Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Welcome and Introductions
3. Review of the minutes from June 8th, 2016
4. Council orientation (Burgess)
5. 2016-2017 charge letter/other expected activities
6. Class C resolution on postdocs
7. Good of the order
8. Adjourn

1) Call to order (0:00 – 9:09)

Rosenfeld called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2) Welcome and Introductions (0:00 – 9:09)

Members and guests of the council introduced themselves and briefly mentioned their research interests. There were several new faculty members to the council including Paul Fishman from the School of Medicine, and Todd Herrenkohl from the School of Social Work.

Rosenfeld reminded the council that last spring it agreed a postdoctoral researcher should be added to the FCR. Pedro Fonseca was present as the postdoctoral regularly-invited guest to the council. Lynette Arias (Associate Vice Provost, Office of Research) was also added as a new regularly-invited guest to the council.

3) Review of the minutes from June 8th, 2016 (9:09 – 9:20)

The minutes from June 8th, 2016 were approved as written.

4) Council orientation (Burgess) (9:21 – 19:12)

Burgess (Council Support Analyst, Faculty Senate & Governance) gave a brief orientation to the council on its role and function with the faculty senate and university at-large.

5) 2016-2017 charge letter/other expected activities (19:12 – 33:17) (Exhibit 1)
The council reviewed its 2016-2017 charge letter forwarded from faculty senate leadership. Rosenfeld provided brief overviews of activities included in the council’s charge:

- The FCR is tasked with reviewing and approving/rejecting any proposed UW research contract that includes restrictions on open publication of results, participation on grounds other than interest of competence, or access to campus facilities in a way that is disruptive. He explained contract review is a common activity of the FCR, and a part of its overall responsibility relating to matters of research at the UW. The Subcommittee on Classified/Restricted Research (typically made up of 3-5 faculty members) handles the initial vetting of waiver proposals, which are then forwarded to the full voting membership for a formal vote. Rosenfeld asked that new or returning faculty members with an interest in the subcommittee consider contacting him outside of the meeting for more information.

- It was noted a draft Open Access Policy developed by members of the University Libraries has now been completed and reviewed by the Provost. The Faculty Council on University Libraries (FCUL) will likely spearhead the effort to bring the Open Access initiative to the wider faculty during 2016-2017.

- Rosenfeld gave a brief explanation of issues raised by the FCR associated with Executive Order No. 61 (Research Misconduct Policy); he noted a main concern was a perceived lack of due process relating to certain procedures included in the policy (e.g. sequestering).

Members did not express any concerns or desire for changes relating to the council’s charge letter, after some discussion.

6) **Class C resolution on postdocs (33:17 – 74:44)** (Exhibit 2)

Fonseca explained no formal organization at the UW represents postdoctoral researchers in decision-making processes for the university (similar to the UW Graduate and Professional Student Senate or Associated Students of the University of Washington). He provided some background on the draft Class C Resolution on Postdocs, noting that an included recommendation is for a structural change at the UW to cement the postdoc population as a part of university decision-making processes (Exhibit 2).

Rosenfeld explained in building out the resolution, he asked that the drafters place all the content they had within the resolution with the intent that elements of the document would be combined or cut out after consultation with the FCR (explaining the document’s long length).

There was some general discussion of postdoctoral researchers at the UW:

- A member explained the School of Medicine houses the majority of postdocs at the UW. There are approximately 1000 employed postdocs, and 600 within the School of Medicine.

- Appointment letters are a mandatory element of postdoctoral researcher employment in the School of Medicine - a policy which has facilitated efforts to identify a category of postdocs as being of a “trainee status,” mainly via coordination with Principal Investigators (PIs) (i.e. not employed solely for research purposes).

- It was noted a greater understanding of the benefits brought by postdocs to the university should be proliferated.
A member suggested more funding be secured for the UW Office of Postdoctoral Affairs in order to facilitate greater support for and representation of postdocs and their interests.

It was noted there are two employment categories of postdocs at the university - those working in a “trainee status” capacity, and those employed as senior fellows. A member explained developing employment policies for postdocs may potentially be muddled given this fact.

