Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Introduction of new members
3. Approval of the minutes from May 13th, 2015 & June 10th, 2015
4. Review of last year and plans for the coming year (Rosenfeld)
5. Changing equipment threshold at UW (Lidstrom) (Exhibit 1)
6. Aiding PIs with compliance issues (Giffels)
7. Proposed Catalyst survey to test ABB influence on collaborative research
8. Council use of Google Drive file in lieu of Sharespaces retirement (Joey)
9. Good of the order
10. Adjourn

1) Call to order

Rosenfeld called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2) Introduction of new members

New and returning members of the council introduced themselves; each noted one fun thing they did over the summer. The council welcomed several new faculty members and ex-officio representatives (full attendance listed at end of document).

3) Approval of the minutes from May 13th, 2015 & June 10th, 2015

The minutes from May 13th, 2015 & the minutes from June 10th, 2015 were unanimously approved.

4) Review of last year and plans for the coming year (Rosenfeld)

Rosenfeld gave a brief introduction to new members on the regular activities of the council. Some of the expected activities for the FCR in the 2015-2016 academic year are:

- Subcontract review: The FCR is tasked to review and approve/reject (by majority vote) any contracts which:
  - prohibit the open publication or dissemination of research results within a reasonable period of time
o restrict participation on grounds other than interest of competence
o restrict access to campus facilities in ways that are judged to disrupt the overall research activity of the university

- Advise and aid SCIPC (Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization) and IPMAC (Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee) in developing responses to IP-related issues and generating university policy
- Work with the Office of Research to address research-related university issues or topics

Rosenfeld explained subcontract review is a common activity of the council and part of its overall responsibility for matters relating to research at the UW. He noted contracts typically requiring review include classified military contracts, and clinical trials where trial results may not be openly published. Rosenfeld noted the FCR includes the Subcommittee on Classified/Restricted Research, which will require volunteers to initially vet contract approval requests before they are brought to the full council for a formal vote.

Rosenfeld informed the council that the two committees SCIPC and IPMAC had decided last spring (within a joint-meeting) to combine their membership to create a single body with dual-reporting purposes to the Office of the President, and the Faculty Senate. He noted this body will address revising the university’s intellectual property policy (within the appropriate Executive Order) this academic year.

Rosenfeld mentioned that the council passed a Class C resolution on Open Access last year urging the university to devote more resources towards improving open access and the university’s existing repository (open access definition: online research outputs that are free of all restrictions on access [e.g., access tolls] and free of many restrictions on use [e.g. certain copyright and license restrictions]). He explained that UW libraries has now taken charge of the initiative, and the FCR will remain updated on all progress made.

Rosenfeld also noted the FCR has been asked to review Executive Order No. 61 (Scholarly Misconduct). He explained that scholarly misconduct may have serious ramifications for parties found responsible. Rosenfeld noted that after a preliminary read-through of the EO, he has not found substantive concerns, though he would like the full council to review it as a safeguard, as well.

5) Changing equipment threshold at UW (Lidstrom) (Exhibit 1)

Lidstrom (president’s designee) and Susan Camber (Associate Vice President, Financial Management) explained that the current UW threshold for designating items as equipment is $2000. They explained that the currently federally and state-regulated threshold for designating equipment is $5000. Lidstrom informed the council that the UW is the only institution in the top 25 research institutions that does not use the $5000 threshold, and the lower threshold creates heightened administrative burden (mainly in academic units) because more items require the “equipment” designation. Given these reasons, the presenters noted there is a proposal to raise the UW’s equipment threshold to $5000. Equipment in this context is defined as: “tangible property other than land, buildings, improvements other than buildings,
or infrastructure with a unit cost (including ancillary costs) of $2,000 or more which is used in operations and with a useful life of more than one year” (UW Equipment Inventory Office website).

The presenters explained one impact of raising the equipment threshold would be a greatly lessened administrative burden, as an approximated 40,000 items would no longer need be inventoried. They noted the cost savings after raising the threshold are estimated at $726,000 for academic units, and $83,000 for the UW Equipment Inventory Office.

