint committee with the OR to address the RCR issues outlined in the guidelines. He suggested that they get some center directors on the committee as well.

5. Requests for Information and Updates

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

  Lidstrom gave council members a monthly update on the stimulus (ARRA) awards. She reported that as of last week they had received 20 awards totaling about $90M. In the next six weeks they will see a large number of National Institute of Health (NIH) awards come in, followed by some National Science Foundation (NSF) awards. Lidstrom noted that they will be posting weekly reports on the UW American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) website.

  Haselkorn noted if they need to alert faculty about short deadlines. Lynne Chronister said she was writing a note to the campus, and explained the serious challenge her office is experiencing with grants.gov.

- **Congressional Liaison (Jonathan Nurse)**

  There was no time to address this item.

6. Old Business

- **FCR Issues for 2009 – 2010**

  Miller noted that they should add the issue of eScience (f.) to the list of council issues. He suggested that they look into the issue of eTravel and why the system is so problematic. Camber suggested that her office will bring someone to speak about it.

  Haselkorn suggested to Miller that he edit the council list and send it out to the council members by this summer. It will become Miller’s document to start off the next academic year. Miller said he would do so.

6. New Business

- **Research Advisory Board meeting (Sue Camber)**

  Camber used the white board to help illustrate the new effort reporting rule that will allow research faculty to go to 6-month effort reporting intervals. She noted that the challenge is that they are working on an electronic effort reporting system. Currently, the permission form gets fed into a cost sharing system that works on a quarterly basis. Camber outlined two options:

  1. Wait to implement the new rule until they finish the new electronic system, about 6 months.

  2. Continue with the current underlying quarterly system for the short term, but still allow research faculty to do 6 month effort reports.
She noted the slight disconnect in which research faculty will do their commitments quarterly and their effort report twice a year. Researchers will be able to average their spring-summer effort reporting. She felt that it wouldn’t impact the overall timeline by more than a few months. Camber noted that they met with a group of administrators and deans who recommended the interim option, which would allow them to catch up on the cost sharing system. Members recommended that we should move to 6-month effort reporting as soon as possible. It was noted that effort reporting is on the council list, and Wright offered to continue working on it next year.

- **End of year summary and look forward**

Haselkorn thanked everyone for their effort in making his job easier. He noted that FCR need to have a representative on committees in order to have a liaison function, and he hoped that members will volunteer when the chair asks them next year. Haselkorn was thanked for his work as chair.

### 7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

*Minutes by Melissa Kane, Faculty Senate, mmkane@u.washington.edu*
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President’s Designee: Lidstrom  
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**Absent:** Faculty: Curran, Fluharty, Roesler  
Ex Officio Reps: Vannatta, Rhodes