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Meeting Synopsis:
1. Call to order and approval of Agenda
2. Approve minutes from November 2008 FCR meeting
3. Announcements
4. Requests for Information and Updates
   - Office of Research (Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, Office of Research)
5. Discussion
   - Review of Institute for National Security and Education (INSER)
   - Faculty Effort Reporting and Council on Governmental Relations (Sue Camber)
6. Old business
7. New business
8. Adjournment

1. Call to order and approval of Agenda

Chair Mark Haselkorn called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. He proposed an amendment to the agenda which would remove the report on Faculty Effort Reporting and Council on Governmental Relations by Sue Camber, since she was not able to attend today, and replace it with an update on the Scholarly Communication Committee. The amended agenda was approved.

2. Approve minutes from November 2008 FCR meeting

A request was made to remove misattributed statements. The minutes were approved as amended.
3. Announcements

Council member Carol Rhodes announced that the First Annual Pacific Northwest Export Control Conference will be held January 6th and 7th in Seattle, Washington. She handed out a flyer, noting that sessions will be held at Henderson Hall and University of Washington Tower. Information on the conference is available on the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) website at: http://www.washington.edu/research/osp/index.php. Rhodes briefly described the agenda, noting that Federal Agency speakers will be addressing issues that include controls compliance and immigration and customs enforcement. She asked FCR to take the information back to faculty. Rhodes said that she will be sending the information to targeted departments. It was noted that the conference was a good opportunity for students as well.

4. Requests for Information and Updates

President’s Designee Mary Lidstrom gave an update on the current budget situation and its effect on research. Lidstrom remarked that research generally increases the revenue stream to the university, and maintaining investment in research at UW is important. Programs such as the Royalty Research Fund (RRF), Bridge Funding, and Matching Funds Request will not face cuts because they are not state funded programs. Lidstrom reported that research services will be expected to take cuts and they are looking at conserving in many areas including conferences, travel, and operations. She noted the current uncertainty around the budget deficit and that the real budget decrease to the university won’t be known until next June. Her office is currently creating possible scenarios on how it would trim about 10% from the research budget. Lidstrom will call all department heads that support research to get their ideas and will bring their proposals to FCR and RAB (Research Advisory Board).

Chair Haselkorn noted the importance of greater coordination between the university research council and FCR, and said he would work to get input. Council member Sara Curran asked Lidstrom about the kinds of information she needs to help prepare for a decrease in budget. Lidstrom pointed to the potential for fewer research services and the value of research faculty, faculty councils, and departmental councils in helping to plan for significant budget cuts to research. Haselkorn spoke about developing public-private relationships as one area in which they could position themselves when the economy turns around.

Special guest Lynne Chronister reported on the recent changes to the process for submitting grant applications to grants.gov. She emphasized the fact that grants.gov can process only 160 grant proposals per hour and that they are working on a back log of awards. Chronister explained that it is a transition from the existing award structure which relies upon paper to one that is semi-electronic. The new system will begin in early January and has a different deadline for the process and proposal, that will help insure that proposals get through. She highlighted key changes which include the rule that any proposal that is not complete or finalized and is sent to the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) less than five days in advance of the grant deadline will be returned to the Principal Investigator. Chronister described OSP’s efforts to train administrators in the new rules. She asked members to consider the best way to get the information to faculty members, suggesting training sessions or something web based. Lidstrom said she has sent an email about it to all faculty, and that there will be an article posted in University Week in January. She also offered the idea of sending faculty a one page explanation of the scary things that can happen and why they need to follow the new submission rules for grants.gov. Curran suggested that they contact divisional deans in Arts & Sciences in order to reach out to faculty who don’t have a lot of research support. Chronister offered to visit departments that work with research. After some discussion there was general
agreement that Lidstrom should send an email to faculty around the second week in January, using a subject line that will catch their attention. Council member Richard Wright noted that new faculty would likely miss the message and suggested the use of a web page link to the OSP web page on grant submission changes. Chair Haselkorn stated that he will contact the Chair of the Faculty Senate, David Lovell, about making an announcement of the changes at the next faculty senate meeting.

5. Discussion
   - Review of Institute for National Security and Education (INSER)

Chair Haselkorn provided an overview and background materials on the review of the Institute for National Security and Education (INSER) for those council members who were not able to attend the last meeting. He described the AAUP’s request for information and how FCR was not initially brought into the review process because there were no restrictions on information. He described the meeting as a good discussion that was both open and probing, and that had two outcomes:
   1. FCR will proceed with a post-review of INSER
   2. A number of email communications have come through the faculty senate that reflects a range in attitude towards the INSER program.

Haselkorn identified three distinct issues that have arisen from the INSER request:

   1. The issue of transparency and the need for a review of INSER
   2. Potential conflicts that can arise when the research of one academic unit is viewed as impinging on that of another academic unit.
   3. The issue of whether or not research money from certain sources should not be accepted on moral or ethical grounds.

A discussion began about the three issues and what role, if any, FCR has to play in them. Council members addressed several key points, including,
   - Whether or not there is a requirement for classified or restricted information in the INSER program
   - The nature of faculty safety concerns tied to the support of international student travel by a research program funded by an intelligence community sponsor
   - The scope of the AAUP’s request and its appropriateness for FCR consideration
   - Issues associated with research interdependencies across university units
   - Issues of academic freedom
   - The variable nature of funding sources across the university

There was unanimous agreement that instituting FCR mechanisms for addressing the second and third issues would introduce a “slippery slope” that threatened academic freedom and the current culture of university research. It was felt that the criteria currently used by FCR, including a focus on transparency, protection of students, and relevance to university mission, were appropriate. FCR reached the following conclusions:
   - INSER had appropriately not checked the eGC-1 box that would have instigated an FCR review since the award did not require classified, proprietary, or restricted information.
   - The post-review of INSER stimulated by AAUP and faculty requests but based on current FCR criteria found that had INSER checked the box, it would have been approved
   - More general moral and ethical concerns that went beyond research-specific issues were returned to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee without comment
• **Scholarly Communication Committee update**

Chair Haselkorn gave an update of a recent Scholarly Communication Committee meeting. He reported that the committee is working towards getting faculty approval for an open access repository for UW faculty. Haselkorn described the existing university repository and the open access mandate at Harvard University. He noted that the committee is working well and is focusing on recommendations before the final report.

5. & 6. **Old/New business**

There was no time to address these items.

7. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:28 a.m.

*Minutes by Melissa Kane, Faculty Senate, mmkane@u.washington.edu*

**Present:**
- **Faculty:** Curran, Fluharty, Haselkorn (Chair), Jain, Stenkamp, Vogt, Wright
- **President’s Designee:** Lidstrom
- **Ex Officio Reps:** Redalje, Lum, Vannatta, Rhodes
- **Regularly Invited Guests:** Nurse (by phone)

**Absent:**
- **Faculty:** Roesler
- **Ex Officio Reps:** Foster, Harrington