Chair Brent Stewart called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m.

Meeting Synopsis:
1. Announcements, approval of agenda, approval of minutes (Stewart)
2. Review of Council’s role, and policies governing Council business (Stewart/Discussion)
3. Solicitation of volunteers for Council subcommittees and other University committees (Stewart/Discussion)
4. Future topics for Council discussion (Stewart/Discussion)

1. Announcements, Agenda, Minutes

The agenda was briefly reviewed and approved. Note: minutes from the 6 May 2005 FCR meeting were approved at the 3 June 2005 meeting. There were no minutes taken at the 3 June 2005 due to the absence of the recorder.

2. Introduction (Stewart)

Stewart welcomed back members who continue on the Council, and welcomed the new members. Faculty members newly appointed to the council include David Fluharty (Marine Affairs), Mark Haselkorn (Technical Communication), and Richard Wright (Linguistics; on sabbatical fall quarter). New ex officio members include David Lovell (Legislative Representative), Susan Kane (ALUW Representative), John Lee (ASUW Representative; Angelina Crown will serve as his delegate due to schedule conflicts). John Slattery is the new President’s Representative. Ms. Kathy Bracy (School of Medicine) will serve as secretary for the year. Stewart noted the arrival at UW of the new Provost, Dr. Phyllis Wise, and the newly appointed Vice Provost for Research, Prof. Mary Lidstrom (effective November 15, 2005). Prof. Lidstrom was unable to join the Council for the October 27 meeting. Stewart would like the Council to send a letter to Craig Hogan, thanking him for his service. Stewart will draft for review at the next meeting.

The new Secretary to the Faculty Senate, Donna Kerr, is making some changes to policies and procedures. Linda Fullerton has found a new position, if anyone wants to send a kind note.

3. Why Serve on the FCR? (Stewart)

The Faculty Council for Research is one of 12 advisory bodies in the Faculty Senate, reporting up to the Executive Committee. Stewart encouraged members to read the Faculty Handbook. Service on the Council requires broad familiarity with the University government. The Council tries to draw from a broad range of university faculty.

Authority of the FCR. Stewart referred members to the excerpt he’d sent out in advance of the meeting regarding the FCR’s authority. He noted that the Council’s role in relation to the Research Advisory Board (RAB) and that the Human Subjects Division (HSD) reports through RAB. Note: HSD will be a topic of discussion with Mary Lidstrom at the 12/15 FCR meeting.
Stewart and other members present during the 2004-05 year briefly recounted some of the major topics of Council discussions. Stewart thanked the Office of Research for excellent work in the past year, and for their consultations with the Council.

5. **Voting Rights of FCR Ex-Officio Members (Stewart)**
*Ex officio* members include representatives of the Professional Staff Organization (Suzette Ashby-Larrabee), the Graduate and Professional Student Senate (Theresa Barker), the ALUW (Susan Kane), Sam Dworkin (emeritus faculty), the Associated Students of the University of Washington (John Lee or Angelina Crown), the Legislative Representative (David Lovell), and the Office of Research (Malcolm Parks). Traditionally, voting rights have been extended to these representatives. Stewart proposed that the Council vote on whether to extend voting rights for AY05-06. Asuman Kiyak believed last year’s vote had permanently established this practice. Stewart thought not, and was unsure whether the Council was empowered to enact a vote that granted permanent voting rights to *ex officio* representatives. Booth-LaForce spoke in favor of voting anew each year. Lovell sought clarification on whether the President’s appointee votes. Slattery, the President’s Representative, felt he should not have voting rights. Asuman Kiyak made the case that tendering voting rights makes the committee more active, and generates more engagement, resulting in a more meaningful contribution to University life by the Council. Parks suggested to the Council that it should maintain control over extending such rights, and therefore continue to vote annually. Haselkorn and Franza pointed out that there should always be a quorum of faculty representatives in order for a vote to occur. Stewart preferred to extend this on a year to year basis, and called for a vote on whether 1) to permanently assign voting rights to *ex officio* members without granting them eligibility to count as members of a quorum; or 2) to vote annually. Faculty members of the council voted to extend voting rights on an annual basis, without counting toward a quorum. The question raised regarding the President’s Representative’s eligibility to vote was not taken up further.

6. **Changes to the Faculty Handbook Regarding FCR (Parks)**
About three years ago, Parks suggested some changes in policy for the council to consider, when the scope of FCR expanded beyond consideration of classified and proprietary research. About two years ago, the changes to the Handbook were approved by FCR. The President signed off toward the end of this past academic year.

Parks provided a further overview of the nature and role of classified and proprietary research at UW. Universities are open places, and public universities are not a venue where secret research is conducted. Very occasionally, research may have a component within it that is classified (e.g., the location of buoys providing sonar data is classified, but the data itself is not). The “classified” research label and regulations were used to address all these kinds of research at UW. After the events of September 11, 2001, governmental regulations began expanding and sensitive elements began appearing in a broader range of research activities. Thus was born a new label: “restricted” or “Sensitive but Unclassified” (SBU) research. Working with FCR, the University began revising criteria and policies to address this issue. Restrictions on publications, facilities, and participation were addressed. Parks suggested the issues should be revisited again. Is UW set up to address new issues in restricted research efficiently? For example, the Department of Homeland Security is now issuing Task Orders rather than receiving proposals. It sets up a pipeline to do the work, then issues Task Orders and drives the research through this pipeline. UW’s current approval process of two- to four-week process may be too slow for this funding approach. Parks suggested this should be an agenda item for a future Council meeting.

