

**University of Washington**  
**Faculty Council on Research**  
Monday, January 12, 2009, 9:00-10:30 a.m.  
26 Gerberding Hall

**Faculty:**

Sara Curran, Jackson School  
David Fluharty, Marine Affairs  
Mark Haselkorn, Technical Communication, Chair  
Apurva Jain, Info. Systems & Operations Mgt.  
Gerald Miller, Physics

Axel Roesler, Art  
Susan Spieker, Family & Child Nursing  
Ronald Stenkamp, Biological Structure  
Daniel Vogt, Forest Resources  
Richard Wright, Linguistics

**President's Designee:**

Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research

**Ex Officio:**

Susanne Redalje, ALUW Representative  
Richard Lum, ASUW Representative  
Mike Vannatta, GPSS Representative  
Carol Rhodes, Professional Staff Organization

Jeanne Small, PSO Alternate  
David Foster, Retired Faculty  
James Harrington, Faculty Legislative Rep.

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Call to order and approval of Agenda
  2. Approve minutes from December 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
    - 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**

Council member Gerald Miller, on behalf of chair Mark Haselkorn, called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

Miller asked if there were any additions, or corrections to the agenda. The agenda was approved as submitted.

**2. Approve minutes from December 2008 FCR meeting**

Miller asked if there were any corrections to the December minutes. Hearing none, a motion to approve the minutes was made and seconded. The minutes were approved.

### **3. Announcements**

There were no announcements.

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

- **Office of Research (Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, Office of Research)**

President's designee Mary Lidstrom had a couple of announcements. She first inquired about the progress of the Royalty Research Fund (RRF) program review, noting that she had heard from Tom Daniels that it was moving along. Council member Daniel Vogt reported that Daniels had sent out something last week. Lidstrom said that when she receives the review she will bring it to the council to discuss. She also said that she will work with chair Mark Haselkorn to get Daniels on the agenda to speak to the council.

Lidstrom reported that a new awards process system was put in place last week and that both the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) and the section of Grant and Contract Accounting (GCA) are very pleased with it. Lidstrom noted that OSP's expectation is that the new system will make a noticeable improvement to the backlog of awards, and will decrease the awards turnaround time probably within a month. Sue Camber added that the new system helps track new accounts, and notifies users electronically about their new budget account. Users can also look at the system anytime and see where their account is at. Lidstrom noted the awards process is moving toward being fully electronic which has helped to lower the workload of the OSP and GCA offices.

Lidstrom was asked to update the council on the current budget crisis. She reported that all units, academic and administrative, were asked last week to prepare 8%, 10%, and 12% budget cutting scenarios. The Office of Research and GCA are fully funded on permanent Designated Operating Funds (DOF) and will be participating in the budget exercises. Lidstrom noted that the exercise will include laying out the consequences of the proposed cuts, and that they will be looking for ways to make cuts without harming service to campus. Lidstrom laid out the predictions for the legislature's difficult budget decision, the possibility of the state receiving Federal aid, the potential size cut the UW might face, and future layoffs. She explained the process for how budget decisions will be made.

Lidstrom was asked what might happen with units that are mostly self-sustaining but almost 100% of their state funding goes toward salaries. She explained how these units will need a combination of using empty positions along with bridging, a process for temporarily shifting non-state funding to cover positions until there are openings through retirement. Lidstrom noted that the Governor has lifted the state hiring freeze which will allow unit heads to balance where they take their cuts. It will also allow research to fill some important positions, such as for eScience where they must hire someone within one year or return the money to the state. Council members continued to discuss budget concerns at length. Haselkorn noted the importance of the council's work that supports university research, because self-sustaining money gives departments more flexibility during economic downturns.

Mark Haselkorn thanked Gerald Miller for jumping in and made a request to amend the agenda, to add a vote for the election of vice-chair, under item 7, New Business. The amended agenda was approved. Haselkorn also asked to add information to item 2, approval of the minutes. He reported that he will present to the Senate Executive Committee this afternoon the council's final report on the INSER discussion, and reviewed the major points he would make. Miller suggested that he talk about the questions they asked and what constitutes a review.

