

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Research
Friday, November 9, 2007
Room 420 Mary Gates

Faculty:

Cathryn Booth-LaForce, Nursing – Chair
Jerry Finrow, Architecture
David Fluharty, Marine Affairs
Mark Haselkorn, Technical Communication
Sanjeev Khagram, Evans School of Public Affairs
Gerald Miller, Physics

Axel Roesler, Art
Ilene Schwartz, Special Education
Ronald Stenkamp, Biological Structure
Daniel Vogt, Forest Resources
Richard Wright, Linguistics

Ex Officio:

Karen Russell, PSO Representative
Theresa Barker, GPSS Representative
Poonam Nathu, ASUW Representative
David Foster, UWRA Representative

Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research
James Harrington, Faculty Legislative Rep.
Susanne Redalje, ALUW Representative

Chair Cathryn Booth-LaForce called the meeting to order at 10:05 AM

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda
2. Approve minutes from 1 October 2007 FCR meeting
3. Announcements
4. Discussion
 - Classified, Proprietary, and Restricted Research Subcommittee proposal (Miller)
5. Requests for Information and Updates
 - Update: Effort reporting compliance and eFECS (Sue Camber, Assistant Vice President), Research Accounting and Analysis; Lisa Yeager, eFECS Project Manager
6. New Business
 - Interdisciplinary Research subcommittee: Plan for 2007-2008 (Haselkorn)
 - Graduate student compensation cap (David Eaton, Associate Vice Provost for Research)
7. Adjournment

1. Call to order and approval of agenda

Cathryn Booth-LaForce opened the meeting at 10:05 AM by asking for the approval of the agenda.

Agenda approved.

2. Approval of minutes from the 1 October 2007 FCR meeting

The minutes of the October meeting were approved.

3. Announcements

Cathryn introduced three new members to the Faculty Council; Axel Roesler, Art; Poonam Nathu, ASUW Representative; and, Theresa Barker, GPSS Representative. Theresa Barker is actually continuing to serve on the Council as the GPSS Representative.

Cathryn then asked Council member if there were any other announcement, and there were none.

4. Discussion

- Classified, Proprietary, and Restricted Research (CPRR) Committee

Gerald Miller told the Council members that the Classified, Proprietary, and Restricted Research (CPRR) Committee, which is made up of Daniel Vogt, Gerry Miller, Mark Haselkorn and Ron Stenkamp, met on October 16, 2007 with David Johnson and Robert Goddard from UW-APL to discuss the UW-APL proposed contract. The subject of this meeting was a request for FCR approval to University of Washington's Applied Physics Laboratory to submit a classified research contract to Chesapeake Sciences Corporation (CSC) to participate in a Phase I classified Small Business Technology Transfer Research (STTR) project. The STTR request is seeking new technology in advanced Anit-submarine Warfare (ASW) Acoustic Transducers and Signal Processing at lower cost. The APL-UW role will be to conduct modeling and analysis for CSC. The goal for this one year classified contract to participate in a STTR project called Advanced Continuous Transmission Sonar for Torpedo Defense funded by the Office of Naval Research was to design, build and test a continuous transmit towed active sonar system for torpedo defense applications. This proposal will be to develop technology for torpedo defense. This last line of defense for naval forces to detect torpedoes and make countermeasures will be enhanced and more affordable if this technology developed is successful. Specific details of the sonar system and the threat torpedoes are classified and therefore specific analyses will also be classified.

The CPRR committee unanimously agreed to recommend that FCR approve UW-APL's request to submit this proposal. This was determined by answering the six FCR questions that deal with classified, proprietary and restricted research.

1. What unique capabilities does your program and the UW bring to this proposed project?

Applied Physics Laboratory (APL) is a national asset. APL was established during World War II to help solve major national defense needs. Over the years APL-UW has established itself as a national asset in applied ocean science in support of the U.S. Navy. The Sonar Simulation Toolset (SST) takes into account the sonar, the target, and the natural environment and provides realistic digital time series that can test algorithms and hardware as if in the water.

2. Describe the scholarly, scientific, and/or educational benefits of this proposed project?

New technology being developed for continuous transmission sonar for torpedo defense will be needed due to third world countries continuing to invest in submarine technologies and the market for advanced torpedoes. This could be our last line of defense for naval forces to detect torpedoes and make countermeasures.

3. In what ways does the proposed project provide a public or community service?

This will be a safeguard with new technologies to keep up with other new technologies being developed.

4. In what ways, if any, will UW students (graduate and undergraduate) be involved in the project: If they participate in the research, will they require security clearance or have restrictions place on their thesis, dissertation, or other academic activities?

