Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Review minutes from January 13, 2021
3. Chair’s update
4. FCR draft letter to provost discussion
5. Review OSP updated list of publication restrictions that can bypass FCR approval
6. Good of the order
7. Adjourn

1. Call to order

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

2. Review minutes from January 13, 2021

The minutes from January 13, 2021 were approved as written.

3. Chair’s Update

Chair Marwick shared a draft of the FCTL Class C resolution on reconceptualizing merit (Exhibit 1). The Chair encouraged members to review the draft in preparation for the next meeting.

Chair Kover will update the council on the Community Engaged Scholarship at the next meeting.

The animal transparency committee recently convened with university-wide stakeholders and reviewed their charge. Members discussed issues revolving around the committee composition, which the committee was charged with reviewing but voted to remove that item from their charge. The council agreed the committee should consider that item for reinstatement.

4. FCR Draft Letter to provost discussion

Chair Kover shared the latest draft of the provost letter on extending the “Allies Program” throughout UW (Exhibit 2). Chair Kover connected with other faculty councils, the Ombud’s office, and several Title IX committees. The Chair will reach out to interested parties with an updated draft.

Some council members noted their involvement with pilot mentor programs in their own schools for undergraduate and graduate students.

5. Review OSP updates list of publication restrictions that can bypass FCR approval
Chair Marwick shared a list of publication restrictions which would move more approval authority to OSP rather than FCR through Executive Order 8 (Exhibit 3).

Members questioned the history of FCR’s role in the sensitive research project proposals approval process. They suggested adding a category noting without student involvement and publication, FCR would not need to review.

There was a motion to recommend an additional category not requiring FCR review. The issue was tabled until the next meeting for members to review the FCR restricted research proposal document.

Lidstrom noted FCR review provides credibility to faculty and assures there is oversight on research proposals going through UW. Lidstrom will speak with the Office of Research to develop a communication plan to inform faculty that FCR is available to review research for PI’s with concerns.

6. Good of the order

A member noted the R&T building at the Harborview campus will be ready for full occupancy by August 1, including more room for Harborview researchers in Spring 2021.

7. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:18 a.m.

Present:

Faculty Code Section 21-61 A: Mike Averkiou, Brandi Cossairt, Chuck Frevert, Nicole Gibran, Sara Kover (chair), Gillian Marshall, Ben Marwick (chair)
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Larry Pierce, Michael Rosenfeld
President’s designee: Mary Lidstrom
Guests: Carol Rhodes, Susan Camber, Lynette Arias, Bill Mahoney, Janice DeCosmo

Absent:

Faculty Code Section 21-61 A: Donald Chi, Francis Kim, Thomas Humphries
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Jenny Muilenburg, Ramsess Javier Quez

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – FCTL Class C
Exhibit 2 – draft Letter to Provost to Extend Allies Program Campus-Wide (3)
Exhibit 3 – FCR Delegated Publication Restrictions Authority DRAFT FINAL
WHEREAS the current pandemic, political unrest, and ongoing protests of systemic racism and violence against BIPOC people have haphazardly, sometimes tragically, affected the capacity of university faculty to contribute to the multiple missions of their various units and have precipitated drastic changes in workload; in the conditions and demands for teaching, research, and service; and in work circumstances, including those related to the use of technology.

WHEREAS BIPOC and female faculty have been disproportionately impacted by these contexts and resulting demands.

WHEREAS the shift to online instruction has required going beyond the usual demands and procedures of direct classroom instruction, creating additional need for preparation, course development, and implementation of appropriate instructional methodologies.

WHEREAS travel restrictions, social distancing requirements, building closures, and cancellation of professional-society conferences have limited faculty members’ ability to conduct and present research and other scholarship.

WHEREAS ongoing problems with full access to the infrastructure and technology required to learn online, sustained personal trauma associated with the pandemic and political events, and the effect of both on students' mental and physical health has created additional need for student mentoring and support on the part of faculty.