Haselkorn noted that he could present all of section 5 in the minutes. He added that they are not providing anything to AAUP.

## 5. Discussion

### • Faculty Effort Reporting and Council on Governmental Relations (Sue Camber)

Sue Camber began her report with some background information on the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR). She explained that as of September she has become a board member of COGR and receives more information, which she would like to be able to share with FCR members. Camber gave members a handout on COGR. She described COGR's work, noting that their primary focus is to help the federal government and universities with regulations, by providing a "voice of reason" to the development of policies that impact university research. Camber was asked if COGR hires lobbyists. She replied that COGR is made up of representatives from large and medium size research institutes who work together to provide advice and information to their membership. Camber was asked if COGR is proactive or primarily responds to requests. She replied that COGR is both reactive and proactive on issues, and provided examples. Haselkorn acknowledged the potential usefulness of COGR for problems that FCR has been asked to address, such as research faculty on 100% grant funding who write proposals. He asked Camber if COGR would know what other institutions are doing, what their best practices are on this. Camber said that she can bring issues that she is familiar with to COGR and bring back information to FCR, or connect the council with someone through intellectual property. Haselkorn asked council members what kind of liaison they wanted with COGR. Council members said that they would like to know that COGR exists as a resource for information, and go to the COGR website. Camber offered to send information that would be of interest to the council, and Haselkorn asked her to contact him about items to put on the FCR agenda.

Camber next spoke about faculty effort reporting. She explained how the federal government has looked into the issue in a cyclical pattern over the last 30-40 years. It has been in the headlines most recently because of large settlements at research universities, such as Yale University's recent \$7.8m fine on effort and cost transfers reporting. Camber said that the National Science Foundation has made it their big issue, and often goes out to big universities to check on their effort reporting. She noted that while they have not yet visited the UW, she expects that they will.

Camber described the efforts of the Research Accounting & Analysis in the last 2-3 years to make sure the Deans, chairs, and faculty understand faculty effort reporting, and know that the research faculty is not on its own on this issue. She noted that in particular, the highest risk faculty, those who are funded 100%, must have a portion of their salary paid by the university if they are doing anything other than research beyond a *de minimus* level, like preparing proposals and serving on administrative committees. The rule applies to all funded faculty members, regardless of the percentage for effort reporting paid by grants, and the federal government finds it easiest to go after fully funded research faculty to find out what they have done besides research. Camber noted that they have worked with all of the colleges, who now have a policy plan on highly funded faculty and how they will handle effort reporting issues in their college. The top five colleges for effort reporting have been asked to have a communication plan in place within their college on how they will reach out and make sure that chairs and faculty members understand the policy. Their plans must have a process in place to deal with effort reporting issues for research faculty. She said they have also begun sending out reports to colleges who have research faculty members with effort reporting issues, and are asking Deans to resolve the issues. Resolution usually means to pay the appropriate portion of

the faculty member's salary with non-funded sources. Camber noted that her office is now seeing fewer reported cases of effort reporting problems. Camber asked council members if they are starting to see a change in how effort reporting is handled in their departments and colleges. Miller responded by saying that the Physics department has begun to pay 5% of its research faculty members' salaries for them to attend departmental meetings. Haselkorn noted that the issue is not consistently addressed in Engineering, but that his department has a staff person who assists faculty members with their Faculty Effort Certification (FEC) reports that document their effort on grants and contracts. Miller suggested that writing proposals is like doing research work, and asked if this could be an issue that COGR addressed with the government. Camber replied that COGR has had discussions on it, but has not gotten anywhere with it, particularly because of the federal budget environment. Haselkorn noted that the Senate Executive Committee has asked council chairs to make a list of issues and that this topic is on FCR's list. He acknowledged that the council's efforts last year towards a university-wide solution were not successful, and asked members how, or if, they should address it now, given the current economic climate. He felt that the council will be asked to explain by the end of the year, what they have done to address the issue of how 100% funded research faculty spend their time.

