Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Review of the minutes from May 9th, 2018
3. Introductions and brief overview of the FCR
4. State-of-research at the UW – Mary Lidstrom
5. Review and approval of restricted research list under FCR purview – Carol Rhodes
6. Discussion on restricted research related to investigator-initiated clinical research
7. Open Science by Design – Ben Marwick
8. UW Shared Research Resources Task Force
9. Discussion and vote on contract waiver request
10. Good of the order
11. Adjourn

1) Call to order

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

2) Review of the minutes from May 9th, 2018

The minutes from May 9th, 2018 were approved as written.

3) Introductions and brief overview of the FCR

Frevert (chair) presented a brief summary of the Faculty Councils including the roles and responsibilities using a PowerPoint (Exhibit 1). He noted the FCR’s roles, as they differ from other councils’ roles, are to review and make recommendations on restricted contracts. Additionally, he outlined the membership of the councils (voting members, president’s designees, and ex-officio members).

4) State-of-research at the UW – Mary Lidstrom

Lidstrom, the President’s designee, provided an update of the UW’s FY18 Research funding using a powerpoint (Exhibit 2).

The UW is a top ranked research institution by NSF standards and receives more federal research funding than any other U.S. public university. The NSF changed reporting guidelines this year, and so the UW’s ranking may be affected.
In state and federal FY18, the UW received $1.35 billion and $1.34 billion, respectfully, in awards for research. This award total is down from the previous state and federal FY17 due to a ten-year, $280 million Gates Foundation award to the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. State and federal funding has been relatively flat over the past five fiscal years. A member noted that dollar amounts provided in the table were are not adjusted for inflation. In actuality, the UW has to do more with less funding.

Lidstrom commented that the NIH recently received more federal funding and the UW should see an increase in federal funding next year. NIH commits at 90 percent. If they get a budget that would satisfy 100 percent, they award that final amount. Lidstrom also noted that when federal dollars are scarce the UW is more competitive. When money is easy, more institutions claim a share.

Guidelines for schools/grants for how to use RRF funds. There are no restrictions now, but there are more pressures. Lidstrom said that she would come back to the FCR and discuss the future of the UW Bridge Funding Program and would also consult with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB).

Challenges include an ongoing uncertainty at the federal level, new regulations, and focus on foreign influence and espionage. A member wanted more clarification around federal guidelines around reporting sexual harassment. Any researcher who has been found guilty of any type of harassment must be reported to the NSF. A member commented that the National Academies recently produced a report on sexual harassment. The chair said he would send out the new NSF guidelines for the council to review at a future meeting. Additionally, there are increasing talks, at the federal level, about restricting/barring researchers from foreign countries as well as restricting foreign funding for research. Countries that are part of NATO are not receiving the same type of scrutiny, a member noted it is mostly focused on China.

A member asked if the University has an elevator pitch or bullet points that illustrate research priorities. The chair requested that the council work with Sarah M. Castro, UW Director of External Affairs to put talking points together regarding UW research priorities.

A member asked how research administration is paid for. Lidstrom responded that payments are made through indirect costs from research grants. Having the budget for research administration tied to a set revenue stream coming from indirect costs makes it difficult in the long run.

5) Review and approval of restricted research list under FCR purview – Carol Rhodes

Carol Rhodes (Director, Office of Sponsored Programs) briefly described the recently revised (spring, 2018) Executive Order No. 8, which states, “The Faculty Council on Research and the Office of Research may, upon mutual agreement, exempt individual or categories of proposals from review by the Faculty Council on Research.” Rhodes pointed out that the categories for exemption were not outlined. She provided a draft for publication restriction categories for the FCR to discuss (Exhibit 3).
The chair asked for the council to review the draft and for it to be placed on the next agenda for further discussion and vote.

6) Discussion on restricted research related to investigator-initiated clinical research

John Slattery (Vice Dean, Research and Graduate Education, School of Medicine) provided his view of and more context around the Investigator-Initiated Research Agreement between Pfizer and the UW. His take, after reviewing the contract, was that the restricting language when applied in context ends up not being a real infringement.