WHEREAS other uncontrollable, durational situations such as natural catastrophes and social or biological emergencies may trigger similar exigencies and impacts in the future.

WHEREAS the existing merit system appears to be antiquated, inconsistently applied across campuses, inequitable, and lacking in appropriate flexibility to accommodate environmental conditions.

WHEREAS merit is categorized and assessed differently across departments, units, and schools, and the faculty’s ability to nimbly respond to the pandemic situation has already created more expansive definitions of research, teaching, and service in some departments, units, and schools, definitions that present viable evaluation mechanisms to be considered in similar times of duress.
THEREFORE, the Senate recommends that departments, units, and schools across all three campuses review existing merit evaluation procedures for 2020–2021, with the goal of considering the following changes:

1. During challenging times created by natural disasters or unexpected social, political, and/or financial instability within or outside our university community, departments/colleges/units across all three UW campuses should be encouraged to create broad and flexible interpretations of what constitutes “meritorious achievement” for faculty, as well as provide targeted supports for faculty who may be disproportionately impacted during these challenging times.

2. An adaptation of our merit evaluation system to accommodate challenging circumstances should allow for and support broad interpretations of what can be considered meritorious in the categories of research, teaching, and service. In the category of teaching, for example, faculty members’ ability and willingness to quickly adapt to sweeping changes in instructional formats (online), as well as the shift in student advising and mentoring demands should be recognized and acknowledged as meritorious. Faculty have also had to make significant adaptations to how/when/where they conduct research due to the limitations of travel and access to research/resources, as well as far fewer service opportunities available to faculty across campus and within the community.

3. The merit evaluation system should provide more agency and flexibility to faculty to choose the work they believe illuminates their meritorious contribution to students, colleagues, their department, the university, and/or the community during times when the normal operation of the university, or their regular function as a faculty person are interrupted or compromised. In particular, departments, units, and schools should work with faculty to approve alternative structures/systems/procedures for student evaluation of teaching during these unprecedented times (as allowed under Faculty Code Section 24-57, Subsection A).

4. Thus, assessing how merit is defined, reviewed, identified, and awarded during these and future extraordinary circumstances, will also serve as a catalyst for a more general, comprehensive review and reconceptualization of merit and the review process beyond 2020-2021.
Dear Provost Richards,

At the beginning of the 2020-2021 academic year, the Faculty Council on Research (FCR) was charged with discussing an “allies program” to address harassment and the support needs of the campus community. This discussion was prompted by the UW climate survey completed in 2019 and by UW’s standard of excellence and core values.

In response to this charge, in Fall 2020, the FCR invited Dr. Sharona Gordon to present on the development and implementation of the Allies Program in the UW School of Medicine. Following her presentation, the members of the FCR discussed the ways in which such a program could be expanded across campus. The FCR was particularly impressed by the structure and success of the program in support of graduate students and postdoctoral trainees.

We are writing to request that the creation of a campus-wide Allies Program (or similar) be given serious consideration.

The primary objectives are to:

1. Produce a plan and accompanying timeline to implement a hub-and-spoke model for a campus-wide support program
2. Identify resources and sources of support for enacting this plan
3. Utilize a hub-and-spoke model for shared resources and training, while providing autonomy, confidentiality, and tailored support within units

We further suggest that:

(a) the individuals producing the plan are diverse in terms of represented units, areas of expertise, and background, including and especially giving voice to people of color, underrepresented minorities, and women
(b) the program is named in a way that reflects the role of the faculty and staff providing support as advocates and is welcoming, noting that the term “ally” can come with a passive connotation in the realm of racial justice,
(c) a pilot program for graduate students and postdoctoral trainees serves as a first step in a phased rollout,
(d) similar programs to support staff, and perhaps eventually undergraduate students and faculty, are considered
(e) successful campus-wide initiatives at other institutions are examined as models, including those with peer-to-peer support components, and
(f) campus-wide, quantifiable recognition is given to those faculty, staff, or students who provide support to program participants.
We believe that creation of such a campus-wide support program is both feasible and likely to improve the experience, retention, and success of UW students, staff, and faculty. These efforts have the support of the Faculty Council on Women in Academia and the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs. Developing and implementing a plan for such a support program might be taken up by a taskforce and/or in coordination with campus stakeholders, such as the Office of the Ombud and others.

