Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Review minutes from December 3, 2019
3. Discussion on draft Class C resolution on transparency in animal research
4. Discussion on salary cap and overages for NIH grants
5. Discussion on draft Class C resolution on promotion of transparency and openness in research
6. Discussion on Class C resolution on community engaged scholarship
7. Discussion and vote on contract waiver request
8. Good of the order
9. Adjourn

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

2. Review minutes from December 3, 2019

The minutes from December 3, 2019 were approved as written.

3. Discussion on draft Class C resolution on transparency in animal research

Marwick, the chair, presented the Class C resolution on transparency in animal research (Exhibit 1). There was discussion of the recommendations within the document. It was noted there is a good record of the concerns expressed over IACUC (Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee). He noted the third “be it resolved” clause is unchanged from the last time the resolution was reviewed by the council. Marwick welcomed comments.

Members felt the resolution touches on the important aspects of the issues. One member felt additional specifics should be added on whom and by what process the standing committee (referenced in the first “be it resolved” clause) will be comprised and appointed. It was clarified that the Office of Research does not oversee animal research at the University.

Marwick explained the Senate Chair in a recent meeting suggested the council try to address this topic by another method other than a Class C resolution. Members expressed support for the idea of a Provost-level committee charged to respond to the concerns, similar to the Laboratory Safety Provost Committee charged in 2019. It was noted the Laboratory Safety Committee was co-chaired by a faculty member or Faculty Senate representative. A member felt the membership of the committee is critical to its effectiveness. He noted the FCR should retain some influence over the committee, and that committee membership should be communicated to the Provost by the type of representatives needed,
not necessarily by offering names. It was noted a reporting component to the FCR might also be stipulated.

A member recommended a letter be drafted to the Provost requesting a committee be constituted and charged to address the matters emphasized in the draft resolution. It was noted the Senate Chair should be asked to sign/endorse the letter.

4. Discussion on salary cap and overages for NIH grants

A document was shown detailing the issues associated with the topic (Exhibit 2). A short summary at the outset of the document states: “the Faculty Council on Research has identified a need for guidance on how to manage salary cap overages when a sponsored program includes investigators from multiple campus units and the sponsor imposes a salary cap” (Exhibit 1). It was noted UW’s smaller schools and colleges do not tend to have policies on this matter while larger units (e.g. UW Medicine) do tend to have policies. It was noted the document was recently corrected for accuracy by Lidstrom and Carol Rhodes (Director, Office of Sponsored Programs).

A member questioned why, if a grant has specified distribution of Indirect Cost Recovery Funds (ICR), is one department is still on the hook to pay for overages. He noted he expected to see some language to the effect that if the ICR is split, units would share the cost of the salary overages, which is not in the document. He noted this issue represents a disincentive for cooperation among units.

It was noted this is almost exclusively a National Institutes of Health (NIH) issue, and there is little indication the policy will be duplicated by other agencies. It was recommended some guidance be added that salary overage costs be shared among the units.

Lidstrom (president’s designee) explained she would share the document with the heads of relevant units. She asked that the document be sent to her. Marwick noted the document will be altered slightly and sent to Lidstrom.

5. Discussion on draft Class C resolution on promotion of transparency and openness in research

The Class C resolution on promotion of transparency and openness in research was reviewed (Exhibit 3). The document recommends, in part, that UW researchers “include a brief statement in their published work that demonstrates the computational reproducibility, transparency and openness of their research whenever possible, and in a manner consistent with the best practices of their research community” (Exhibit 3).

After some discussion, the word “computational” was suggested for removal from the first “be it resolved” clause. The change was accepted.

It was recommended that a subset of UW’s research-related webpages be revised to include a statement referencing some of the key points of the resolution. Lidstrom noted online information can likely be added; she noted care must be taken to avoid misguiding UW researchers into thinking the information reflects a formal policy.