It was noted classroom/instructional experience is critical for postdocs planning to eventually transition into faculty roles at the university.

It was noted the current university-wide limit for postdoctoral researcher appointments is a term of six years.

There was some discussion of recent Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) changes to overtime exemptions and the effect it may have on postdocs, as it has been directed that postdocs be included in implementation of those changes at the UW. Changes involve raising the required annual salary for those employed under overtime exempt conditions. UW’s Provost has set a policy to raise the minimum salary for postdocs to the required limit (from $23,660 to $47,476) with another element being that there will be no more “overtime eligible” postdoctoral appointments at the university. A member noted the fiscal amount necessary to bridge grant funding to implement the change is approximately 2 million dollars (bridge period will last for one year). The policy will be implemented December 1st, 2016.

There was some discussion of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) agreeing to fund the FLSA revision. Discussion revealed it is unclear if the NIH has implemented a concrete policy on the matter. It was noted the hope is that there will be a supplementation from NIH, though on the other hand, the fear is that the change will result in a reduced amount of slots for postdoc training grants.

A member noted the new FLSA policy will have ramifications for part-time postdocs at the UW. There is a contingent of postdocs currently employed under part-time conditions in certain schools and colleges, usually for family leave reasons. The change will also affect foreign postdocs working under international grants at the UW, as they must be brought up to the new annual salary minimum as well; it was noted in many cases visa renewals depends on contract status.

It was noted the end result of implementing FLSA changes at the university will likely be that there are fewer postdocs on the UW campuses.

Discussion then began on the draft Class C resolution:

It was noted the resolution is too lengthy to be effective, and the council should decide what they want the resolution to accomplish as a starting point to drive revisions.

Objectives were outlined by Fonseca for the Class C resolution, which included departments having mentoring programs for postdocs, identifying them as a category of trainees.

Other objectives were noted by members:
- Best practices relating to postdocs from the National Academy of Sciences was mentioned, with the desire that the UW adopt a similar set of best practices.

There was a recommendation agreed to, that the resolution be retooled by a small working group; members were identified. Fonseca was asked to enlist additional postdocs to work with the small group. An advisory group in the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs was also suggested as a resource to the small group. It was noted this work should be completed before the November 9th FCR meeting.
Discussion subsided.

7) **Good of the order (74:44 – 75:03)**

The Class C resolution on Postdocs will be retooled and brought back to the council in the November 9th meeting.

8) **Adjourn (74:44 – 75:03)**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:19 a.m.

_____________________________________________________________________________________

*Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst*

**Present:**  
**Faculty:** Eliot Brenowitz, Chuck Frevert, Gina-Anne Levow, Michael Rosenfeld (chair), John Slattery, Paul Fishman, Todd Herrenkohl  
**Ex-officio reps:** Jennifer Harris, Michelle Brault  
**President’s designee:** Mary Lidstrom  
**Guests:** Susan Camber, Lynette Arias, Pedro Fonseca

**Absent:**  
**Faculty:** Donald Chi, Mark Haselkorn, Ben Marwick, Tueng Shen, Nicole Gibran  
**Ex-officio reps:** N/A

**Exhibits**

Exhibit 1 – fcr_councilchargeletter_2016-2017.pdf  
Exhibit 2 – FacultyResolutionPostdocsDRAFT_Oct4.doc
September 16, 2016

Michael Rosenfeld
Chair, Faculty Council on Research

Dear Professor Rosenfeld:

The Faculty Council on Research is charged with responsibility “for all matters of policy relating to research” (Faculty Code, Sec 42-37). Activities historically performed include reviewing any requests for approval submitted by a principle investigator (PI) who is entering into a contract which creates restrictions to the university’s research and academic mission - reporting council vote results to faculty senate leadership; addressing research-related issues, inquiries, and interests on behalf of UW faculty, especially by way of inviting key administrators for providing supplementary information and for receiving council feedback and guidance on topics at-hand.

Our recommendation is that the council identify 3 specific goals that can be accomplished by the end of the 2016-17 academic year.

