1. Call to order
Council chair Ron Stenkamp called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

2. Approval of Minutes
The minutes from the April 14, 2010 meeting of the FCR were approved without changes.

3. Announcements
Camber announced that the Division of Cost Allocation, the federal agency that negotiates indirect cost rates, was coming to campus in the next week to visit several units. Rate negotiation may take place by the end of next week.

Chronister announced that UW has now received over $326 million in ARRA (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act) funding, including 95 awards that extend beyond 2 years. Thus, the reporting system will need to be maintained for at least 4 years. Eaton mentioned that they will have to keep an eye on the budget to make sure there is enough support for reporting requirements. Chronister said that it may be useful to do a presentation about new reporting requirements coming on. UW is now number one for ARRA funding from the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Most of the ARRA National Science Foundation (NSF) funding is truly new funds, though some may have already been slated for funding.

4. Reduced Responsibility Policy and Process
Eaton introduced the Reduced Responsibility policy, which is being developed so that it is easy to develop a paper trail for salaries and establish what a faculty member’s base salary is. This is being done because a faculty member’s salary cannot be raised based solely on their ability to get grants, yet, if somebody had a certain funding source that ends, the federal government would see that reduced, less-
than-100% effort salary as their base salary when reviewing grants. Thus, it is necessary to be able to establish a faculty member’s full-time base salary.

Eaton described the Reduced Responsibility implementation plan and handed out a draft Grants Information Memorandum (GIM) on Reduced Responsibility Status Involving External Funding.

Haselkorn asked whether this issue is less of a problem for staff, noting that it happens to them, too. The council briefly discussed the question but reached no definitive answer; the issue may not have been on the radar of the auditors, and may have to do with whether a reduced-responsibility staff member is named in the submission of the next grant. The council agreed to further look into the matter.

Eaton added that they hope the process is not onerous and that it is useful for more than faculty members. The policy signals a change in mindset; previously, if you were a faculty member who lost a source of salary and saw a 25% salary reduction, you were told you couldn’t use that 25% of your time for scholarly activity including writing grants. This policy changes that so now that is your time and you are allowed to perform scholarly activity including writing grants with that time. This is a different scenario than losing 25% of your salary because you wish to move to a part-time, 75% FTE.

Vogt asked if funding agencies would monitor the staff as closely as faculty. Eaton said there would be no reason they couldn’t, but he doesn’t think they do.

Eaton said that they would like this policy to be in practice by the beginning of spring quarter, and that some deans are already using it. He stressed that it involves reduced responsibility, not reduced FTE, and is for people who are losing a source of funding but have every intention of returning to where they were. The type of external funding lost does not matter; for example, it could be a grant, a gift or an endowment. The point is to have a paper trail of the base salary when seeking grants. As the policy is written as a Grants Information Memorandum, it is relevant to faculty that have grants or external funding, however, there is no reason that faculty who have no grant funding in their portfolio couldn’t use it if they plan on replacing any lost support with external support.

Haselkorn pointed out that this seems most relevant to research faculty, many of whom might be very shocked to learn they could lose base salary. Eaton said that he wants to make sure the faculty understands this policy, and that it’s in their best interest. Currently, they are operating under WOS (without salary), an informal procedure that is hard to defend to funding agencies. Haselkorn stressed the need to communicate clearly to the faculty the intent and benefits of this policy.

Council members asked about where the relevant forms would reside, and who would be in charge of keeping track of changes. The form will reside in the personnel file, and the faculty member’s department will be in charge of keeping track of changes, not the individual faculty member. If a faculty member has a number of grants that are changing but not affecting the bottom line, the form doesn’t have to be filled out – only when the total salary is reduced.

Eaton emphasized that they don’t want this process to be used by a dean to take away the percentage of time allocated to research faculty for scholarly activities or grant writing. If a faculty member is 100% on grants, they cannot write any other ones. This issue is pointed out in section III.f. of the policy, which works in conjunction with GIM 35 (Effort Reporting Policy for Sponsored Agreements).
Stenkamp asked what would happen with A/B funding under this policy. If the B line was running out, what would the base salary be? Eaton answered that it would be A+B, and that the policy applies to A/B funding. However, the explanation needs to be fleshed out, because A/B funding is not applied exactly the same across the campus.

