

**University of Washington**  
**Faculty Council on Research**  
Monday, February 11, 2008  
Room 26 Gerberding

**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

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda
2. Approve minutes from 5 December 2007 FCR meeting
3. Announcements
4. Requests for Information and Updates
  - Royalty Research Fund (Jeff Cheek, Associate Vice Provost for Research Compliance and Operations, Office of Research)
  - Grant and Contract Accounting update (Sue Camber, Assistant Vice President, Research Accounting & Analysis)
5. Old Business
  - Letter to Provost Wise (Cathryn Booth-LaForce)
  - Interdisciplinary Research Subcommittee proposed legislation (Mark Haselkorn)
6. New Business
  - Classified, Proprietary, and Restricted Research Subcommittee proposal (Daniel Vogt)
7. Adjournment

**1. Call to order and approval of agenda**

Cathryn Booth-LaForce opened the meeting at 9:02 AM by asking for the approval of the agenda. The agenda was approved as written. She then introduced Lynne Chronister as the new Director of the Office of Sponsor Programs and welcomed her to the meeting. Cathryn also welcomed Sarah Spritzer and Barbara Perry who were attending via teleconferencing.

Agenda approved.

## **2. Approval of minutes from the 5 December 2007 FCR meeting**

The minutes of the December meeting were approved with just two minor corrections submitted by Sue Camber.

## **3. Announcements**

Cathryn then asked Council members if there were any announcements. Hearing none, Cathryn introduced Jeff Cheek who was invited to the meeting to talk about the Royalty Research Fund.

## **4. Requests for Information and Updates**

- Update on Royalty Research Fund – Office of Research, Jeff Cheek

Jeff Cheek asked the committee members if they had any questions about the Royalty Research Fund (RRF), as he presented a handout.

Gerry Miller wanted to know about the apparent lack of funding for full professors, and should they even attempt to submit proposals since it seems like most of the funds go to junior faculty.

Jeff distributed an update on the five year award history. The RRF has two cycles per year and the awards are reviewed by three different review panels made up of faculty across campus. The three different review panels are: Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences; Basic Biological and Biomedical Sciences; and, Physical Sciences and Engineering. The handout showed ten cycles of funding going back to June of 2003 through January of 2008. There is about \$1M per cycle and the peer reviewers from each panel make the final recommendations for funding. The award data in the handout is broken out by disciplines and academic title. There is a range of success rates for senior faculty in receiving RRF funding depending on disciplines, ranging from 10% to 33% on average.

Cathryn asked Jeff if he anticipated that the Royalty Research Fund would be increasing in the near future. Jeff didn't think there would be an increase in funding given the current projections for licensing income and interest earnings.

A discussion pursued regarding the question of whether disciplines should receive funding only if they are more likely to create new patents and royalties and can possibly feed monies back into the fund instead of funding disciplines such as the humanities that do not provide such a return. This committee will discuss this issue and other RRF issues at the March meeting.

- Grant and Contract Accounting update – (Sue Camber, Assistant Vice President, Research Accounting & Analysis)

Sue Camber, Associate Vice President, Financial Management, handed out two different handouts; one showing the percentage change in expenditures, awards and

budgets and the FTE and other listing process improvements in GCA with a focus on both customers and internal systems/organization and cross functional teams.

The direct expenditures for the UW for 1990 were about \$274M as compared to \$961M in 2007 (251% increase). The awards went from \$346M in 1990 to \$1,019M (195% increase). Number of budgets managed went from 8,164 in 1990 to 21,793 (167% increase). The FTE in 1990 was 43 permanent positions and in 2007, 44 FTE permanent positions (2% increase). Heavy turnover in recent years and increased in compliance requirements and complexity have also had a significant impact. Sue explained that it takes about two years to understand the basic range of post-award grant management responsibilities with about a 2-4 range from really knowing the job well.

Financial Management, parent organization to Grant and Contract Accounting, has had a quality improvement program in place since 1990. As a result, GCA processes have been continually streamlined, automated, and improved in the years since then, allowing the unit to absorb some of the increased volume. Examples of improvements include a 2005 reorganization of Grant and Contract Accounting. In that reorganization, we created six teams, each serving a group of colleges and/or departments. The service team establishes new budgets and follows that budget from the beginning to the end, instead of several different units doing different things to the same budget. In addition, examples of changes and improvements include: a new invoicing system and continued automation of the many manual invoicing formats our sponsors require; creation of an advisory board to provide ongoing input; automation of the indirect cost encumbrance and indirect cost base functions; and improvement to the fiscal reporting process to improve timeliness of required reports.

Sue is working closely with Mary Lidstrom to plan joint GCA and OSP process improvements. We are also working closely with OSP's new process improvement manager, Debbie Flores. Sue is submitting a budget request for additional FTE. In spite of years of process improvements, turnover and volume increases continue to impact our ability to serve faculty well.

Mark Haselkorn wanted a quick picture of OSP - is the Office of Sponsored Programs in as bad of shape as GCA? Jeff Cheek and Dave Eaton indicated that the Office of Sponsored Programs and the Human Subjects Division are not in as dire a need as GCA, although they have seriously limited resources as well. The Office of Research, OSP and GCA are approaching budgets requests with a united front to the Provost. Dave Eaton also noted a connection in these offices from the strategic roadmap – upgrading the electronic systems, which is critical.