The FCR discussed that the language in this contract is similar to previous contracts that were not approved by the FCR.

The member discussed the complexity of clinical research contracts. The FCR will likely have to make decisions based on each project. FCR will have to look at ways to assist OSP in reviewing each restriction.

Discussion around whether a genetic snip (involved in this project) would be included in the electronic medical record. The language seems vague on restrictions. Slattery thought that this was a non-effective restriction.

7) Open Science by Design – Ben Marwick

Moved to next meeting

8) UW Shared Research Resources Task Force

Moved to next meeting

9) Discussion and vote on contract waiver request

The council discussed two restricted contract waivers.

The first project proposal discussed was titled “Fractionated gemtuzumab ozogamicin to eradicate measurable residual disease in acute myeloid leukemia patients (GO for MRD),“ and the Principal Investigator (PI) is Mary-Elizabeth Percival.

The chair stressed that the FCR should maintain high ethics and standards when reviewing clinical research contracts to maintain the credibility of the research performed at the University. The FCR should also be wary of potential liability concerns.

A member noted that the FCR should consider the IRB of these data, and IRB is probably more restrictive than language used by Pfizer. There were some concerns about clinical research funded by pharmaceutical interests.
Members were also asked to consider the benefits to Percival and how this clinical trial may fuel future research for her. A member noted that other universities use similar clinical contracts. Another member noted it is important for the FCR to take these types of grants seriously.

A member noted that Pfizer is not funding this trial for altruistic purposes, and previously, these contracts have not been approved because there is concern for setting a precedent. The FCR wants to be vigilant. Members agreed that consistency is important, and asked if there were other pharmaceutical trials that use this same contract language. Only Pfizer so far.

The members discussed if there was value in having individual data referred to as disaggregated data in the contract for distribution. It was brought up that the aggregated data from this study could be used in a manuscript and would be uploaded to the NIH Clinical Trials web site.

Several members agreed that the language used in the contract is too vague. They thought it was important to clarify what Pfizer has claim over. A member asked if the language could be revised or clarified.

After discussion, the council voted in favor of the proposal, but requested that if possible, the vague language in the contract be further clarified by Pfizer.

The second project proposal for review was titled “Obstacle Avoidance and Environmental Sonar Sensors and Processing,” and the PI is Lee Thompson. This project is restricted due to the classified nature of the research and comes from the Office of Naval Research. The council commented that this is a common contract, no publication and no students are involved.

After discussion, the council voted in favor of the proposal.

10) Good of the order

The council is still waiting for ASUW to appoint a student representative and for the Senate Chair to send their charge letter.

The chair requested that members use the good of the order to make comments concerning items to discuss in future meetings.

11) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Minutes by Lauren Hatchett, lehatch@uw.edu, council analyst

Present:  
Faculty: Donald Chi, Chuck Frevert (chair), Benjamin Marwick, Michael Rosenfeld, Nicole Gibran, Francis Kim  
Ex-officio reps: Ann Glusker, Larry Pierce, Stewart Tolnay  
President’s designee: Mary Lidstrom  
Guests: Lynette Arias, Susan Camber, Carol Rhodes, John Slattery
Absent: Faculty: Paul Fishman, Sara Kover, Erika Harnett
Ex-officio reps: JoAnn Taricani

Exhibits
Exhibit 1 – Background FCR_10.09.18.pptx
Exhibit 2 – FCR Oct 2018 - Research Update.pptx
Exhibit 3 – EO8 and draft publication restriction categories
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University Faculty Councils

- Standing committees appointed by the Senate Executive Committee and confirmed by the Faculty Senate
- Advises both the Provost and the Senate Executive Committee on issues of faculty and university concerns