Eaton explained that there are two parts to the form. The first is filled out to establish base salary when it is realized that funding will be lost, and the second is filled out when that loss is known.

Haselkorn asked a question about FAQ 6: does it imply that a dean could take away a 5% time for writing grants, and it would not trigger a GIM RR? It was clarified that FAQ 6 applies to an administrative supplement (ADS) or endowed supplement (ENS) that is a non-permanent part of the base salary. As the 5% would be part of regular pay, the dean cannot take away that designated time if external funding is lost. Camber added that, according to GIM 35, the funding for proposal writing and other scholarly activities should reflect the percentage of effort used for those activities.

Wright asked if this policy would threaten summer salaries, since they are effectively a boost in salary. Eaton and Camber clarified that this policy doesn’t pertain to summer salary, and that another FAQ is being written to address this issue. The rate for the 9-month appointment would also apply to the summer salary. You wouldn’t have to fill out the form if you do or don’t get a summer salary.

Eaton noted that to complete this process, grants submitted will have to include specific language in the budget justification about base salaries and full-FTE amounts. This could be a concern for faculty if a grant submission has page limits, and the Office of Research will work with administration and faculty to make sure that it gets inserted. The council noted that it could be included in the cover letter and also put on a checklist. NIH is going to electronic budget modules and the statement will be included there when possible. A presentation will also be given to get the word out at administrative levels.

Regarding implementation, the council stressed the importance of discussing the issue with faculty. Deans should deliver the information for maximum impact, but faculty should be asked to redirect any concerns or issues they encounter to the FCR. Camber asked for language on faculty not losing support on scholarly activity, and said they are planning on sending an email to all faculty. Eaton noted that as a GIM, the policy is easy to change in the event of needed clarifications or unintended consequences.

The council discussed ways for FCR to get feedback on this and other policies, including the creation of an email address and the use of the Senate blog.

5. Old/ New business

Voting rights for ex-officio members
Stenkamp brought up the Senate Executive Committee’s recent discussion on voting rights for ex officio members of faculty councils and asked the council for input. Haselkorn said that FCR is the only faculty council that regularly has a vice provost attending, and it’s much more powerful as partnership with the Office of Research. The council doesn’t forget that some members are faculty and others are staff or administration, but gets along. It was also pointed out that the massive UW research enterprise really only has two major committees that monitor it, FCR being one of them, and to think that they could work in isolation is unrealistic. Eaton noted that he is a faculty member, as is interim Provost Lidstrom. Wright said that the council mostly deals with faculty research, but typically not faculty rights and responsibilities (with the exception of today’s meeting).
Haselkorn moved that the FCR request the SEC to grant voting rights to ex officio members from the Office of Research, with Wright seconding. A brief discussion ensued to clarify which ex officio members should have the right to vote. An amendment to change the motion to “the FCR requests that the SEC grant voting rights to ex officio members who hold faculty appointments” was accepted as friendly, and seconded. The motion passed.

**FCR Issues for 2010-11**
Other issues that the FCR could look at for the year were discussed:

- **Classified, proprietary, and restricted research.** This topic could be expanded thoroughly with the many subtleties on rules and restrictions. Wright suggested that it would be good to have a risk management person come talk about the subject, because many rules come down to that. Chronister noted that these issues are becoming more prevalent because of the terms and conditions UW is getting on research contracts. Wright suggested a goal of clarifying this situation.

- **Activity Based Budgeting (ABB).** Haselkorn suggested having discussion about indirect cost recovery (ICR) under ABB. The basic principle of ABB is that funds go back to the generators and research enterprises could be in jeopardy if current ICR policy continues, as ABB will be regulated more clearly. ICR could be argued as a university and unit facilities issue, but if people don’t write grants, without that small bit of flexibility, we are not supporting the research community as we’re supposed to. He would suggest the FCR seeks to understand how ABB and ICR are going to be handled, and understand the faculty part of it. Eaton added that under ABB, the specific structure won’t change because the return from ABB will still reside with the deans. It will change the way the money comes back to the dean, but it will still be with the dean.

- **With meeting time running short, Stenkamp said he would look further into potential issues and discuss them with council members prior to turning in a list of issues to the SEC.**

**6. Adjournment**
The meeting was adjourned at 10:31 a.m.

---
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