Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Review minutes from February 10, 2021
3. Report from the transparency in animal research taskforce
4. Chair Updates
5. Good of the order
6. Review and vote on restricted research proposal
7. Adjourn

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 9:01 a.m.

2. Review minutes from February 10, 2021

The minutes from February 10, 2021 were approved as written.

3. Report from the transparency in animal research taskforce

This item will be reviewed at the next meeting.

4. Chair Updates

Chair Marwick noted the updated OSP list would need to be voted for approval by FCR before it can be finalized (Exhibit 1). A motion was made to accept the current OSP publication. The motion was approved.

Chair Marwick mentioned plans to meet with SCPB to discuss a FCR Class C resolution and the search committee for the Dean of the Libraries have formed and FCR would be included in regular updates.

Council members reviewed the finalized FCTL Class C resolution on reconceptualizing merit and provided their feedback (Exhibit 2).

Chair Kover shared the latest draft letter to the Provost regarding a campus-wide “allies program” (Exhibit 3). Members were encouraged to share their feedback and consider next steps.

Chair Kover also shared a draft of the Class C resolution on Community Engaged Scholarship (Exhibit 4).

5. Good of the order
Nothing was stated.

6. **Review and vote on restricted research proposal**

The council reviewed a restricted research proposal from the National Institute of Health (NIH) with funds obtained from the NIH National Cancer Institute – Division of Cancer Treatment and Diagnosis. The principal investigator is Shireesha Dhanireddy.

The council voted to approve the proposal and recommended the PI attempt to limit the publication timeline restriction.

7. **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 a.m.

---

**Present:**  
*Faculty Code Section 21-61 A:* Mike Averkiou, Brandi Cossairt, Chuck Frevert, Nicole Gibran, Francis Kim, Sara Kover (co-chair), 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, Gillian Marshall, Thomas Humphries, Jacob Vigdor  
*Faculty Code Section 21-61 B:* Jenny Muilenburg, Ramsess Javier Quez

---

**Exhibits**  
Exhibit 1 – FCR Delegated Publication Restrictions Authority DRAFT FINAL  
Exhibit 2 – FCTI Class C Merit Final  
Exhibit 3 – Letter to Provost to Extend Allies Program Campus-Wide  
Exhibit 4 – AY 2020-2021 Draft Class C resolution on Community Engaged Scholarship
<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>FCR</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>FCR</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>FCR</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>FCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Restriction Type</td>
<td>Agreement Type Example</td>
<td>Approval Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<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 (<strong>Task Orders under the Basic Ordering Agreement previously approved by the FCR</strong>)</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>
FCT&L Class C Legislation Proposal: Reconceptualizing Merit

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
Class C Resolution

Definition, Assessment, and Recognition of Community Engaged Scholarship

Draft

Background (Preambulatory clauses)

In 2019, the charge letter to the Faculty Council on Research (FCR) from the Faculty Senate recommended: “Per strategies presented in the UW Faculty 2050 document, examine Faculty Code Section 24-32 and begin to discuss how “Community Engaged Scholarship” might be better defined, assessed, and recognized at the University.”

The UW Faculty 2050 Report, compiled by UW Faculty Senate leadership and faculty in collaboration with then Provost Baldasty and the Board of Deans & Chancellors, was presented to UW Provost Mark Richards in 2018.

In describing emerging and aspirational strategies for faculty careers in the area of research, it was noted that “…the UW seeks to become the #1 University for Impact and to be viewed as a true and enduring partner with our communities,” (p. 24).

The report called on the Provost and Board of Deans & Chancellors to work with faculty and their elected faculty councils “to develop or refine tenure, promotion, and hiring guidelines to meet the goals of this report to recognize community-engaged, public, and other approaches to research, teaching, and service as appropriate to each unit;” (p. 4, Executive Summary Implementation Proposal).