Roles include:
- Prepare legislation and resolutions to the Senate Executive Committee
- Submit reports to the Senate Chair
- Receive and make recommendations on behalf of university faculty
- Request information/assistance and appoint ad hoc committees to solve university concerns
- Receive reports from university administrators and provide recommendations/feedback
- **Review and make recommendations on restricted contracts**
Council Membership

- Voting members of the university faculty (3-year terms, all vote)
  - Appointed by the Senate Executive Committee
- President’s designees (1-year terms, do not vote)
  - Appointed by the President
- Ex-officio members (1-year terms, some vote)
  - Associated Students of the University of Washington (ASUW)
  - Graduate and Professional Student Senate (GPSS)
  - Association of Librarians of the University of Washington (ALUW)
  - Professional Staff Organization (PSO)
  - University of Washington Retirement Association (UWRA)
Update on Research Funding
Fall 2018

Mary Lidstrom
Vice Provost for Research
October 12, 2018
Trends in Current Research Funding

• Since 1972 the UW received more federal research funding than any other U.S. public university

• Since 1969 we consistently place among the top five for total funding for all public and private universities in the country

• We are one of the few universities in the U.S. with total research funding over $1B
# Recent World Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai Jiao Tong World University (2018)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuters Most Innovative (2017)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UpShot College Rankings Index (2017) (do the most for low-income students)</td>
<td>18 (in US)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Funding Update for Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17*</th>
<th>FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State FY</td>
<td>$1.39B</td>
<td>$1.31B</td>
<td>$1.36B</td>
<td>$1.63B</td>
<td>$1.35B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal FY</td>
<td>$1.34B</td>
<td>$1.31B</td>
<td>$1.32B</td>
<td>$1.68B</td>
<td>$1.34B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: A ten-year, $280M Foundation award accounts for the higher level of funding in FY 2017
Funding Update for Awards: FY 14–18 (State FY)

Awards Originating from Federal and Non-Federal Sponsors, FY14-18

* Note: A ten-year, $280M Foundation award accounts for the higher level of funding in FY 2017.
Trends in Federal R&D, FY1976-2018
In billions of constant FY 2018 dollars

*Note: Beginning in FY 2017, a new official definition of R&D has been adopted by federal agencies. Late-stage development, testing, and evaluation programs, primarily within the Defense Department, are no longer counted as R&D.
Source: AAAS analyses of historical budget and agency data and FY 2018 omnibus legislation. R&D includes conduct and facilities. © AAAS | 2018
UW Marketshare of Federal Research Funding

UW Marketshare of Non-Federal Research Funding

Competitiveness

• Marketshare
  o % for federal funding is trending up
  o Indication of increased competitiveness

• Collaborations: 26% of our total FY18 funding is in incoming + outgoing subcontracts

• A testament to the strength of our faculty
UW Measures to Ensure Competitiveness

- Focus on recruiting and retaining top faculty, post-docs, students and staff
- Continue Bridge Funding and RRF grant programs
- Targeted investment in development of modern research facilities
- Decrease administrative burden on researchers
Giving Time Back to the Researcher
Building capacity in research administration

Three-part approach:

New website: function-based

Information to save time
Provide easily accessible information and resources to manage all stages of the project lifecycle

Training to enhance expertise
Provide comprehensive learning resources on research administration

Partnerships to achieve operational excellence

Automation to streamline
Provide systems and tools to increase capacity and decrease administrative burden.

MyResearch Portal
- Training transcript
- Funding status
- ZipLine (IRB)
- HoverBoard (IACUC)

https://myresearch.washington.edu
Challenges

• Ongoing uncertainty at the federal level
  o Funding
  o Regulations
  o Science-based decision-making

• Never-ending onslaught of new regulations
  o Reporting of sexual harassment
  o Focus on data sharing
  o Focus on protections for sensitive data

• New focus on Foreign Influence and Espionage
  o Regulations and expectations for disclosures
  o Limitations for DoD funding
  o Pressure to limit/end relationships with foreign entities
Strengths