Parks confirmed for Haselkorn that the Applied Physics Laboratory functions as a service facility and conduit for other University units who need to navigate security issues. He emphasized that this issue is about managing the practicalities of successfully conducting research that does belong within a university context,
not to expand the university’s willingness to be ordered to conduct research that does not belong in this setting.

Stewart noted that Zuiches works very hard to delete security language from grants and contracts as part of the University’s pre-award processes. Only one proposal was not submitted based on UW’s efforts to remove such language.

7. **Classified, Proprietary and Restricted (CPR) Research Committee (Kiyak/Stewart)**

Asuman Kiyak has chaired the CRP committee for the past two years. Other members are Dan Vogt, BobFranza and Gerald Miller. She described the committee's focus. Most proposals come from Applied Physics Lab, A unit within Oceanography. They conduct classified research for DOD, ONR, and other military funding sources. Usually these are clearly focused projects, or subcontracts to perform a specific service. APL is very knowledgeable about the routine, especially Bob Miyamoto, who is often the PI of such applications. The committee review answers four questions: 1) does the UW have unique capabilities that are required on this project? 2) Does it have substantial scholarly, scientific or educational benefits? 3) Does it constitute an important public service? and 4)What is the impact on graduate students?

Asuman Kiyak reported on the CPR committee’s September meeting regarding the Miyamoto (“Technical Support Services to the PNNL Coastal Environment Effects Program”) and Fox/Goddard (“Vector Hydrophone Torpedo Defense Array”) projects. They voted unanimously to support the proposal. Endorsed proposals are forwarded to FCR, which then votes with full membership. Eleven voted in favor with one abstention via e-mail for both proposals. FCR then forwards the voting result to the Office of Sponsored Programs (C. Zuiches).

Vogt agreed to serve as CPR committee chair if new volunteers don’t wish to, and Asuman Kiyak will continue to serve on committee. Stewart will seek volunteers via email to form a committee of five.

8. **FCR Liaison Committees (Stewart)**

A. **Humans Subjects Policy Board.** Stewart is seeking a volunteer from this Council to serve. This is an important policy area for UW’s research enterprise. Parks described the obligations and responsibilities, with the caveat that the new Provost and Vice Provost will likely make some decisions and adjustments. Significant resources are being invested in this area, which is positive. The Policy Board is where matters of policy are taken up, discussions about new areas and new needs occur, and assessments of new ethical issues are conducted. There is an argument supporting this body’s role as a “daylight commission”, serving both to advise and critique. The Board is likely to serve in the accreditation process in the future, as the Human Subjects Division will be seeking formal accreditation within the next year or two. Therefore, the establishment of formal policies will be a key activity. Asuman Kiyak recalled last year’s presentation by Karen Moe and Helen McGough. She expressed concern about FCR lacking adequate input and influence over the speed of positive steps, if FCR’s role is limited to service on the Policy Board. Slattery encouraged FCR to consider the definition of human subjects research. He noted that, as regulations are created to respond to medically focused human subjects activities, upper campus research activities with much less risk and invasiveness are negatively impacted. Slattery posited that current Federal guidelines need to be more responsive to the realities and range of human subjects activities. Parks suggested that this be discussed further with Mary Lidstrom in December.

Stewart asked members to email him with their interest in serving on the Human Subjects Policy Board.
B. Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee. Stewart is seeking a volunteer; he asked that interested members please email him.

C. Export Control Policy Committee. Stewart is seeking a volunteer to serve as an *ex officio* member. Meetings are monthly for 90 minutes. Please email Stewart, who is currently serving and would like to reassign this. Stewart noted that federal regulations prohibit graduate students from certain countries from being in proximity to certain fields of research. Parks clarified that “export” includes the transfer of knowledge from public talks, or laboratory activities to individuals from prohibited companies. Also, of course, regulations set limits on export of devices and materials to individuals born in the restricted countries. C. Zuiches has been working hard on this issue. There are personal penalties (e.g., conviction) that faculty risk. Per Parks, C. Zuiches is the campus expert, and this issue is very much in play. Barbara Perry, UW’s federal representative, is also a resource to this council.

Stewart and Parks noted that federal government is seeking to have simplified access to university and library IT systems, giving them easier access for surveillance purposes. Per Parks, current law allows this. More immediately, this is a cost issue for UW, as making the necessary adjustments to our systems would cost several million dollars, roughly estimated. Parks expects that multiple national professional and advocacy organizations for higher education and research are pursuing this issue.

9. Future Topics (Stewart)

A. Export Controls with Carol Zuiches.
B. Faculty Effort Certification. Miller supported asking Sue Camber back to discuss this further.
C. Indirect Cost Allocation Formulas. Miller suggested this topic. Slattery noted that President Emmert’s speech on October 26 committed to greater openness and accountability within campus administration. Lovell noted that yesterday’s Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs’ discussion of FECs linked up with some indirect cost issues. Franza spoke in favor of conducting an analysis of fund flows.
D. Lessons Learned from UW’s Response to Hurricane Katrina. Haselkorn suggested that the problems some schools and units experienced in being able to navigate would be a useful point of analysis.
E. Human Subjects Division with Mary Lidstrom

10. New business
None.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:37 a.m. *Minutes by Kathy Bracy, Director of Finance and Administration, Office of Research and Graduate Education, School of Medicine*

**Present:** Faculty members: Benner, Booth-LaForce, Franza, Haselkorn, Kiyak, Miller, Morrison, Rasmussen, Stewart, and Vogt

President’s designee: Slattery

Other ex officio members: Ashby-Larrabee, Crown (representing Lee), Lovell, Parks

**Absent:** Faculty members: Fluharty (excused), Haeseleer, Kumar (excused) and Wright (excused)

Ex-officio members: Dworkin and Kane

**Guests:** None