The UW Faculty 2050 Report, in relation to faculty careers and research in the 21st century, provided next steps for defining, assessing, valuing, and strengthening support of the following types of scholarship, such that they are recognized and considered in hiring, merit, promotion, and tenure of all applicable faculty, are stated: community engaged scholarship, collaborative and interdisciplinary scholarship, public scholarship, and diversity scholarship. It was further suggested that a university-wide resource be established to support these types of scholarship.

The UW Faculty 2050 Report recognized that institutional practices must acknowledge community engaged work, such that clear definitions for evaluating impact and public dissemination avoid misidentification of such scholarship as service. The report further urged all units across the three campuses to define metrics most appropriate for their disciplines to document and reward achievements in community engaged scholarship. That is, the UW Faculty 2050 report calls for framing and interpretation of promotion and tenure criteria in a manner that recognizes exemplary community engaged scholarship.
In addition, with respect to faculty careers, it was recommended that immediate action include a “[r]equest [to] Deans and Chancellors to identify and share how Tenure & Promotion guidelines address expanded forms of research and teaching, including collaborative, community-engaged, and/or interdisciplinary,” (p. 5, Executive Summary High Priority Recommendations). Additional information about an internal review of promotion and tenure standards are provided in Addendum #3.

Examples of community engaged scholarship abound, on UW campuses, and elsewhere, with an emphasis on community inclusion and practices in, rather than on, the community, including action research, policy development, research studies of partnerships, community responses to outreach programs, evaluations studies of impact on the profession.

Across UW campuses, momentum around community-engaged scholarship has been building. For example, at UW-Bothell in 2018, the General Faculty Organization Executive Council endorsed a definition of inclusive scholarship, linked closely to community-engaged scholarship: “We are committed to diverse forms of scholarship, and we believe that scholarship should be made public in meaningful and significant ways. Scholarship may contribute to disciplinary or interdisciplinary knowledge; be conducted in collaboration with community and organizational partners; and offer new theoretical insights or forge new fields of inquiry. Because of the breadth of scholarly activity and its conduct, the path and gestation period of any scholarly agenda will vary according to the nature of its questions and the means of their pursuit. In order to ensure alignment with school- and division-based statements, we recommend that each unit complete a review of its P&T criteria (tenure- and lecturer-track) for inclusion of work on community-engagement and diversity, inclusion, and equity. Each unit should then review its P&T policies and practices to remove obstacles to the valuing of work that matches those criteria in P&T processes.”

In line with these values and activities, all three campuses of the UW received the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification in January 2020, which is an elective designation signaling the UW’s commitment to community engagement, under the collective effort of President Cauce and the UW Community Engagement Steering Committee, co-chaired by Dr. Ed Taylor and Dr. Joy Williamson-Lott.

The UW Community Engagement Steering Committee (2019-2020) has defined community engagement at the University of Washington as, “collaboration between the UW and our larger communities (local, tribal, regional/state, national, global) for the equitable, mutually beneficial creation and exchange of knowledge and resources. These collaborations with public, private, non-profit, and individual partners span disciplines and sectors. They are grounded in reciprocity, entailing co-developed definitions of problems, solutions, and measures of success; and they are asset-based, where community partners’ strengths, skills, and knowledges are respected and incorporated.” This includes, for example, “citizen science, community-based participatory research, or other means of research, scholarship, or creative activity...if it incorporates a reciprocal partnership with community.”
Proposed Action (Operative Clause)

The Faculty Senate requests that:

1. Faculty code be updated to edit existing items or add a new letter-item to **Chapter 24 - Section 32 “Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members”**, noting that evaluation of scholarly activities is also guided by Executive Order **No. 45**, “Documentation of Qualifications and Recommendations for Promotion, Tenure, and Merit Increases.”

   a. One edit for consideration might be within Faculty code 24-32 Item B (suggested edit in brackets): “Important elements in evaluating the scholarly ability and attainments of faculty members include the range and variety of their intellectual interests; the receipt of grants, awards, and fellowships; the professional and/or public impact of their work; and their success in directing productive work by advanced students and in training graduate and professional students in scholarly methods. Other important elements of scholarly achievement include involvement in and contributions to interdisciplinary [or community-engaged] research and teaching; participation and leadership in professional associations and in the editing of professional journals; the judgment of professional colleagues; and membership on boards and committees.”

