The Faculty Council on Research met Tuesday, November 27, at 9:00 a.m., in 36 Gerberding. Chair Ross Heath presided.

PRESENT: Professors Booth, Gordon, Kiyak, Reh, Troll, Vance, Vitaliano, Vogt Ex-Officio Camber, Perrin, Sheehan, Zuiches, Ludwig, Ghosh Regular Guests Mac Parks, Office of Research; Special Guests: Jim Luby, Applied Physics Laboratory; Kelly Knickerbocker, Applied Physics Laboratory; Bill McKean, Forest Resources

ABSENT: Professors Kartsonis, Ruzicka, Stewart Ex-Officio Blake, Kahl, Sjåvik, Takhar

AGENDA

1. Approve agenda
2. Approve minutes of June 7, 2001 meeting
3. Consider classified research proposals
4. Chair's welcome; voting rights
5. Review "Human Subjects Protections and Procedures"

1. Approve agenda
With the addition of item 4, Chair's welcome and voting rights, the agenda was approved.

2. Approve minutes
The June minutes were approved as submitted.

3. Classified research proposals
Chair Ross Heath opened the discussion by reminding the Research Council of its charge: To ensure that nothing in the research proposals and contracts violates the ethics, interests, and principles of the University. Important among those principles, Heath said, is ensuring that the right of graduate students to discuss and publish their research is not compromised.

Heath asked Mac Parks, Associate Provost for Research and the University's Security Officer, to lead the discussion on classified research proposals.

Parks commented that his role includes ensuring that the acts of researchers do not compromise the University's ethics, interests, and principles. There is no secret research at the UW, said Parks, and all research contracts are public records open to scrutiny. In classified contracts, however, there is an element of the research that is constrained by a security rule of some kind.

Acting for the Faculty Council on Research, Sharona Gordon and Tom Reh have scrutinized the two classified contracts being reviewed today and will report on them, Parks said. In addition, the two Principal Investigators for the contracts (Bill McKean, Forest Resources, and James Luby, Applied Physics) are attending the meeting to answer any questions or concerns.

Gordon advised that she and Reh reviewed the classified contracts and found they do not involve any graduate student research, do not contravene any UW policies, and do not contain any "red flag" issues. In addition, each contract does meet one or more of the criteria for a classified project (uses a unique...
University capability or resource, has a substantial scholarly, scientific or educational benefit, or provides a very substantial public service).

The Principal Investigators commented on their respective projects:

**James Luby, Applied Physics Laboratory:** The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), said Luby, is conducting underwater acoustics research in which APL has a lot of expertise. Lockheed Martin is the prime contractor on this project; they have asked APL to participate as a subcontractor. The work aims to improve passive sonar arrays designed to give the Navy improved listening capabilities so they can detect new and quieter submarines built by adversary nations. APL's participation would involve acoustic modeling, work that is similar to the NAVSEA contract approved by FCR last year. No students would be involved in the project.

It was moved, and seconded to approve the classified contract for APL. Motion carried.

**Bill McKean, Forest Products:** As a function of paper science engineering, McKean's group has the resources to test and analyze paper to determine its source. The Central Intelligence Agency needs to identify the source of paper and would like McKean's group to act as consultants in their process. The McKean proposal would require UW staff to obtain security clearances and participate in classified conversations. No students would be involved.

It was moved and seconded to approve the classified contract for Forest Resources. Motion carried, with one faculty member abstaining.

### 4. Chair's comments and voting rights discussion

**Voting rights**
Ross Heath advised FCR members that, with the exception of representatives appointed by the administration, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (SEC) has authorized individual Councils and Committees to grant voting rights to non-voting members if they choose to do so. Heath asked whether FCR members wanted to exercise this option.

In general discussion, Ed Perrin (Emeritus Faculty), commented that emeritus members should be welcomed and involved in the discussions, but should not vote since the outcome of the vote does not affect them. Perrin added that librarians and graduate students should probably be granted the vote. Mac Parks said the UW will, over the next few years, be addressing difficult issues that will profoundly affect the libraries. Previous library representatives have been very active and valuable members, said Parks. As the administration's Research representative, he wants their input and sees value in allowing them to vote. Cathryn Booth agreed that such input is valuable, but asked "If this is a faculty council, shouldn't it be a faculty vote?" Asuman Kiyak concurred. Tom Reh asked whether students vote on any of the other councils. Sharona Gordon said she would not want to make a decision without the library representative present. Kiyak asked if this would be a yearly vote for each new representative; Heath responded it would be done yearly. Joy Ghosh (GPSS) commented that he was a voting member of FCR last year, but did not have the vote the year before.

