The Faculty Council on Research met on Tuesday, June 11, at 12:30 p.m. in 26 Gerberding. Chair Ross Heath presided.

**PRESENT:**  
**Professors** Booth, Gordon, Heath, Kiyak, Stewart, Troll, Vitaliano, Vogt  
**Ex-Officio** Camber, Kahl, Parks, Perrin, Zuiches

**ABSENT:**  
**Professors** Kartsonis, Reh, Ruzicka, Vance  
**Ex-Officio** Blake, Ghosh, Ludwig, Sjåvik, Takhar

**Guest:** Vice Provost for Research Craig Hogan

**Synopsis:**  
1. Approve agenda  
2. Approve minutes  
3. Conversation with Craig Hogan, the new Vice Provost for Research  
4. Discussion of the RCR report  
5. Report on the Rose Committee recommendations  
6. Ideas for AY 2002-03 FCR activities

**Approve agenda**  
The agenda was approved.

**Approve minutes**  
With minor corrections, the April minutes were approved.

**Conversation with Craig Hogan, the new Vice Provost for Research**  
Ross Heath introduced Craig Hogan as the new Vice Provost for Research and invited him to discuss research plans and issues at the UW. Hogan said he is new on the job and learning how the UW works - he has been charged by Provost Lee Huntsman to take a broad view of the functions of the Office of Research.

In answer to a question about his background, Hogan said he is a theoretical astrophysicist whose subject matter is astrophysical cosmology; he has been involved in research on a spacecraft named LISA that may fly in about ten years. His recent studies have been in gravitational waves. Hogan has had a joint appointment in Astronomy and Physics at the UW, and has chaired the Astronomy Departments here and at the University of Arizona. He is working with NASA on planning space missions for the next 25 years, has created TV programs popularizing science, and has set up the UW Science Forum that is now televised on the Research Channel.

Heath mentioned that he has a concern with Friday Harbor labs, which are well-known and well-respected in the research community. Heath said there is no consistent UW policy on the labs - they are used by many researchers but exist solely on what grant monies individual PIs can pull together. What can be done to make sure these irreplaceable and valuable properties - which have been close to being sold to real estate developers - are safeguarded for research purposes?

One criticism of Friday Harbor, Hogan said, is that it's relatively disconnected from academic programs on main campus. He wants to change the reporting structure so the advisory board becomes more of an
actual supervisory or governing board. He needs to learn more about the labs, and the faculty assigned there. Maybe some of the labs should be sold - it will all have to be evaluated, Hogan added.

Heath said part of the value of these labs is how they relate to one another for study - for example, Pac Forest and Big Beef Creek span the spectrum from pristine forest with freshwater streams to shallow saltwater estuary, with Friday Harbor a perfect example of a deep water ecosystem. For research purposes, they are much more valuable together than any one of them would be by itself. Once sold, these resources are gone forever and with them the long-term opportunities for research.

Hogan observed that these labs need to be considered in light of how they contribute to large-scale UW initiatives - the More Foundation, for example, is interested in sponsoring initiatives that deal with climate changes and ecological issues. The labs might be part of that kind of initiative.

In response to a question from Asuman Kiyak, Hogan said he has visited with the Health Sciences Deans, and will be appointing a high-level person from Health Sciences to the Research Office. Kiyak said she hoped Hogan will talk to a wider cross-section of Health Sciences people - it is difficulty to get a good picture of Health Sciences Research by just talking to the deans. She hopes Hogan will visit some of the research professors, labs, and research institutes that operate pretty independently of the deans. Hogan agreed, and specifically mentioned AIDS research and cancer research as areas with which he will become better acquainted.

Ed Perrin cited competition for Indirect Cost Recovery dollars as a huge barrier to collaboration in research - there is no Vice President for Health Affairs, and this is a problem because there is no arbiter for negotiating who gets the indirect costs in shared research. There is a framework for getting this to happen, but it doesn't work very well - there should be incentives for collaborative research.

Hogan said it sounds as if there needs to be administrative reform in the ways deans work together. Mark Troll added that the deans are in an extraordinary position - a huge amount of indirect cost money goes to the deans, but the research community does not know what happens to it.