2. All units develop rubrics with definitions, categories of expectations (e.g., “meritorious” and “excellent”), metrics as evaluation tools (e.g. “Quality, Impact, Productivity” or “Rigor, Impact, Dissemination, Leadership and Personal Contribution” or “Competence, mastery, expertise”), and examples of indicators of impact, to standardize and communicate their values and norms of community engaged scholarship, as an activity distinct from service. Additional information regarding use of rubrics and process best practices can be found in **Addendum #3 of the UW Faculty 2050 Report**. This process should include a review of promotion and tenure criteria for recognition of community-engaged scholarship and removal of obstacles to valuing community-engaged scholarship (e.g., expectation for a certain number of publications, expectation for solo publications, expectation for publication outlet [academic journal versus other media]). These rubrics and criteria, in considering community-engaged scholarship, should maintain or enhance acknowledgement of diversity, inclusion, and equity-focused scholarship.

3. All units intentionally “onboard” new faculty with the goal of introducing policies and rubrics related to community engaged scholarship and other relevant expectations for promotion and tenure.

4. Implement parallel processes and acknowledgement of community-engaged activities, as appropriate, for individuals in non-tenure-track roles, such as research faculty, research scientists, and other professional staff.
5. Establish a university-wide resource or office for strengthening support of collaborative, community-engaged, and interdisciplinary research, teaching, and service.

FAQs

Q: What are examples of units on UW campuses that have promotion and tenure policies or metrics that address community engaged scholarship?

A: As identified in the UW Faculty 2050 Report, the UW School of Public Health, outlines four domains for evaluation: research, teaching, service, and practice. Within each, they use metrics to evaluate rigor, impact, dissemination, and leadership and personal contribution. The College of Education has metrics for quality, impact, and productivity (including public discourse) with specific indicators in the domains of teaching, research, and service. Evaluating impact addresses the unit-defined ways in which the research has improved standards of practice, influenced policy, solved publically relevant problems, and reached key audiences.

Q: What are examples of other US campuses that have promotion and tenure policies or metrics that address community engaged scholarship?

A: Examples from across the country, identified by the UW Community Engagement Steering Committee (2019-2020), include the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG) university-wide evaluation guidelines.

Q: What are other UW resources or sources of information on community engagement?

A: Examples of UW resources and hubs of information include: the UW Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement landing page, the UW Bothell community engagement landing page, the UW Tacoma Office of Community Partnerships homepage, and a variety of media releases related to UW efforts to increase recognition of community engagement.

Q: What are other national or external resources or sources of information on community engagement?

A: Examples of resources or sources of information external to UW include: the Campus Compact/Research University Civic Engagement Network’s Research University Community Engaged Scholarship Tenure and Promotion Repository compiled by Campus Compact, and several resources compiled by UNCG found here, including a community-engaged scholarship original toolkit / updated toolkit and other resources from Community Campus Partnerships for Health.
Definitions

Community engaged scholarship - As defined by the UW Faculty 2050 Report, “community-engaged scholarship brings skills, knowledge, and dialogue between the University and the public into a more intimate form of conversation. In this style of research, academics and community members draw from their collective knowledge and skills to co-create knowledge aimed at understanding and addressing matters of public concern. It is through reciprocal partnerships with community partners and the co-creation of goals of outcomes that community engaged scholars create work of lasting impact.” (p. 28).

Key concepts from Carnegie Classification documents include - reciprocity, mutually beneficial exchange, public and private sectors, contribute to the public good, shared authority, and co-creation of goals and outcomes.