Since a straw poll showed weak support for granting the vote to graduate students and librarians at this time, Heath tabled the issue with the comment that it could be revisited if experience shows it has merit.
Chair's comments and discussion
Heath welcomed old and new FCR members, and read the description of the Council's charge:

"The Faculty Council on Research shall be responsible for all matters of policy related to research."

Heath employed a mycological metaphor to express his view that, while FCR has been very responsible in matters of research policy, it has been more reactive than proactive and is not sufficiently "in the loop" on research issues. He shares the view of the Faculty Senate Chair that a proliferation of advisory and expert committees across the University has diluted the effectiveness of some faculty councils, including the Research Council, on matters of policy within their purview. He cited the Research Advisory Board as an administrative committee that exerts a powerful influence on research conducted at the University, and called for better communication between the two bodies.

Tom Reh agreed that, in past years, some research issues have been discussed in other committees and then brought to FCR as a "done deal." There is a lack of procedures specified in the Faculty Code, he said - it would be helpful to spell out how, when, and by whom research issues should addressed. Heath agreed, and added that FCR often tends to receive research issues in final draft form - the Council needs more involvement and early warning, rather than being asked to approve policy issues at the last minute on an up-or-down vote.

Heath advised FCR members that SEC is reviewing overlapping jurisdictions and responsibilities in order to reduce the number of councils and committees as much as possible.

Parks agreed that there is a proliferation of committees and applauded both the efforts of SEC to streamline this and the efforts of the Research Council to be more visible and proactive. He hopes the administration and the Research Council can be allies in this process. Parks said FCR activity varies from year to year; in the past two or three years he believes the Council has been less active. He also commented that the Research Advisory Board has been put "on hold" and has not met this academic year, pending the resolution of some organizational issues.

Parks described the Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee (IPMAC), appointed by President McCormick, as a group that interacts with FCR on issues of patents and copyrights. He added that communication and coordination with IPMAC could be improved, and pledged to do this. FCR may also consider seeking representation on IPMAC.

Ed Perrin commented that research groups at the UW are isolated groups ("cottage industries") doing their own thing, with insufficient communication and coordination. Heath said that the UW, while one of the top research schools in the nation, suffers from this lack of coordination externally as well. Heath would like to see a Vice President for Research at the UW, who would be responsible for internal coordination as well as external visibility for the research capabilities of the University. Is that the kind of issue, asked Heath, on which FCR should advise the President's Office?

Mark Troll asked, "To whom should UW research be more visible?"

Where the UW should be promoting or defending research efforts at the State or Federal levels, replied Heath, this is not happening to the degree it should. Sharona Gordon pointed out that, for example, the University still pays sales tax on research grants - this amounts to nine percent of her research budget. If this issue were successfully promoted at the State level and the tax were to
be dropped, it would be like getting nine percent more research dollars. Gordon sees this as a symptom of the University growing to be a large research institution but "not acting like it."

Perrin was adamant that the University needs a Vice President for Research as much as it needs its Vice President for Hospitals. Mark Troll added that internal visibility is also important - for instance, a member of FCR should be on the Research Advisory Board to improve coordination and share knowledge. Parks said the Chair of FCR sits on the Research Advisory Board.

Grant and Contract Administration would welcome the advocacy and accountability a Vice President for Research would provide, said Parks. But University administration has not seen evidence of a crisis in this area, while it has seen crises in other areas. However, added Parks, Research Services is under extreme pressure to perform. In the last 10 years, grants have increased 8-11% per year, and proposals are 'way up. Five months into this fiscal year, grants are running 20-30% ahead of this time last year.

Asuman Kiyak observed that FCR became very proactive a few years ago in the area of Human Subjects Purchasing. As a result, Kiyak said, things changed for the better. "A lot of us see the Research council as a council that can make the quality of life better for researchers on campus," she added. FCR needs to know about workload and other issues in the Research Services offices so the council can help resolve these issues with the administration, she said - can FCR have a report from each of these offices at Council meetings, to keep abreast of issues? Heath concurred.