There will be no graduate student involvement.

5. Does the proposed project pose any restrictions on publications by the PI, members of the research team, students or postdoctoral fellows?

They do not plan to publish on this proposed project.

6. Are there any 'foreign nationals' working on this project?

No foreign nationals will be employed in this project.

Gerald Miller said that the subcommittee unanimously agreed that they would recommend approval to the Faculty Council on Research. Gerald Miller moved that FCR approve UW-APL's request to participate in a STTR project called *Advance Continuous Transmission Sonar for Torpedo Defense* funded by the Office of Naval Research, and was seconded by David Flaherty. Cathryn reminded council members that only the faculty could vote. Theresa Barker thought that everyone could vote not just the faculty. Theresa thought that in the past they were allowed to vote too. Cathryn thought that this had been decided on in the past that only faculty would vote on these type of issues. Sanjeev Khagram thought that each year you can take a vote and decide if everyone will be allowed to vote or only faculty members. Cathryn said that she would check into this. So, the council members decided to vote both ways; just the faculty and then everyone and it was approved by 7 faculty members and then again by 11 votes by everyone; no one opposed the submission of this proposal.

ACTION: Approved

5. Request for Information and Updates

- Update: Effort reporting compliance and eFECs (Sue Camber, Assistant Vice President, Research Accounting & Analysis; Lisa Yeager, eFECs Project Manager).

Lisa Yeager started by giving council members an eFECs Project update. eFECs is an electronic version of handling Faculty Effort and Cost Sharing reporting by improving and simplifying the process of reporting faculty's effort and cost sharing on-line. Mary Clark also took part in the presentation of eFECs. Phase I examined the external requirements needed for effort reporting, examined campus needs, reviewed software products, and conducted a cost benefit analysis. The team recommended a University-built solution.

Phase 2: Core Development – includes the foundation/infrastructure work; mitigate cost share and moving old components off BGT (old system), and establish integrated framework taking data from BGT and integrating data with SAGE and MyFD and eFECs. The project team is currently gathering feedback from stakeholders. Specific questions at this time include: Is it value-add for campus departments to receive the eFECs information online before full certification functionality is available.

Sue Camber spoke up saying that retroactive salary transfers would show up which is a bonus to consider. Preliminary feedback (including from the PI Advisory Team) is to go forward with something sooner rather than later.

Gerald Miller said that his department administrator fills out the form and they look it over and sign it. David Eaton asked about it being on line and if you found errors, could you correct them. The old way you had to print it out, staple it, get signatures and mail in which it could get lost some where along the way. The new way is just to go on line, do a transfer via the online functionality that is being released by My Financial Desktop next year, and the next day it's there. Lisa Yeager showed a summary of their timeline, but dates can always change.

Feedback sessions are planned at different locations around campus with administrators and payroll coordinators and they plan to have some open sessions with faculty/staff and hope to get some good feedback from around campus. Lisa and Sue asked the council members if they had any good ideas of how to get this information of the open sessions out to campus faculty/staff who may be interested in attending these feedback sessions. The Deans/Directors/Chairs list was mentioned as a good source. They also wondered about sending the notice to research faculty, but in the past the turnout hasn't been too good.

Sue Camber talked about the Faculty Effort Certification. In the Summer/Fall of 2007, the top five colleges in volume of effort reports were asked to develop outreach plans tailored to their units to continue to address non-grant activity such as proposal writing, administrative activity etc, for highly funded grant faculty. All are sharing the results at a discussion in October and again in December with our Effort Reporting Compliance Advisory Team which Richard Wright, a FCR council member, is a representative along with other faculty representatives. Some colleges have started taking action. In addition, letters will go out to all faculty receiving effort reports providing updates,

contacts and links to information after another round of input from Effort Reporting Compliance Advisory Team. Letters to Deans listing faculty members who submitted proposals while they were 100% funded on grants are being developed. After the Advisory Team concurs with the letter; they will be sent to Deans. The Deans have committed to resolving the issues and communicating with the Chairs and PIs.

The council members talked about this being a big challenge. When faculty are funded 100% on federal grants, they have no time to write new proposal on their time. They would have to be taken off grant funding some percentage of their time and paid from another source in order to write new proposals. The Council on Governmental Relations (COGR) and Association of American Universities (AAU) have this on their list of significant issues in effort reporting.