Lidstrom and Camber presented a PowerPoint to the council with additional information and effects of raising the equipment threshold at the UW (Exhibit 1). Some takeaway points were:

- Effective date for threshold change no earlier than July 1st, 2016
- Raising the threshold includes proposal to centralize equipment inventory within the Equipment Inventory Office, data quality expected to improve (fewer errors), expected departmental relief from most inventory burden; implementation expected in 2018
- F&A rate expected to be less after implementation, not more
- Cost to researchers:
  - Equipment between $2000 and $5000 would be subject to indirect costs
  - A $3000 item costs a grant $3000 today. It would cost $4635 after the change.
  - Grants based on direct costs (mainly NIH and foundations) would see no impact.
  - Grants based on total cost (NSF, DOE, etc.) would see equipment in this range become more expensive (only new grants; existing grants would be grandfathered).
  - Only 20% of the total equipment inventory was purchased on grants
- Summary slide states: “Given the major impact on workload for staff, faculty, and lab members, and given the small impact on RCR return, despite making some equipment more expensive, we feel as an institution we cannot afford to maintain a $2000 equipment threshold. We recommend raising the threshold to $5000 and centralizing equipment inventory.”

Rosenfeld noted dissemination of the changing threshold may be one of the larger challenges. He explained the best way to get to the information to faculty is through administrators. It was noted there is an FAQ being developed on the change.

6) Aiding PIs with compliance issues (Giffels)

Rosenfeld noted the administrative work-load of Principal Investigators is a topic of interest for the council this year (PIs). He gave some background explaining that in order to write grants PIs need to be in compliance with the various state, federal, and university regulations. He noted the Office of Research website has excellent information on achieving compliance, and even includes information on how and where to take local compliance courses. He noted this web resource is underutilized by faculty, and he would like the council to play a role in investigating and advising on the dissemination of the information.
Giffels (Associate vice Provost for Research Compliance, Office of Research) was present to provide the council information on the resources faculty have at the UW for achieving compliance. He explained his main intention in his role is to aid an investigator in staying compliant, and to investigate why a researcher may not comply with regulations. He presented a PowerPoint presentation to the council with more information (Exhibit 2).

Giffels explained that among many other barriers to achieving compliance, there are dozens of compliance subject areas. Some other potential difficulties for achieving compliance were noted as:

- The highly technical nature of research compliance subject areas
- The fact that regulations change over time and that new ones emerge
- How regulations may conflict
- How each research project presents specific research compliance issues

The council then looked at some of the currently available UW resources on research compliance. The council discussed a few of these in more detail: (discussion indicated by *)

- **GIMs (Grants Information Memoranda)**
  * Lidstrom noted she has the authority to change GIMs (statements of policy related to grant and contract issues at the University of Washington) She explained if the council wants to do this, it can be done. She provided some info on the level of effort needed to change GIMs, explaining that the Governor of Washington would also have to sign-off on some changes before formalization can happen.

- **EOs (Executive or Presidential Orders)**
- **APSs (Administrative Policy Statements)**
- **Faculty Grants Management Course**
  * Giffels noted faculty receive automatic reminders to take this course in four-year intervals. He explained grants cannot be awarded if this requirement is not met.

- **Office of Research web site (compliance, research administration, support offices)**
- **MyResearch Training Transcript**
- **HSD (Human Subjects Division)**
- **OAW (Office of Animal Welfare)**
- **Radiation Safety Office**
- **Biological Safety**
- **Financial Conflict of Interest**
- **Responsible Conduct of Research**
- **MRAM (Monthly Research Administrators Meetings)**
  * It was noted UW’s MRAMs see attendance from up to 200 people either joining electronically or attending in person, and is highly sought after. The council found that the MRAM listserv does not broadcast widely to all research faculty.
Lidstrom noted the UW has research compliance offices scattered all over campus. She noted she does not have authority over all the offices, but they work together and the system works. She explained each office shares the common goal of supporting faculty in conducting their research.