The fourth “be it resolved” clause was recommended for removal, as the granting of resources to UW Libraries for this effort may take away from other ongoing FCR efforts.
A member questioned if UW CoMotion and the commercialization of ideas should be addressed in the resolution. It was noted most researchers patent a potential product idea well in advance of publishing a paper. It was noted a sentence might be added to the resolution in relation to this point. It was also noted that a spectrum might be recognized relating to the openness of research, rather than asking that the same standards be applied across various fields.

It was noted the goal of this resolution is not to solve these problems but to raise the awareness of UW researchers on how to achieve openness within their own fields using existing solutions.

Marwick noted he will tweak the resolution based on the discussion, and possibly meet with Muilenburg to determine the position of the UW Libraries as it relates to the resolution.

6. Discussion on Class C resolution on community engaged scholarship

Kover spoke to the draft resolution, which is not yet complete (Exhibit 4). She noted members of the UW are considering how best to achieve team research community-engaged scholarship. New draft language for Faculty Code Chapter 24 Section 32 (Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members) is included in the resolution.

During discussion, it was noted this topic dovetails with the Provost’s initiative on faculty merit evaluations. Members noted the merit process should recognize community-engaged scholarship. The chair of the Senate requested a one-page brief on the matter in order for him to better understand the position of the FCR on the topic.

A member requested language be included to cover non-faculty at the university engaging in community-engaged scholarship (such as research staff). He asked the council to consider how professional staff might also benefit from these considerations.

Marwick noted he will draft the one-pager and share it with the Faculty Senate chair as well as the council.

7. Discussion and vote on contract waiver request

The council considered a restricted research waiver request for a research contract from the Applied Physics Lab of the University of Washington (APL-UW) titled “Leidos Gizmo.” The work will be subject to a classification guide provided by the sponsor; the research may only be published with approval from the sponsor and prime contractor.

The request was approved by vote of the council.

8. Good of the order

Nothing was stated.

9. Adjourn
The meeting adjourned at 10:23 a.m.

Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, assistant to the secretary of the faculty

Present:  
**Faculty Code Section 21-61 A:** Ben Marwick (chair), Chuck Frevert, Sara Kover, Brandi Cossairt, Mike Averkiou, Michael Rosenfeld  
**Faculty Code Section 21-61 B:** Stewart Tolnay, Larry Pierce, Jennifer Muilenburg  
**President’s designee:** Mary Lidstrom  
**Guests:** Carol Rhodes

Absent:  
**Faculty Code Section 21-61 A:** Gillian Marshall, Donald Chi, Nicole Gibran, Francis Kim  
**Faculty Code Section 21-61 B:** JoAnn Taricani

**Exhibits**
Exhibit 1 – resolution Concerning the Composition of the UW’s Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees (IACUCs).doc  
Exhibit 2 – memo from the FCR on salary cap and overages for NIH.doc  
Exhibit 3 – resolution Concerning transparency, openness and reproducibility.doc  
Exhibit 4 – resolution Concerning community engaged scholarship.doc
Draft of a Class C resolution for the UW Faculty Senate Concerning the assessment of current and best practices of animal research at the University of Washington

WHEREAS, the University of Washington is a place of world-leading research and strives to follow best practices.

WHEREAS, we embrace our stated strategic priority of “UW Standard of Excellence: We hold ourselves to the highest standards of ethics, as a beacon for our community and the world.”

WHEREAS, nearly 25% of the University of Washington’s $1.6B in annual grant and contract awards is used with more than 500 active animal use protocols, involving hundreds of thousands of rats, mice, rabbits, dogs, wolves, ungulates, marine mammals, large cats, sheep, fish, frogs, pigs, ferrets and nonhuman primates;

WHEREAS, animal research is important for advances in biomedical research that have resulted in the development of new drugs and devices used in both human and veterinary medicine. Examples include:
- Since 1972, 43 of the 44 Nobel Prizes awarded in Physiology or Medicine depended on animal research (needs updating to include the 2017 and 2018 Nobel Prizes).
- The 2018 Nobel prize in Physiology or Medicine 2018 was awarded jointly to James P. Allison and Tasuku Honjo for their work on cancer immunotherapies that have have harnessed the ability of our immune systems to cure cancer.