6. New Business

- Interdisciplinary Research Subcommittee plan for 2007-2008

Mark Haselkorn told council members that the Interdisciplinary Research Subcommittee met October 16, 2007, and their initial discussion focused on the difficulties related to mobilizing a campus-wide committee, and addressing the full range of relevant issues that encompass so many aspects of campus life. See web site at:

<http://uwnii.pbwiki.com/Discussion+and+Work+Area>

The attendees were Mark Haselkorn, Gerald Miller, Ron Stenkamp and Dan Vogt.

We focused on how to take on such a huge set of interdependent issues in smaller chunks. It was decided to pick one goal out of many already suggested and focus on achieving progress in that area, rather than take everything on at once. The three goals selected for consideration and the pros and cons of each were discussed.

Goal #1: Assure that non-tenured faculties are encouraged to participate in interdisciplinary research and receive full credit for that participation.

Pro- important and potentially transformational. Con – potentially meddles in departmental process and values.

Goal #2: Assure that Deans and Chairs are evaluated based on how well they promote interdisciplinary activity involving their unit, not just on how well they promote and enhance their unit.

Pro – can be achieved with no cost, just a clear mandate on the role of Deans and Chairs and how they are evaluated. Con – may be a smaller gain than could be achieved by focusing on some other goals.

Goal #3: Assure that interdisciplinary research teams receive a share of indirect costs generated by their joint activities.

Pro – would provide more stability and incentive for collaborative interdisciplinary research. Con – requires a redefinition of how units share indirect cost returns.

After discussion, the sub-committee was leaning towards Goal #2 as it seemed that concrete action could be achieved most easily on this goal.

Deans and Chairs are usually reviewed every five years. There is word that deans will be reviewed every year in the very near future. The goal #2 could be worked into the review of chairs and deans as to how well they promote interdisciplinary in their unit.

There was a discussion of goal #3. The problem with the third goal would be how to split indirect costs. Indirect costs are given to one unit, not divided. David Eaton said that this is a real problem RCRs go back to the same units. He has been dealing with the development of centers and institutes and provides guidance to negotiate upfront to share RCRs. Dave will share his draft with Mark's group on the feedback from centers and institutes. There is no real mechanism at all to control. There are over 200 centers and institutes, and the interpretation of what is a center and what is an institute can be uncertain, and we don't want to inhibit people from getting together.

Some of the problem lies in that indirect costs are tied to space/administration and interdisciplinary groups don't own space. Richard Wright commented that there are lots of issues and spin-offs.

The council members encouraged the subcommittee to pursue goal #2. The subcommittee will draft a resolution to present to the council for approval and then present it to the Senate for review and approval.

- Graduate student compensation cap (David Eaton, Associate Vice Provost for Research)

Support from NIH through training grants and stipends are specified. According to a specific NIH policy established in 2001, Graduate Research Assistants (RAs) paid by NIH research grants (e.g., RO1s) has to be "reasonable". The NIH definition of 'reasonable' is that the total compensation package (salary, tuition, benefits) cannot exceed the salary for a 'year 0' NRSA (National Research Service Award) postdoctoral fellow. The 'year 0' NRSA postdoctoral fellow salaries are established by NIH, and updated periodically). However, at the UW salaries for pre-doctoral RAs are highly variable with multiple different salary structures, thus it is complicated to determine if a particular student is being paid more than the NIH 'cap'. If a student gets paid more than the cap, then the money has to come from non-federal funds. This gets very complicated with different factors from full time to part time and with variable rates etc.

Michael Anthony is working on a draft guidance document that will help administrators determine if students are being compensated above the NIH cap, and if so, how the excess compensation must be addressed. He is taking the lead on this document. One challenge is that the NIH recently told someone at the UW that, if the institution sets their own 'year 0' post-doc salary, that they can use that as the CAP, rather than the NRSA amount. Thus, whenever the UW salary rates for year zero postdocs changes, it could change the cap. But the UW could make its own policy to either use the NRSA cap (which would be the most clear) or use the UW-established rate.

Hopefully the new guidance documents should bring some clarity to this issue soon.

7. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 11:25 AM. *Minutes by Peggy Fanning.*

Present: **Faculty members:** Booth-LaForce, Fluharty,
Haselkorn, Miller, Roesler, Schwartz, Stenkamp, and Wright
President's designee: David Eaton for Mary Lidstrom
Other ex officio members: Allen, Foster, Harrington

Absent:
Faculty members: Finrow, Khagram, and Vogt
Ex-officio members: Barker, Nathu, Redalje, Russell

Guests: Sue Camber, Mary Clark, Peggy Fanning, Barbara Perry and Lisa Yeager