Council feedback

Rosenfeld asked the council to provide feedback. Chi explained he was not aware of all the noted resources, and was happy to hear many great resources do exist. Other members expressed a desire to receive specific information in relation to the research they are doing at that time (e.g. filtered information). They explained it is difficult to go looking for specific compliance information, given the volume of material available. Brenowitz noted he would like to be made aware of the logic behind the institution of new regulations.

Lidstrom noted research compliance does not have the same tools as advertising, which targets individuals based on their behavior. She noted she is interested in providing information to faculty right when they need it (via small web pop-ups which give more information while filling out forms). Giffels mentioned he is working on software to target faculty and give them timely and context-specific information they may need while in a certain stage of their research. He noted the technology is available to provide this sort of context-specific information, and he will report back to the council when progress is made on this front.

Rosenfeld noted it is just as important for knowledge of compliance to be given to administrators as it is for PIs. Giffels agreed that PIs should not be the only ones to investigate requirements for achieving compliance.

7) Proposed Catalyst survey to test ABB influence on collaborative research

Rosenfeld noted the council has been charged to investigate Activity-Based Budgeting (ABB) on behalf of the ABB Review Committee and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB), looking specifically into its impact on “research collaboration.” He explained the council decided last year to begin investigating by way of a survey, and questions for the survey were discussed and mocked up in FCR meetings last spring (2015).

Lidstrom gave some background into the problems ABB poses. She noted a part of indirect costs go to the dean’s office of the lead PI, which has been policy for the last 30 years. Activity-Based Budgeting, she explained, elevated the awareness of revenue streams. She clarified some deans do not want to share their revenue streams, and there is evidence that this is an issue, but not necessarily an ABB issue. A member agreed, and noted he is a part of an effort to create an interdisciplinary neuroscience program, which has been ongoing for the last twenty years, and has been bogged down at the level of the deans.
Lidstrom noted she would like the council to address the problem, and possibly disseminate the policy on indirects to faculty, and make it easier to understand and comply with. Rosenfeld posed that the survey could go to the Council of Deans and Chancellors. Lidstrom mentioned she could talk to the deans, informing them of the survey plan, once it has been completed.

It was suggested that some survey questions should include a text box wherein responders can elaborate on their answer. One question that was noted to be in need of a text box was: “do you feel like barriers have kept you from extending your research?”

Rosenfeld explained he wants all members give input on what the final survey will look like. He noted because of the absence of many members in the meeting, he will send out an email asking all members to submit their questions to him directly. He explained the next meeting will be used to work on the survey, and make it ready for broadcasting. Lidstrom noted she would provide the definition for “research collaboration” to be used in the survey.

8) Council use of Google Drive file in lieu of Sharespaces retirement (Burgess)

Council support analyst Joey Burgess demonstrated use of Google Drive (cloud-based file sharing software) to members of the council, and explained that in lieu of Catalyst Sharespaces’ expected retirement by UW-IT on November 12th, 2015 - the council will make use of Google Drive for all future file-sharing needs. He noted this decision has been authorized by Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty.

Logistically, he noted council members will receive hyperlinks connecting them to their respective council’s Google Drive folder in each meeting broadcast email, and folder securities may or may or not be heightened depending on the council’s posting of sensitive and/or exclusive materials.

9) Good of the order

Rosenfeld noted the council has been tasked to review Executive Order No. 61 on Research and Scholarly Misconduct in their next meeting (November 18th).

10) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst

Present: Faculty: Eliot Brenowitz, Donald Chi, Gina-Anne Levow, Michael Rosenfeld (chair), John Slattery  
Ex-officio reps: Tom Gebert, Jennifer Harris  
President’s designee: Mary Lidstrom  
Guests: Carol Rhodes, Susan Camber
Absent: Faculty: Chuck Frevert, Mark Haselkorn, Benjamin Marwick, Tueng Shen, Juliet Shields, Daniel Vogt
Ex-officio reps: Diana Louden