We are more than willing to be involved in any way that would facilitate progress, in coordinating across relevant parties, or contributing to ideas for implementation.

We appreciate your time and look forward to your reply.

Thank you,

Ben Marwick and Sara Kover

Chair and Co-Chair, UW Faculty Council on Research, 2020-2021
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication Restriction Type</th>
<th>Agreement Type Example</th>
<th>Approval Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Publications Restrictions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborators each have the right to publish. UW may independently publish results.</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>OSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborators intend joint publication. UW may not independently publish collaboration results until a waiting period <strong>not to exceed 18 months</strong> after study is completed.</td>
<td>Multi-site or consortia</td>
<td>OSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborators envision joint publication. UW may not independently publish collaboration results until after a waiting period <strong>that exceeds 18 months</strong> after study is completed.</td>
<td>Multi-site or consortia</td>
<td><strong>FCR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication decisions are made by committee; but UW may independently publish only its own results.</td>
<td>Multi-site or consortia</td>
<td>OSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortia or committee makes publication decisions. UW may not independently publish.</td>
<td>Multi-site or consortia</td>
<td><strong>FCR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Publication Restrictions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information related to the heritage or cultural identity of the sponsor or study subjects may not be published.</td>
<td>Indigenous or tribal population studies</td>
<td>OSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of PHI, PII or other personal, student, or other protected information is prohibited. This information is protected by statute or regulation.</td>
<td>Clinical Study with patient data</td>
<td>OSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication restrictions are necessary to prevent dissemination of export-controlled information. If export-controlled information is removed, UW may publish without restriction. (i.e., UW publishes only fundamental research results)</td>
<td>Applied Research Agreement</td>
<td>OSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) may not be shared. If CUI is removed, UW may publish.</td>
<td>Federal contracts or subcontracts</td>
<td>OSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal classified work Publication is restricted to prevent distribution of classified work information outside the intended clearance limitations.</td>
<td>Federal contract or subcontract that contains a DD Form 254</td>
<td><strong>FCR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder or third party’s business confidential or proprietary information may not be published. Proprietary information is clearly defined in the contract. No overreaching terms asserting funder ownership of UW-owned information or research results are present.</td>
<td>Industry agreements</td>
<td>OSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder or third party’s business confidential or proprietary information may not be published. Proprietary information definition is vague or overly broad. Or Funder is attempting to control publications for its own commercial advantage.</td>
<td>Industry agreements</td>
<td><strong>FCR</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Publication Restriction Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication Restriction Type</th>
<th>Agreement Type Example</th>
<th>Approval Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement allows a sponsor review period of <strong>over 90 days but does not exceed 180 days</strong> total to review the manuscript/publication for patent protection and/or to strike its confidential/proprietary information.</td>
<td>Industry agreements</td>
<td>OSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement allows a sponsor review period <strong>that exceeds 180 days</strong> total to review the manuscript/publication draft for patent protection and/or to strike its confidential/proprietary information from the publication.</td>
<td>Industry agreements</td>
<td>FCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal contract or subcontract contains DFARS 252.204-7000 that requires prior Government approval all research dissemination.</td>
<td>Federal contract</td>
<td>FCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task orders under APL’s Basic Ordering Agreement that contain DFARS 252.204-7000 <em>(Task Orders under the Basic Ordering Agreement previously approved by the FCR)</em></td>
<td>APL’s ONR Basic Ordering Agreement</td>
<td>OSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any publication restriction contained in a time sensitive clinical trial compassionate care use agreement</td>
<td>Clinical Trial Compassionate Care Use Agreement</td>
<td>OSP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>