- Well-informed and highly supportive congressional delegation
- Competitiveness
- Collaborative culture
- Great recruitments—keep building to the future!
Summary

- Research is foundational for the future of the UW
- We are investing in our future by enabling research advances that maintain our competitiveness
- Our competitiveness remains strong; research funding continues to grow in the face of a restricted federal funding climate
- We will continue to work in partnership with campus on increasing competitiveness and meeting upcoming challenges
New EO8 language in B.1.c: “The Faculty Council on Research and the Office of Research may, upon mutual agreement, exempt individual or categories of proposals from review by the Faculty Council on Research.” (italics added)

DRAFT Publication Restriction Categories-- for discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Publication Restriction Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FCR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Publications or By Committee</td>
<td>Collaboration in which joint publication is envisioned; UW can independently publish</td>
<td>The parties (sponsor and UW) are collaborators and both have right to publish. UW has the ability to independently publish results.</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration in which joint publication is envisioned; however, UW cannot independently publish until a waiting period is over.</td>
<td>The parties are collaborators and intend to jointly publish. UW does not have the ability to independently publish results of the collaboration effort until after a waiting period NTE 18 months after completion of study.</td>
<td>NO, unless waiting period exceeds 18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publication decisions by committee; UW independently publish</td>
<td>Consortia or committee makes publication decisions for multi-site or consortia publications; however, UW may publish independently for only its site.</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publication decisions by committee; no ability for UW to independently publish</td>
<td>Consortia or committee makes publication decisions; no ability to independently publish.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restriction related to Federal Regulatory Requirements, or Business Proprietary</td>
<td>Prevents publication of information related to cultural or heritage of sponsor or individuals involved in research</td>
<td>Studies including Native American, tribal, or other native groups</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevents publication of information restricted by privacy regulations</td>
<td>The purpose of the publication restriction is to prevent PHI, PII or other personal, student, or other privacy information protected by statute/regulation from being shared.</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevents publication of information restricted by export control regulations</td>
<td>The purpose of the publication restriction is to prevent export-controlled information from being shared; if removed from publication, can publish without restriction (e.g. fundamental research results)</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevents publication of information considered Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI)</td>
<td>The purpose of the publication restriction is to prevent CUI from being shared; if removed from publication, can publish without restriction</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevents publication of classified work</td>
<td>The purpose of the publication restriction is to prevent classified information from being distributed outside the intended clearance limitations.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New EO8 language in B.1.c: “The Faculty Council on Research and the Office of Research may, upon mutual agreement, exempt individual or categories of proposals from review by the Faculty Council on Research.” (italics added)

DRAFT Publication Restriction Categories-- for discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication Restriction Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FCR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevents publication of information considered by sponsor to be business confidential or proprietary</td>
<td>The purpose of the publication restriction is to prevent a sponsor or third party’s proprietary information from being included in publication. Restriction is limited to proprietary information as that is defined in contract; no overreaching terms that include all research results or UW owned information as belonging to sponsor</td>
<td>NO, unless sponsor requires broad definition of “proprietary” or is trying to control the publication for its own commercial advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended period of restriction for sponsor review</td>
<td>The publication restriction is to allow sponsor to review the intended manuscript/publication draft for possible patent protection or to strike its confidential/proprietary information from the publication, and this restriction exceeds 90 days, from time of disclosure.</td>
<td>NO, unless exceeds 90 days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor approves all publications</td>
<td>Sponsor has the final approval over all publications or other dissemination of the research results.</td>
<td>YES, unless Task Order/Delivery Order under ONR Basic Agreement, then may accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Research</td>
<td>Sponsor owns the results therefore we do not have right to publish/disseminate results (typical in services or other procurement agreement, not typically handled by OSP but rather under the auspices of APS 59.5)</td>
<td>NO. OSP to use UW IP Disposition Memo to get PI acknowledgement of terms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Restriction related to Federal Regulatory Requirements, or Business Proprietary, cont’d.

Exhibit 3