WHEREAS, the USDA Animal Welfare Act (AWA), the Guide for the Care and Use of Animals (The Guide) and the PHS Policy on Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals when taken together form a core set of minimal regulations and guidelines that establish a system of self-regulation and regulatory oversight that binds researchers and institutions using animals;

WHEREAS, there have been instances in the past of negative publicity related to adverse incidents of animals used in research:
- https://komonews.com/archive/uw-investigated-for-unauthorized-monkey-surgeries

therefore,
BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate requests the following:

1. A faculty-led committee conduct an assessment of current and best practices at the UW regarding the principle of the “Three Rs” related to the use of animal research subjects, that is, “reduction, refinement, and replacement”, explore comparative metrics at peer institutions, and provide guidance to the Senate on how to ensure sustainable best practices and leadership in animal research at UW.

2. The committee identify innovative, efficient and sustainable approaches for:
   a. faculty involved in animal research to proactively communicate with the public
   b. long-term compliance with the mandated composition of the IACUC
   c. anticipating future vulnerabilities that might put at risk the UW’s AAALAC International accreditation and assessment

3. The committee be constituted as a forward-looking, introspective, constructive group, comprising broadly faculty with expertise not only in animal research, but in the social and ethical dimensions of this work
UW Faculty Council on Research Advice On Negotiating NIH Salary Cap Overage

Background: Most Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) sponsors, including NIH, and some other federal sponsors will only award up to the Federal Executive Level II pay scale level. Therefore, if a faculty member’s institutional base salary (IBS) exceeds this cap, the overage must be covered with other funds. More information on Salary Cap is found on MAA’s website.

The Faculty Council on Research has identified a need for guidance on how to manage salary cap overages when a sponsored program includes investigators from multiple campus units and the sponsor imposes a salary cap.

One of the potential barriers to interdisciplinary collaborations, especially in submitting and carrying out federal research grants, is the lack of a standardized salary cap overage policy. While some units (departments, centers, etc.) have established relationships to organise salary cap overages, many do not. The absence of a formal UW policy on who is responsible for salary cap coverage on federal grants can lead to delays and confusion when organising and administering DHHS and other Federally-funded research. The purpose of this memo is to provide guidance to administrators on how to handle salary cap overage amounts for DHHS-funded and other Federally-funded research in which the sponsor adopts the cap.

The organizational unit managing the award may decide to rebudget award funds to cover the overage, within sponsor policies. However, if the unit managing the award chooses not to rebudget, for programmatic reasons, or because sponsor disallows, the following guidance applies:

Responsibility for salary cap overage should come from the primary unit of the faculty whose salary exceeds the federal salary cap. This is not necessarily the organizational unit that is submitting the proposal to OSP and receives the associated Indirect Cost Recovery Funds (ICR).

The primary unit is defined as the unit that holds the faculty member’s primary appointment.

In cases where the primary unit does not receive Indirect Cost Recovery funds, the salary cap overage should come from the level in which the primary unit resides (e.g., school, college, center).
Draft of a resolution Concerning the importance of reproducibility, openness, and transparency in research at UW

WHEREAS, the primary mission of the University of Washington is the advancement, dissemination and preservation of knowledge; and

WHEREAS, although reproducibility, openness, and transparency are recognized as essential features of science, there is growing evidence that nearly every field is affected by studies that are difficult or impossible to replicate or reproduce.

WHEREAS, the reports by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine ‘Reproducibility and Replicability in Science’ (2019) and ‘Open Science by Design’ (2018) recommends:

● To help ensure the reproducibility of computational results, researchers should convey clear, specific, and complete information about any computational methods and data products that support their published results in order to enable other researchers to repeat the analysis, unless such information is restricted by nonpublic data policies.
● Educational institutions should educate and train students and faculty about computational methods and tools to improve the quality of data and code and to produce reproducible research.