Richard Wright offered two possible action options for faculty who are 100% research funded:

- push back against federal regulations (which he felt hasn't worked), or
- comply at a university-wide or departmental level.

He explained his position, noting that it is possible to do both at the same time. Wright acknowledged that there are different forms of compliance, but that he thought it was possible for a research faculty member to comply by not being the grant writer (principal investigator), and by not participating in departmental functions such as faculty meetings and advising students not related to the grant. Council members pointed out that attending infrequent faculty meetings would be viewed as *de minimus*, especially as research faculty are averaging over the effort reporting period. Camber noted that possibly by late spring, they are considering going to a 6 month effort reporting period for everybody, which would give research faculty some flexibility to participate in a little activity outside of grant work. It was pointed out that advising students who are not related to the grant is still a problem that concerns fully funded faculty. Camber was asked if the federal government defines *de minimus*. She explained the disadvantage to having the government clearly define it, and the advantage in the current effort reporting system that allows researchers to approximate their time. Camber also responded to questions about the conflict between federal agencies who define by an hourly commitment and the percentage system used by the university, the rules for tracking time spent, and the difficulties faced by researchers with fluctuating salaries.

A discussion began about claiming proposal writing time as *de minimus*. Camber explained that depending upon the size of the proposal and program there are some instances in which claiming *de minimus* would be appropriate, but that the average time needed for National Institute of Health or National Science Foundation proposal writing would not fall under that definition. Camber noted that if research faculty are 100% during their effort reporting period a list goes out to the deans. There was discussion about ways to indicate that a faculty member is fully funded by grants. A possibility exists as they move toward a totally electronic reporting system to include a report of 100% funding, as well as a series of pop-up boxes that would explain reporting rules. Lidstrom noted that research faculty always have the option to amend their reporting forms to note changes in charges to their salary. Camber emphasized how well the reports to deans are working to bring attention to the issue.

The issue of the summer quarter problem was addressed. Camber clarified that the 6 month reporting period is broken into fall-winter, and spring-summer reporting periods. It was pointed out that using 6 month averaging for effort reporting eliminates the summer problem. Camber explained that she would be seeking approval for the 6 month averaging of effort reporting in the next two weeks.

Haselkorn asked council members what they wanted to do with the issue, if they wanted simply to report to the Faculty Senate that they had a discussion on these issues and felt that the move to 6 months was a good solution, and will monitor it. Or, return to the issue and do something. Anything we can do to help research faculty. Camber noted that COGR has looked at the proposal cost issue but that she saw no enthusiasm for the issue now. A discussion began on whether they should pursue getting administration or university funds to cover 100% research faculty who write proposals. Lidstrom pointed out the complicated nature of the topic and the value in council members getting educated on all of the issues, as well as proposing action for them. A discussion began about what kind of education is needed, with the idea to go back to the fundamentals on the topic, especially for all of this year's new council members and a good review for everyone else. Wright and Camber agreed to work together to write up a list of useful information. Haselkorn asked them to plan a half hour discussion on it, and an agenda for how to address it for the remainder of the year.

Lidstrom and Camber explained the complicated nature of the time related reporting and the consequences if the central university were to fund 100% research faculty's proposal writing efforts.

Haselkorn noted that they will continue the discussion and put it on the next agenda.

## **6. Old business**

There was no old business.

## **7. New business**

Council members elected Gerald Miller as FCR vice-Chair for the current year.

## **8. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 a.m.

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

**Present:**       **Faculty:**   Curran, Fluharty, Haselkorn (Chair), Jain, Roesler, Stenkamp, Vogt, Wright  
                      **President's Designee:**   Lidstrom  
                      **Ex Officio Reps:**    Redalje, Lum, Vannatta, Foster (by phone)  
**Absent:**       **Ex Officio Reps:**    Harrington  
                      **Regularly Invited Guest:** Nurse