Sharona Gordon raised the issue of research space, which is at a premium. She has offers from three drug companies to do research, for which there is no lab space available. If she goes to their offices as a consultant, the UW and UW students realize no benefit from the research. Hogan said the UW is working on this issue by building spec buildings for which grant costs pay. This doesn't solve the problem, however. The UW also rents a great deal of space, but there is a legal limit on the percentage of available space the UW can rent within a mile of campus. These limits are highly political and depend upon the will of the local community.

Kiyak said she is concerned about whether there's a grand plan for research at the UW, or an overall mission, or is it just a chase for dollars to keep the institution going? Hogan said UW choices are guided by principles and the institution's mission to society, but the UW also has budget problems and so some decisions between one worthy project and another are made based upon available funding.

As a researcher, Perrin said he is frustrated about internal restrictions on foundations and other granting organizations that have been designated "off-limits" to being approached by individual researchers. Some of this is mandated by the foundations themselves, but there are others on a list that the development office has made up. Unfortunately, the development office does not always work hand-in-hand with the researchers who have "something to sell," Perrin said. Mac Parks agreed that the paths to these foundations for individual researchers are not clear, and that Perrin's point is well taken.
Heath observed that the UW is one of the largest recipients of research dollars in the country, but is not represented in Washington D.C. when decisions are made. This is especially true at the agency level. Faculty members have good personal connections in the research community, but Heath would like to see a better PR effort in D.C. with the decision-makers and a Vice President for Research.

After more general discussion about the state of research at the University, Hogan asked if the Council would add him to its mailing list and invite him back regularly to Council meetings. He would like to be involved and knowledgeable about all issues that concern the research effort at the UW. Heath and the Council thanked Hogan for attending and will add him to the mailing list.

**Discussion of the RCR report**

Heath sent a questionnaire to the deans of schools and colleges that received more than $500,000 in RCR allocations in 2001-2002 asking them to report on the following questions:

1. Do you have a pre-determined or “formula” policy of allocating your RCR funds within your unit?
2. If so, what is the formula and has it changed over the past 10 years?
3. If you do not have an RCR allocation formula, how have your RCR funds been allocated for the past two biennia?
4. What role (if any) does your faculty advisory body (College or School Council) play in allocating or advising on the allocation of your RCR funds?

In summary, the responses were as follows:

- 2001-02 allocations as a percentage of 2000-01 ICR generation range from 27-44%, due to differing proportions of on-campus and off-campus research (the RCR allocations for which are 30.6 and 63.8% respectively) and to the use of a 3-year rolling average ICR recovery figure as the basis for ICR allocations to some units and the prior year’s ICR recovery as the basis in others (see attachment 2).

- The proportion of RCR passed through to departments (or directly to PIs in one case) ranges from about 10% to about 25% of the total ICR generated. Lower values are associated with schools/colleges having more central infrastructure (such as computer services and research offices) and those which must address ongoing DOF commitments (see Attachment 1). Higher values are associated with units where DOF commitments and most services are handled at the departmental level.

- Deans’ discretionary resources are typically a few percent of the ICR and are used for matching (e.g. in proposals for equipment grants), pilot studies, funding gaps for non-State-funded researchers, and central services. In some schools and colleges, these expenses, other than matching, are handled at the departmental level, whereas in others, some or all are handled centrally.

- Virtually all schools and colleges have formulae to allocate their RCR funds. These have been either specified by the dean or negotiated between the dean and departmental chairs.

- The role of faculty advisory bodies (such as school or college councils) in advising on RCR allocation policies has been close to zero. In one case, such a body has been asked by the dean for advice and recommendations, in another it is involved in advising the dean on bridging support for non-State-funded researchers facing funding gaps.
Heath reported that the Code provision for getting College Councils involved in these decisions is not being followed, not even to the extent of advice. The Code provisions should be enforced, and consciousness should be raised across campus. This is a shared governance issue that affects PIs university-wide, and which should probably be addressed at the Faculty Senate level in some way.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:34 p.m. Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.