The University of Washington
Faculty Council on Research

The Faculty Council on Research met Thursday, October 5, 2000 in 36 Gerberding. Chair Mark Bothwell presided.

PRESENT:  Faculty Bothwell, Gordon, Heath, Kartsonis, Stewart, Vance; Ex Officio *Jewell, *Sheehan, Sjåvik (for Ludwig) and Wiseman (for Camber) Zuiches; Special Guests Michael Corn and Diane Scillo.

ABSENT:  Faculty Bosch, Ewart, Furness, Kennedy (on sabbatical), Kronmal, Mirza, Stamat.; Ex Officio Kwiram, Ludwig, Perrin and Kahl.

Minutes from June 7, 2000 were approved as written.

Introductions and Discussion of Anticipated Topics for Coming Year
Council members introduced themselves and stated which department they represented. Chair Bothwell then listed some topics he thought FCR might address in 2000-2001 and solicited ideas from other council members. Some possible topics discussed were: DNA Chip Technology--universities are racing to pull together robotics and other equipment and several areas of the UW are doing this at the same time--why not centralize these efforts and pool resources? Bothwell also mentioned the University Initiative Fund (UIF), whereby the President takes 1% from each department's budget and applies the money to various University-wide initiatives--is this a good thing? Is it being implemented properly? Wiseman clarified that UIF funds are not just earmarked for research; they can be used to pay for any infrastructure needs.

The Office of Technology Transfer (OTT) and its interactions with private companies is another topic Bothwell presented for future discussion. Recently, the UW's inability to reach a technology-use agreement with Affymetrix caused UW researches to have to stop using Affymetrix technology until an agreement was reached. Such interactions have a huge impact on research and there is a perceived lack of involvement by faculty in these negotiations. Bob Miller is the new Vice Provost for Research and there is some talk that recent changes in the OTT have moved the process even further away from faculty. Stewart asked whether Grants Contracts Services and OTT were adequately staffed; he has had a proposal with OTT for a year-and-a-half and they have yet to rule on his proposal.

Bothwell also mentioned assessing University Services and the UW Purchasing system. He feels the University could do a better job dealing with surplus equipment; he has had surplus computers lie around his lab for months before anyone came to pick them up. This equipment could be put to use elsewhere on campus. Kartsonis wondered why individual faculty were not allowed to purchase surplus equipment and why it must be wholesaled outside the UW. Bothwell mentioned the Tax Exempt Status issue that he has been working on for the past two years; he has spoken with Mary Coney and Brad Holt from the Faculty Senate Office and they are anxious to see this initiative through. Holt is Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting and Bothwell hopes this issue will be taken up by them.

Heath mentioned a study on retirement systems that was done a few years ago in a joint undertaking by the Faculty Senate and Administration and staffed by a graduate student. The issue was resolved due to the diligence and follow up by the grad student; perhaps this kind of follow up is needed to address the tax exempt issue. Kartsonis suggested looking into the difficulty faculty have when inviting foreign scholars to the UW. The process is particularly onerous and often not worth the hassle. One must ask invasive and often embarrassing questions
of the guest scholars and Kartsonis wondered if there were any way the University could expedite the process. Bothwell asked who the FCR might get to come talk to the council about this issue. Kartsonis said she would get names of the people involved and ask if they could speak to the council.

Report from Travel Office on New Travel Cards
Diane Scillo, manager of the UW Travel Office, advised FCR on the recent change from American Express cards to the new First USA Visa cards. There were several complaints regarding the Amex cards; namely, that they were not accepted in many small towns where researchers often conduct their studies. Amex also charges higher fees to merchants than do Visa or MasterCard. When the UW was considering RFB's (referral for bids), First USA was the only company offering an online travel expense voucher system; faculty will be able to fill out all their reimbursement paperwork online, mail it in, and get their checks in three to five days after the Travel Office receives the documents. First USA cards will also allow faculty to draw cash advances, something they could not do with Amex.

Faculty can still use their Amex cards until October 31st, then the University will switch to the First USA cards. New cards should be mailed out well in advance of that date. Sheehan said she recently got an Amex bill stating that her account was delinquent; she wondered who would pay the delinquent fee since the Travel Office had not reimbursed her yet. Scillo asked if the bill was 60 days old yet; Sheehan replied that it was not. Scillo clarified that Amex is supposed to give faculty 60 days before declaring the bill delinquent; this gives the Travel Office time to process the paperwork and issue the reimbursements.

Scillo concluded by saying she hoped faculty would find the new cards easier to use and she urged them to contact the Travel Office with any questions or comments.