The Senate office did a background review to help identify goals for your council. This included review of minutes from last year’s meetings, review of discussions at Faculty Senate meetings, and selected outreach for topics. Recommended goals and / or topics for discussion include:

- Aid in bringing the newly created draft Open Access Policy and other facets of the initiative to a faculty vote at the UW, in consultation with the Faculty Council on University Libraries.
- Review and collaborate with newly formed dual-reporting faculty senate and administrative committee ACIP to update Executive Order No. 36 (Patent, Invention, and Copyright Policy).
- Invite Environmental Health and Safety Director Jude Van Buren to report on use of Provost funds granted in 2015-2016 academic year. Review current administrative policies and initiatives regarding lab safety and identify any remaining areas for improvement, especially concerning laboratory compliance and safety. Identify potential reporting and enforcement mechanisms that might be adopted to enhance lab accountability for mitigation or redress of compliance issues.
- Identify best practices for educating faculty and facilitating awareness of research misconduct policies and procedures as outlined in updated Executive Order No. 61.
- Develop a Class C resolution garnering faculty awareness and support for Guidelines on Employment of Post-Doctoral fellows at the University of Washington.
Supplementary:

- Review emerging policies and procedures regarding research and intellectual property as it relates to GIX (Global Innovation Exchange) in anticipation of first incoming cohort. Collaborate with new dual-reporting university committee on Intellectual Property.

After your first council meeting we will be available to discuss the goals your council identified. Thereafter, we will post your council’s goals on the Faculty Senate Website to communicate the important work you are doing on their behalf.

Sincerely,

Zoe Barsness
Faculty Senate Chair
Associate Professor of Business

/jmb
WHEREAS, nationally there are 167 postdoctoral offices serving the needs of approximately 79,000 postdoctoral scholars in 2014, compared to 25 offices in early 2000s1.

WHEREAS, nationally postdoctoral trainees in science, engineering and health increased from 47,240 in 2004 to 63,593 in 20142, a 25.7 percent increase in a decade.

WHEREAS, nationally the majority of postdoctoral appointments are federally funded (69 percent), most are doing research in the life or health sciences, 22 percent are in the physical sciences or engineering, and 4 percent are working in the social sciences or humanities3.

WHEREAS, “the current science and engineering enterprise relies heavily on the postdoctoral population, who carry out large proportion of nation’s research. Postdoc educate, train and supervise junior members, assist with writing grant proposals and papers, oftentimes presenting their research at professional society meetings, all the while building their curriculum vitae”4.

WHEREAS, descriptive results of Sigma Xi National Postdoc Survey in 20055 show that 84.3 percent have received an official letter of appointment or contract; 23.4 percent received formal evaluation while 69.8% received informal evaluation; 48.6 percent of the respondents were not at all exposed to opportunities outside of an academic or a research career.

WHEREAS, statistical analysis of Sigma Xi National Postdoc Survey in 2005 suggest that postdocs who plan their experience with their advisors at the outset of their appointments fare substantially better than those who do not; Exposure to nonacademic careers and training in teaching skills, proposal writing, project management, and ethics are all associated with greater levels of subjective success; Postdocs with a written plan (e.g. IDP) submit papers to peer-reviewed journals at a 23% higher rate, first-authored papers at a 30% higher rate, and grant proposals at a 25% higher rate than those without a written plan6.

WHEREAS, a recent national survey of postdoc experience showed that of the 179 UW respondents, 60% plan on remaining in academia in a primarily research-based setting. 46% of postdocs have at least somewhat changed their career plans since starting their postdoc position, and 8% were “very confident” that they would attain their specified career plan.7

---

WHEREAS, National Postdoctoral Association Institutional Policy Report in 2014\(^8\), a summary of postdoctoral policies (institutional, training, health insurance, and benefits) at 92 institutions, reveals that 71 percent of Postdoctoral Office had grievance policy, 87 percent had centralized appointment process, 63 percent set the maximum term limit as 5 years, 47 percent require Individual Development Plan (IDP) or encourage (37percent) to.

WHEREAS, National Science Foundation Survey\(^9\) shows University of Washington ranked 9\(^{th}\) nationally out of 323 institutions by total numbers of postdoctoral appointees in science, engineering, and health in 2014.