Heath underscored the University's need for a stronger, more visible, and more aggressive position on research in Washington D.C., where most research money originates. Parks suggested that Barbara Perry, Director of Federal Relations, talk to FCR about her activities on the scene in Washington, D.C.

Kiyak commented that researchers have their contacts within the granting organizations and these professional relationships tend to govern how the monies are allocated. In her view, Perry is a very good PR person but Kiyak does not see her getting grant money for the UW.

Parks agreed that Perry's role may be oriented more toward public relations, and wondered what the University can do to facilitate the kinds of relationships that bring in grant money. Tom Reh suggested that a bigger issue might be "Are we missing out because we don't have higher level representation with NSF and the other big foundations?"

Ed Perrin commented that foundations are not the source of funds, they are the distributors. "The source is the U.S. Congress. For instance, the Hutch was created because a downtown Seattle surgeon lobbied Senator Warren Magnuson, not because we went to NIH for a grant."

5. Human Subjects Protections and Procedures
Mac Parks opened the Human Subjects discussion by describing the Provost's Task Force charged with assessing the status of UW procedures and protections for human subjects in research. The Task Force is identifying what else needs to be done to respond to the heightened national concern about human subjects protection. In the last 2.5 years - after the Gellsinger case at Johns Hopkins - there has been intense scrutiny of these issues, and the rules are being more closely enforced.

The Task Force met all through Fall 2000, and produced a set of recommendations that is being taken very seriously (copy attached). Human Subjects staff has been increased and consolidated into a new location (15th Avenue near Gould Hall), IRB teams have been reorganized, and better data systems are in place.
Carol Zuiches said that the new database will connect with GCI so proposals can be electronically entered and paperwork reduced. NIH certification is pending.

Sharona Gordon asked whether there is capability to monitor human subjects research after the project is approved. Parks said they are still working on monitoring and auditing models, and waiting to see what the Federal agencies will require, before any monies are spent. This information should be forthcoming in the next two or three months.

Parks complimented Carol Zuiches on the excellent job Grant and Contract Services has done on getting roughly 6,000 proposals "out the door."

Ed Perrin commented that this is a marvelous achievement with some huge resource allocations involved - he speculated that indirect costs for grants will go up next year. Park responded that indirect costs can't go up because they're capped. Perrin voiced concern that someone should be lobbying Congress to reduce the data requirements in view of the cap on indirect costs. Parks replied that the Provost's office is lobbying locally. Nationally, said Parks, both the AAU and the Council on Government Relations are lobbying for an adjustment in the cap or to have a third component built in - costs would then be allocated in three areas: Facilities, Administration, and Compliance. New studies show that universities are not being reimbursed the true costs of research, and are in effect subsidizing the research.

The American Society for Experimental Biology (ASEB) has called for reimbursement of compliance costs; NIH is funding a project to develop models of compliance costs.

Heath asked how the UW is paying for all that is being done in the Human Subjects area, and how these costs are expected to increase as the number of research grants increases. Is there a model that can predict how much extra space and how many new people will be needed as grants increase by X dollars?

Kiyak noted that grant monies are increasing at the rate of 8% per year, but staff and resources needed to administer grants has increased at a much slower rate. Yet each grant has 51% indirect costs built into it. What's happening to the monies that should be realized by holding these costs down?

Parks responded that it's very difficult to track one dollar of indirect costs through the system. Heath agreed, and said he's interested in tracking the incremental cost for services.

Susan Camber commented that ten years ago she had 46 staff members - today, grant volumes have doubled and she has just 38 staff to do the increased work. Kiyak wondered where the 51% indirect cost monies on these increased grants are going, if the department is operating with fewer staff. Parks replied that indirect cost recovery actually averages about 30%, not 51%. Clinical trials lose money, for example, because drug companies won't pay 51% indirect costs.

Kiyak suggested that FCR take up the subject of indirect costs in greater detail at a future meeting. She would also like to see Helen McGough, who heads the Human Subjects Division of Grant and Contract Services, included as an ex-officio member of the Research Council or at least come and talk to the group about how they're responding to these new conditions.

Heath said he intends to have each of the service groups that support research come and talk to the Research Council yearly, so Council members can better understand the issues surrounding indirect costs and other research grant concerns.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 a.m. Recorder - Linda Fullerton.