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

2. Review minutes from March 10, 2021
The minutes from March 10, 2021 were approved as written.

3. VPR search – Dan Pollack
Dan Pollack (co-chair of the search committee) joined the council to discuss updates on the VPR (Vice-Provost of Research) search. Pollack encouraged council members to ask questions, noted applications are due April 21, and highlighted the messaging sent to potential applicants.

4. Announcements
   a. Campus wide support program – draft letter to provost
   b. Class C resolutions update
Chair Kover shared updates on the Class C resolution regarding community-engaged scholarship (Exhibit 1). The chair noted next steps to distribute the draft back to stakeholders for additional review.

The draft letter to the Provost on the “allies program” was also shared with the council (Exhibit 2). Chair Kover noted the letter may be ready to send by the end of the academic year.

Chair Marwick mentioned a planned meeting with SCPB Chair Jones regarding a FCR Class C resolution.

5. Report from the transparency in animal research taskforce
Michael Rosenfeld stated the taskforce is reviewing the best practices on campus as to how the public accesses information on animal research.

6. **Good of the order**

An update from core facilities will be noted for the next meeting.

Mary Lidstrom (President’s Designee) updated the council on the DEI Stem faculty recruitment initiative.

A member noted the undergraduate research symposium will be virtually hosted on May 21st, 2021.

7. **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:57 a.m.

---

**Present:**

**Faculty Code Section 21-61 A:** Mike Averkiou, Brandi Cossait, Chuck Frevert, Nicole Gibran, Sara Kover (chair), Gillian Marshall, Ben Marwick (chair), Thomas Humphries

**Faculty Code Section 21-61 B:** Jenny Muilenburg, Michael Rosenfeld, **President’s designee:** Mary Lidstrom

**Guests:** Susan Camber, Janice DeCosmo, Dan Pollack

**Absent:**

**Faculty Code Section 21-61 A:** Donald Chi, Francis Kim

**Faculty Code Section 21-61 B:** Ramsess Javier Quez

---

**Exhibits**

Exhibit 1 – AY 2020-2021 Class C resolution on Community Engaged Scholarship

Exhibit 2 – Letter to Provost to Extend Allies Program Campus-Wide
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.
Dear Provost Richards,

Prompted by the University of Washington 2019 climate survey and by UW’s standard of excellence and core values, for the 2020-2021 academic year, the Faculty Council on Research (FCR) was charged with discussing a university-wide support program to address harassment and overall support needs of the UW tri-campus community. These efforts also have the support of the Faculty Council on Women in Academia and the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs.

We have engaged in conversations with a number of campus offices, leaders, and stakeholders to solicit initial ideas and input, including the Office of the Ombud, the Office of the Title IX Coordinator, the Graduate School, the Office of Faculty Advancement, the University Diversity Officer, and the founder of the Allies Program in the UW School of Medicine. It is apparent that UW supports its students, faculty, and staff through a number of existing entities, programs, and services (see Appendix). Nonetheless, we believe that creation of a campus-wide support program that is contextualized to local units is both feasible and likely to improve the experience, retention, and success of UW students, staff, and faculty, in general, but especially, graduate students and postdoctoral trainees.

We write to request that serious consideration be given to the creation of a campus-wide support program, beginning with a focus on graduate students and postdoctoral trainees.

The primary objectives will be to:

1. Undertake a needs assessment, with an emphasis on ways that graduate students and postdoctoral trainees can both be supported within their local units and more readily connected to UW-wide resources as they navigate barriers to success, resolve conflicts, and develop in their academic careers;

2. Produce a plan with an accompanying timeline and resources, including ongoing training and support to mentors, to implement a campus-wide support program that is fully integrated with existing UW entities and systems; and

3. Utilize an efficient hub-and-spoke model for shared resources, while also allowing for tailored interactions. The hub would administer centralized training on how to provide high-quality support, along with access to information and resources for mentors. The spokes would be comprised of a combination of existing campus entities and activities (see Appendix), as well as mentors situated within their unique academic contexts (i.e., units) providing individualized support.

Based on our conversations with UW entities and leaders related to this topic, we further suggest the following.

(a) The individuals charged with producing the plan should be diverse in terms of represented units, areas of expertise, and background, including and especially giving voice to people of color, underrepresented minorities, women, graduate students, and postdoctoral trainees. In addition, UW experts in this area who would be ideal to engage in future discussions
and efforts, include, for example: UW Ombuds, the University Diversity Officer, the Title IX coordinator, the ADA Coordinator, an Undergraduate Research Program representative, representation from the Graduate School, Graduate and Professional Student Senate (GPSS) representatives or liaisons, and UW Postdoctoral Association representatives or liaisons. Indeed, many of these individuals have agreed to contribute to future conversations.

(b) Careful attention should be paid to clarifying gaps in support and where this campus-wide support program meets a need. Along with this should come specification of what purposes the campus-wide support program would not serve, because certain goals are already met by existing UW entities (e.g., Office of the Ombud, SafeCampus). Critically, planning and implementation must be done in collaboration with UW systems and units, such that a campus-wide support program is intentionally placed and does not detract or compete with existing UW entities, systems, and processes. Further, it is necessary to provide clear and open communication about the relationship between the campus-wide support program and existing UW services, especially to the graduate students and postdoctoral trainees who will receive support and to the individuals (mentors) providing the support. Ensuring coherence, building trust, and cooperation are critical to avoiding harm.

(c) A program with both peer-to-peer supports within units and faculty-to-graduate student/postdoctoral trainee supports within units should be considered. Successful programs at UW and successful campus-wide initiatives at other institutions should be examined as models.

(d) Although focusing on graduate students and postdoctoral trainees, consider phased programming to support staff, undergraduate students, and eventually faculty, as well.

(e) Campus-wide, quantifiable recognition should be given to the mentors who provide support to program participants. These individuals should also receive ongoing guidance and support, extending beyond their initial training. It might be considered whether peer mentors who are graduate students or post-docs might also receive compensation of some kind.

(f) The program should be named in a way that reflects the role of the mentors providing support as advocates and in a way that is welcoming, noting that the term “ally” can come with a passive connotation in the realm of racial justice.

We are more than willing to be involved in any way that would facilitate progress, including by providing a representative for a task force or committee, coordinating across relevant parties, or contributing to ideas for producing and implementing a plan.

We appreciate your time and look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Sara Kover and Ben Marwick
Co-Chairs, UW Faculty Council on Research, 2020-2021
Appendix: Examples of Existing Components of UW Support

Office of the Ombud

Title IX

SafeCampus

OMAD Student Services

UW Human Resources

UWPD Victim Advocacy

The University Complaint Investigation and Resolution Office (UCIRO)

Husky Health & Well-being

School of Medicine Allies Program

Student Care Team

Undergraduate Research Program (e.g., activities for graduate students and postdocs who mentor undergraduates)

Center for Teaching and Learning Faculty Fellows

Graduate School Associate Dean of Student & Postdoctoral Affairs Lunch-and-Learn mentorship training (in development)

Commented [1]: Additional potential resources: 1) DRS/DSO, 2) could mention the UAW (union for grad and postdocs), 3) GO-MAP, 4) Office of Faculty Development,