WHEREAS, the UW is the leading public university in federally funded research and innovation;

WHEREAS, as of March 2016, University of Washington has 1,057 postdocs based on 4 identified job class codes, 35.8 percent out of which are international, 45.1 percent women, 56.1 percent from School of Medicine\(^10\).

WHEREAS, several national bodies, including the NIH, NSF, the federal Office of Management and Budget, the National Postdoctoral Association, and the National Academies have defined the role of postdoctoral researcher as “a temporary position of advanced mentored training in research,” and recognize the “dual role” of postdocs as employees and trainees;

WHEREAS, postdocs are nevertheless not represented formally on the UW by either the Faculty Senate or Graduate and Professional Student Senate;

WHEREAS, there are no central offices that monitor incoming postdocs, ongoing postdoc experiences, policies relevant to postdocs, or alumni/career placement data;

WHEREAS, postdocs can be isolated to a single research group or faculty advisor and not be aware of broader campus resources and communities;

WHEREAS many postdocs enter into their positions without having clear information concerning their rights and responsibilities as trainees, e.g. stipend level and responsibilities within the laboratory.

BE IT RESOLVED that the University of Washington recognizes the postdoctoral programs as a transitory phase and places a limit of five years of experience under the various job titles encompassing postdoctoral researchers, barring extraordinary circumstances. Once the period of advanced training is completed, individuals should be promoted to permanent or advancing positions such as Acting Assistant Professor or Research Scientist. Acting Assistant Professors are faculty, and not postdocs.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the University recognizes the dual role of postdoctoral researchers as both employees and trainees entitled to reasonable release time and support for professional development including workshops, travel to conferences, or teaching opportunities.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that faculty recognize that mentoring is an essential responsibility taken on when employing a postdoc. As such, best practices should be adopted including the creation and

---


10 Data source: Academic HR, University of Washington.
maintenance of Individual Development Plans (IDPs), a mentoring team, and annual progress reviews with constructive feedback.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that faculty recognize that mentoring is a collective responsibility of the University and not just a responsibility of the faculty members that work directly with the postdoctoral researchers. As such, postdoctoral researchers should additionally have their progress reviewed by faculty members other than those that directly interact with them on a day-to-day basis. Furthermore, the faculty body should provide timely feedback to the immediate mentors of postdoctoral researchers to anticipate and prevent mentoring deficiencies.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that departments with a significant body of postdoctoral researchers guarantee the appointment of a staff member with the roles of establishing, maintaining and enhancing an explicit training program for postdoctoral researchers.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the University recognizes the right for postdoctoral research applicants to receive timely, accurate and complete information regarding the goals of the work and the working conditions associated with the postdoctoral appointment.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the University recognizes the University of Washington Postdoctoral Association (UWPA) as an organization of interest for the postdoctoral research body of the University and for the University. The University shall support, promote and respect the independence of the Association.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the University recognizes that a significant fraction of postdoctoral researchers intend to pursue an academic career. Consequently, the University recognizes that every postdoctoral researcher has the right to be informed of the non-renewal of the appointment with sufficient notice to ensure that every postdoc has a fair opportunity to find a suitable subsequent appointment. The University aims at providing a one year notice for all postdoctoral researchers and ensures that, under any condition, at least a 6 month notice is provided.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that postdocs, as an essential part of the University’s research enterprise, are entitled to permanent representation on key University bodies such as the Research Advisory Board, the Faculty Council on Research, and others.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs is a permanent part of the University organization with the responsibility of coordinating policies, practices, and procedures for postdocs at the University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the University centralize and make publicly available the collection of data on postdocs it employs including the satisfaction with their training and tracking of employment after leaving in order to quantify the quality of research training received at the University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that offer letters extended to postdocs include: the compensation the postdoc will receive, the source of the funding, time limits for initial funding and for the length of the postdoctoral position, whether or not a fellow is required to acquire funding from outside sources to remain in the laboratory, and any specific responsibilities that must be fulfilled to ensure continued employment/training in the lab.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the exit survey data can be used to track trends in postdoc experience offered by departments and research groups to inform quality improvement efforts with mentoring.