WHEREAS, many institutions and research communities are recommending or adopting practices that improve the reproducibility of research (such as the deposit of research data in publicly-accessible repositories, the use of open source programming languages as analytical tools) to:

● Ensure the reliability of knowledge and facilitating the reproducibility of results
● Improve the efficiency and creativity of knowledge creation
● Expand access to knowledge and to the research enterprise

WHEREAS, many public and private funders have introduced mandates to ensure that the data and methods underlying articles are available

WHEREAS, the University of Washington Libraries has established an online, freely accessible and searchable data repository, ResearchWorks at the University of Washington (ResearchWorks), for the dissemination and preservation of scholarly works published by members of the University community [view ResearchWorks];

therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate requests the following:

1. UW researchers are recommended include a brief statement in their published work that demonstrate the computational reproducibility, transparency and openness of their
research whenever possible, and in a manner consistent with the best practices of their research community

2. UW instructors are recommended to teach students integrity in empirical research by informing students of the principles, methods, and tools that will enhance the reproducibility, transparency and openness of work produced by future generations of researchers.

3. Research funds originating on campus (e.g. the Royalty Research Fund and the Mary Gates Scholarship) inform applicants about campus resources to enhance the reproducibility and transparency of the proposed research, e.g. the UW Library resource page: https://guides.lib.uw.edu/research/reproducibility

4. The Provost’s Office provide resources to the University of Washington Libraries to support the UW’s ResearchWorks to enhance the reproducibility, transparency and openness of UW research, according to their previous assessments.
FAQ

Definitions:

Transparency
Research is transparent if the methods, analysis and data are reported and disseminated openly, clearly and comprehensively.

Integrity
Research has integrity if it has been conducted, analysed, reported and disseminated honestly and to a high standard, ensuring that the research and its findings can be trusted.

Reproducibility
The findings of a research study are reproducible if they can be obtained in an independent study using the same methods and data as those used in the original study.

Replicability
A research study is replicable if its results can be obtained in an independent study using the same methods as those in the original study, but using different data or a new context.

Robustness
Research findings are robust if they can be consistently produced a) across a range of tests within a research study, and/or b) across different research studies that involve variations in assumptions, variables or procedures.
Draft of a Class C resolution for the UW Faculty Senate Concerning the assessment of current and best practices of animal research at the University of Washington

WHEREAS,

... 

therefore,

- All units intentionally “onboard new faculty” at the earliest possible time with the goal of introducing policies and rubrics related to research expectations for promotion and tenure
- All units develop rubrics with definitions, with categories of expectations (e.g. “meritorious” and “excellent”), and metrics as evaluation tools (e.g. “Quality, Impact, Productivity” or “Rigor, Impact, Dissemination, Leadership and Personal Contribution” or “Competence, mastery, expertise”), and with examples of indicators of impact, to standardize and communicate their values and norms of Community Engaged Service as an activity distinct from service.
- Faculty code be edited to add a new letter-item to chapter 24 to define Community engaged scholarship


Faculty are encouraged to combine their scholarly skills, resources, and talents with groups external to the campus to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching, and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good. Scholarship that engages a faculty member with communities in a collaborative process is an important contribution that is distinct from public service. Community engaged scholarship is valued for its distinctive emphasis on reciprocity, mutually beneficial exchange, shared authority, and co-creation of goals and outcomes.
BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate requests the following:

1. A faculty-led committee conduct an assessment of current and best practices at the UW regarding the principle of the “Three Rs” related to the use of animal research subjects, that is, “reduction, refinement, and replacement”, explore comparative metrics at peer institutions, and provide guidance to the Senate on how to ensure sustainable best practices and leadership in animal research at UW.

2. The committee identify innovative, efficient and sustainable approaches for:
   a. faculty involved in animal research to proactively communicate with the public
   b. long-term compliance with the mandated composition of the IACUC
   c. anticipating future vulnerabilities that might put at risk the UW’s AAALAC International accreditation and assessment

3. The committee be constituted as a forward-looking, introspective, constructive group, comprising broadly faculty with expertise not only in animal research, but in the social and ethical dimensions of this work