Meeting Synopsis:

1) Call to Order and Approval of Agenda
2) Review of minutes from Nov. 9, 2011 FCR meeting
3) Requests for Information and Updates
   a. Guidelines for Establishing and Organizing Research Units
   b. Changes to Security Questions EGC1
4) Old/New Business
5) Adjournment

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda
The meeting was called to order by Council Chair Ron Stenkamp at 8:34 a.m.

2. Approve minutes from Nov. 9, 2011 FCR meeting
Minutes from the November 9th meeting of FCR will be corrected and approved online.

3. Requests for Information and Updates

Guidelines for Establishing and Organizing Research Units (ORUs)
Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, discussed the handout regarding establishing organized research units. She defined Research Units and distinguished between Research Institutes and Research Centers. These new guidelines clarify the processes for establishing new ORUs and requesting central financial support for them.

Lidstrom stated that ORUs are very difficult to sunset, and these guidelines establish performance review, normally being reviewed every five years. New elements for this policy will require annual reporting and accountability through an annual report for ORUs with matching funds. Lidstrom emphasized that no additional workload will be added through such reporting, noting the importance of accountability due to the shift to the Activity Based Budgeting (ABB) model.

She noted that the contentious issue is how ‘Research Cost Recovery’ (RCR) is calculated when a Center is established. This occurs in multidisciplinary ORUs, where currently all the RCR is returned to the primary academic home of the ORU director. However, it is recommended by the Office of Research to negotiate the sharing of RCR amongst participating units. An additional issue due to the ABB model is how to split RCR and credit costs to primary units through established sub-budgets. As with ABB, revenue would be allocated in accordance to activities, and thus RCR and credit for expenditures would
be allocated toward the participating unit of the primary investigator. Lidstrom described the difficulty of establishing a threshold for requiring sub-accounts in non-primary departments in a multi-investigator grant, such as requiring sub-accounts for non-primary departments with activity beyond a threshold. RCR already serves as a disincentive towards collaborative work, and avoiding further disincentives would be ideal. Council members raised questions if sub-budgets could be used below the threshold, in response to which Lidstrom commented that all ORUs will be encouraged to have sub-budgets.

Further questions arose about the flexibility of the restrictions for using the terms “Center,” or “Institute”. Lidstrom noted rigidity in naming conventions occurs when central funds are being allocated. Risks of “paper institutes” (without funding) were noted, either by misrepresentation of the University of Washington or international research projects.

Changes to Security Questions EGC1
Garrett Steele, from the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP), briefly discussed changes within the eGC1 (electronic Grants and Contracts form 1), which serves to capture control and security concerns. He described three questions which were reworded to get better information, and an additional question was added:

1) “Will any items be transported out of the United States in connection with this project?” was changed to “Will any export-controlled items be transported out of the United States in connection with this project?”

2) A second question was added to capture information regarding non-physical transfers: “Will any export-controlled information or technology be transported to a foreign end-user?”

3) “Will this project potentially be subject to export restrictions?” was changed to “Will this project potentially involve restrictions on participation, restriction on access to research facilities or restrictions to publication?”

4) “Will this project require restriction on information, personnel, security, or classification?” was changed to “Will this project potentially involve access to classified national security information?”

Questions were raised about the sequences of these questions, and discussion occurred whether some of these questions will be conflicting with or duplicating other portions of the form. Council members emphasized the importance of the Help text within this form to prevent confusion and clarify the intent of the questions. Council members asked OSP whether a response of “yes” to the 4th question on the form would serve to trigger FCR’s classified research process. Lynn Chronister from OSP clarified that not all such projects understand from the beginning if they are classified or not and described that this would be detected within the written agreement. A change was suggested regarding “transferred to a foreign end-user” or “between UW and a foreign end-user” to include transfer to the University of
Washington as well as from it. Steele commented that he would investigate such an adaptation. No faculty objections for these changes in the eGC1 form came forth from the Council.

4. Old/New Business

Lidstrom mentioned new regulations being enacted which will affect faculty, which she can discuss at a future meeting, such as: conflict of interest, export controls, human subjects, and security. She stated the trade-off for the new regulations is that the Human Subjects requirements will be easier for researchers in the long term, but increasing security up to HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996) standards will be very resource intensive and expensive. Changes have been proposed to Circular A21¹, which Sue Camber will be able to summarize in two or three months. Council members raised questions on the size of the impact on North and South campus work. Clarification was requested if such standards “flow through” when information is obtained from another organization.

5. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 9:26 a.m. by Chair Stenkamp.

Minutes by Jay Freistadt, Faculty Council Support Analyst. jayf@u.washington.edu

Present: Faculty: Stenkamp (Chair), Haselkorn, Miller, Vogt, Roesler
President’s Designee: Lidstrom
Ex-Officio Reps: Pantazis
Guests: Poland, Chronister, Steele, Camber

Absent: Faculty: Spieker, Slattery
Ex Officio Rep: Nolan, Spelman, Gruhn

¹A Circular which establishes principles for determining costs applicable to grants, contracts, and other agreements with educational institutions: http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars_a021_2004/