Executive Order #36
The council was presented with proposed amendments to the Operations Manual, Section D 59.4, concerning Equity Distribution in Business Ventures. Vance pointed out that the proposed changes were striking out a provision whereby one half of the proceeds from the disposition of assets are transferred to an endowment account to be used for graduate student research fellowships and stipends. He and other council members were alarmed by this proposed change and noted that Humanities departments have no way of generating money from research or sales of patents and copyrights and such departments will be in serious trouble if these endowments are done away with. The Chair noted that FCR had discussed some of the ramifications of EO 36 with Mac Parks from the Office of Research last year. This proposal would mean more dollars going to individual researchers making large incomes, and less money going to researchers making small incomes.

Sheehan observed that FCR had not seen this draft of EO 36 before and was concerned that the council was being asked to sign off on changes they had not had a chance to discuss. Kartsonis wondered where the support for graduate student research had been shifted. Corn replied that the Royalty Policy which FCR reviewed last year has already been implemented and that the Equity Distribution Policy (EO 36) has been reviewed by IPMAC (Intellectual Property Management Action Committee), among others, for the past 18 months. IMPAC's concern is that there is no current Equity Distribution Policy in effect and it is eager to implement one. Vance observed--if the sum of money that used to be earmarked for the endowment account is potentially large, the FCR needs to think very seriously about this issue before signing off on it. Corn noted that the council's objections were more of a redistribution argument and spoke to the larger issue of a university-wide distribution policy.
Heath observed that, on the other hand, inventors are probably not happy about seeing the fruits of their labor distributed across campus. Kartsonis argued that the University has an obligation to its graduate students and this is where the money should be distributed. Vance agreed that there must be some degree of asset sharing among University departments; he suggested that 1% of the President’s University Initiative Fund (UIF) be used to offset Arts and Science personnel attrition. The Chair declared that he did not think FCR had seen this particular version of EO 36; the council spent the majority of its time last year dealing with the Royalty Distribution issue, not Equity Distribution. Sheehan agreed that Parks pushed for FCR to vote on the issue and had told FCR that IPMAC had reviewed the issue for the past 18 months. To her knowledge, FCR did not review the Equity Distribution proposal in its current form.

The Chair submitted that FCR needed people to tell it what reasoning went into this Executive Order. Heath commented that perhaps this was a case of protection versus micromanagement. Kartsonis wanted to know the extent of faculty involvement in IPMAC and in the review of EO 36. Sheehan argued that the Equity Distribution Policy should be reviewed at greater length. Corn repeated that the review process has been going on for 18 months now and if a policy were not adopted it would leave a large amount of funds without a procedure to govern its distribution. Heath asked who appointed IPMAC members—the implication being that, since IPMAC reviewed EO 36, it had been reviewed by faculty. Sjåvik suggested the council communicate its concerns to Senate Chair Mary Coney. Sheehan noted that FCR needed an explanation for why the paragraph concerning the graduate student research endowment fund was deleted; she also suggested FCR review the entire amendment. Kartsonis agreed and said it would be beneficial for council members to have the document well in advance of the next FCR meeting.

Vance declared that subsidizing graduate student research across campus affects all departments and the abolition of this endowment should not be taken lightly. Heath noted that the UW sees no state money for research and asked about books being written by Humanities faculty—the University does not receive any revenue from the sale of these books; therefore, why should inventors be asked to redistribute a portion of their equity across campus? Heath said he sees this as a philosophical issue—how do you distribute funds that come from some subset of the faculty—from athletic personnel to clinical faculty. Corn pointed out that 2/3 of the proceeds are going back to faculty. Sheehan asked why even 1/3 should go to the college when there are no matching funds from the University—the money never goes where it is supposed to go.

Sheehan made a motion to defer voting on EO 36 until the council has had a chance to review the full amendment and has had someone explain how IPMAC members are chosen and if IPMAC includes faculty representation. She also moved to inform the Faculty Senate that FCR had been misrepresented in Carol Niccolls' letter to Mary Coney dated September 15, 2000 to wit: "The proposed revisions [to Executive Order #36, "Patent and Invention Policy"] have been reviewed by the Faculty Council on Research . . . ." The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

Executive Order #53
Regarding EO #53, "Use of Experimental Animals," the council agreed that the proposal reflected the current way experimental animals were handled and merely served to codify the status quo. The council was satisfied that the University was doing everything possible to ensure the proper care and handling of these animals. The council voted unanimously to approve EO #53.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45. Minutes by Todd Reid, Recorder.