Exhibits
Exhibit 1 – RAB Eq Inventory Sept 28_fcr_Lidstrom_fall2015
Exhibit 2 – Research Compliance Info for FCR Oct 7
Equipment Inventory Threshold

• Current threshold for equipment = $2000
• Federal and state threshold = $5000
• Creates administrative burden, mainly in academic units
  – Cost to academic units = $1.4M*
  – Cost to Equipment Inventory Office = $247K*

*From costing study by Cost Accounting & Analysis in 2014

• UW is the only institution in the top 25 research institutions that does not use the $5000 threshold

Proposal: Raise the equipment threshold to $5000
Impact of Raising the Threshold

Administrative burden

– 40,000 items would no longer be inventoried (only 13% of the total inventory value)

– Estimated cost savings*
  • Academic units: $726K
  • Equipment Inventory Office: $83K

*From costing study by Cost Accounting & Analysis in 2014
Impact of Raising the Threshold

Cost to researchers

– Equipment between $2000 and $5000 would be subject to indirect costs
– A $3000 item costs a grant $3000 today. It would cost $4635 after the change.
– Grants based on direct costs (mainly NIH and foundations) would see no impact.
– Grants based on total cost (NSF, DOE, etc.) would see equipment in this range become more expensive (only new grants; existing grants would be grandfathered).

Only 20% of the total equipment inventory was purchased on grants
Centralizing Inventory

• Proposal: Equipment Inventory staff carry out the inventory (with software and tracking)
• New cost to EIO is estimated at $149K; cost savings to other units estimated at over $1M
• Data quality would improve, fewer errors
• Departments would be relieved of most of the burden
• Used successfully at MIT, Arizona, Arizona State
• Implementation in FY18
F&A Rate Implications

• 1\textsuperscript{st} rate cycle after implementation: no impact
• 2\textsuperscript{nd} rate cycle after implementation: net decrease in F&A of about $1M (due to decreased depreciation)

**NET IMPACT IS NOT MORE F&A, IT IS LESS**

Impact spread over all departments = 0.4% decrease in total RCR
SUMMARY

Given the major impact on workload for staff, faculty, and lab members,
and

and

Given the small impact on RCR return,

Despite making some equipment more expensive,

We feel as an institution we cannot afford to maintain a $2000 equipment threshold

We recommend raising the threshold to $5000 and centralizing equipment inventory.

Effective date for threshold change no earlier than July 1 2016
Input on Communications

• How and when should this change be communicated to faculty?

• We can use the MRAM list (campus research administrators) to reach staff
Research Compliance Information
The Question?

- How can researchers most efficiently access information about the various compliance topics associated with research at UW?
Research Compliance Information

Let’s be mindful of...

• The large number of research compliance subject areas
• The highly technical nature of research compliance subject areas
• The fact that regulations change over time and that new ones emerge
• How regulations may conflict
• How each research project presents specific research compliance issues
Research Compliance Information

Available Resources

GIMs (Grants Information Memoranda)
EOs (Executive or Presidential Orders)
APSs (Administrative Policy Statements)
Faculty Grants Management Course
Office of Research web site
  Compliance
  Research Administration
  Support Offices
MyResearch Training Transcript
Research Compliance Information

Available Resources (Continued)

HSD (Human Subjects Division)
OAW (Office of Animal Welfare)
Radiation Safety Office
Biological Safety
Financial Conflict of Interest
Responsible Conduct of Research

And the list goes on…
Research Compliance Information

Available Resources (Continued)

Monthly Research Administrators Meetings (MRAM)
- For anyone interested in Research Administration
- Held in the Tower Auditorium
- Broadcast online in real time
  - Moderated
  - Interactive
- Listserv for announcements
- Website archive of informational materials
The Question?

- How can researchers most efficiently access information about the various compliance topics associated with research at UW?
What Are the Issues?

• Lack of available resources?
• Lack of awareness of available resources?
• Lack of organization of available resources?
• Lack of sophistication of how resources are made available to researchers?
  • Contextual
  • Just-in-time
  • Clear, concise
• 1:1 subject matter expert availability is expensive. Is it needed?
• Other?