## **5. Old Business**

- Letter to Provost Wise (Cathryn Booth-LaForce)

Cathryn drafted a letter to Provost Wise regarding concerns about funding for OSP and GCA. The letter is written on behalf of the Faculty Council for Research in regards to their concerns about the current level of funding for the Office of Sponsored Programs and Grant and Contract Accounting. Over the past ten years the number of grant applications and funded grants has grown tremendously, but staff increases have been highly disproportionate to this growth. The added efficiencies of new procedures,

streamlined processes, and the move to electronic records have helped these offices, but their systems are still under considerable strain. Faculty members are affected by these funding/staffing levels in many ways. Some examples are delays in processing subcontracts, excessively late Financial Status Reports, and lack of assistance with complex budget problems. The overall letter encouraged the Provost to consider allocating more funding to OSP and GCA.

David Eaton thought that it would be a good idea to attached the graph that Sue Camber distributed to the committee regarding the research accounting analysis from 1990 to 2007 and the small percentage of FTE in relation to the huge increase in direct expenditures (215%), the increase in awards (195%), and the increase in budgets (167%).

Gerry Miller moved that we adopt this letter to present to the Provost and Mark Haselkorn seconded the motion. The committee members approved this motion unanimously.

**ACTION ITEM: Approved**

- Interdisciplinary Research Subcommittee proposed legislation (Mark Haselkorn)

Mark Haselkorn distributed a handout regarding a Faculty Senate resolution on fostering multi-unit interdisciplinary research proposed by the Faculty Research Council and the Senate Sub-committee on cross-campus interdisciplinary research. The resolution is attached.

Mark asked if there were any questions or comments. The council members approved this resolution, which will be put on the agenda for the next Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting on the 25<sup>th</sup> of February.

**ACTION ITEM: Approved**

Cathryn told the council members that she has been trying to get the Applied Physics Laboratory to come to their meeting but it probably won't be until spring quarter.

**6. New Business**

- Classified, Proprietary, and Restricted Research Subcommittee proposal (Daniel Vogt)

Daniel Vogt told the council members that the FCR's Classified, Proprietary, and Restricted Research (CPRR) Subcommittee (Daniel Vogt, Gerry Miller, and Ronald Stenkamp) met on January 30, 2008 with Robert Miyamoto and Mark Wensnahan from APL-UW to discuss a proposed subcontract between APL-UW and PNNL. The CPRR committee members were all present except Mark Haselkorn, who stepped aside due to a potential conflict of interest because he may do some work with PNNL.

The request for FCR approval to University of Washington's Applied Physics Laboratory (APL) to submit a classified research subcontract to Pacific Northwest National

Laboratory (PNNL) to provide enhanced projections of Arctic sea-ice extent and thickness related to global warming is shown in the handout. The funding would be used to validate their model using some classified data on sea-ice thickness – global climate models could help with national security by providing more detailed and accurate assessments of probable future environmental conditions in Arctic coastal areas as well as benefit future, non-classified environmental research on ice-covered seas. The sub-committee met and asked the usual questions of APL and all members of the sub-committee were satisfied. The following are APL-UW's abbreviated response to those questions

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

- *It is thought that the use of this ice-ocean model linked to Global Climate Models (GCMs) is unique and the contribution of projections of future sea-ice changes related to global warming will be very valuable.*

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

- *The classified proposal will use data on Arctic sea-ice thicknesses for the validation of their model (Pan-Arctic Ice-Ocean Modeling and Assimilation System) (PIOMAS), this model will produce estimations and project future sea-ice changes especially under different scenarios of climate change.*

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

- *It is thought that the use of ice-ocean model linked to Global Climate Models will contribute projections of future sea-ice thickness changes related to global warming and will also be very valuable for the Navy.*

4. In what way, 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 placed on their thesis, dissertation, or other academia activities?

- *No students will be involved.*

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

- *We do not expect to publish under this contract; however there will be procedures in place to review possible publications to release the information for unrestricted publication.*

6. Are any foreign nationals working on this project?

- *No foreign nationals will be employed in this project.*

**ACTION ITEM:** Daniel Vogt made a motion to approve APL-UW's submission of this classified proposal which was seconded and **approved** unanimously.

Mark Haselkorn had excused himself from the Subcommittee discussion since some may view him to be in a conflict of interest situation since he is funded by PNNL on an entirely different project – but thought it was best to be on the safe side, so no one could question him on taking part in the discussion and taking money for funding from PNNL.

Council members wondered if they should have some type of policy in place for such situations. Jeff Cheek recommended that it would be a good idea and maybe they could look at the GIM-10 for wording for such a policy.

### **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 AM. *Minutes by Peggy Fanning.*

**Present:** *Faculty members:* Booth-LaForce, Haselkorn, Miller, Stenkamp, Vogt, and Wright

*President's designee:* David Eaton for Mary Lidstrom

*Other ex officio members:* Redalje

**Absent:**

*Faculty members:* Finrow, Fluharty, Khagram, Roesler, Schwartz,

*Ex-officio members:* Allen, Barker, Foster, Harrington, Nathu, Russell

**Guests:** Sue Camber, Jeff Cheek, Lynn Chronister, Peggy Fanning