Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Review of the minutes from October 12th, 2016
3. Research Administration Regulatory Reform – Lynette Arias
4. Class C resolution on postdocs
5. Subcontract review
6. Good of the order
7. Adjourn

1) Call to order

Rosenfeld called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. He asked for introductions, as it was the first meeting of some new members.

Rosenfeld made an announcement that a new university-wide Open Access Policy was developed, completed, and recently accepted by the Provost. He noted he is personally adamant that this policy be brought to the full faculty for a vote. He explained it may be that the FCR forwards Class B legislation in order for this consultation to take place. Rosenfeld gave some background on the initiative, which has been ongoing since winter of 2015 (prompted by a jointly-sponsored FCR-FCUL Class C resolution on Open Access). He noted the idea is this would be an “opt-out” OA policy, and it has been developed as such.

Marwick added that the rationale for an “opt-out” policy is to increase the impact and visibility of the work going on at the UW. There was some discussion of the status of “preprints” under the new policy.

Rosenfeld explained he would consult with senate leadership and report back to the council on the topic.

2) Review of the minutes from October 12th, 2016

The minutes from October 12th, 2016 were approved as written.

3) Research Administration Regulatory Reform – Lynette Arias (Exhibit 1)

Lynette Arias (Assistant Vice Provost of Research, Office of Research) was present to give information to the council on various policy/legislative-advising bodies for research, science policy, and research
administration, as well as new legislation which will cement a federal “Research Policy Board” (RPB), among other things.

Arias explained she was the Director of the Office Sponsored Projects (OSP) for three years, and has been in that role at other universities for over 20 years. She explained in her current role, she is becoming more immersed in politics in Washington D.C. on behalf of faculty researchers.

She explained the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP), the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR), as well as another committee on research regulatory reform are important bodies that the government looks to for advice on policy changes as they arise. She noted one goal of these groups for several years has been reducing administrative burden involved in conducting research. She presented a handout including links to reports on that initiative (Exhibit 1).

Arias explained the Research Policy Board is meant to be proactive relating to changes in the United States research regulatory environment. Currently, legislation (University Regulations Streamlining and Harmonization Act of 2016) is being put forward to cement the Research Policy Board at the federal level. After a question, Arias explained there are a lot of legislative changes ongoing surrounding human subjects and clinical research, including the altering of definitions of various research-related terms, which have been controversial.

Arias explained she is part of the voice of research faculty at the UW. She noted as she enters various issues, she is most interested in accurately representing UW researcher’s views, interests, and priorities.

Members of the council thanked Arias for the update. Rosenfeld explained he would like Arias and Haselkorn (who acts as UW’s faculty member representative on the FDP) to return to the council and present on legislative initiatives as they arise, and report any expected affects on research at the UW.

4) Class C resolution on postdocs (Exhibit 2)

The council continued discussion on a draft Class C resolution on Postdoctoral Researchers, which was further developed after being discussed in the last FCR meeting (Exhibit 2). Kelly Edwards (Associate Dean, Graduate School/Professor, Bioethics and Humanities) and UW postdoctoral research Pedro Fonseca explained the revisions made to the resolution. Edwards thanked the council for the opportunity to forward the resolution, and thanked Arias, Slattery, and Fonseca for their work on the resolution outside of the last council meeting.

Edwards gave a brief summary of changes made, which included cutting down the resolution in length so only key points and recommendations are present, and adding rationale to the document as the first paragraph. Edwards explained one goal of the resolution is to move UW’s postdoc policies in-line with national and local recommendations. Additionally, the resolution points out that postdocs are not represented in the faculty senate, or by UW student government organizations.

Rosenfeld explained he would like to open discussion on if the resolution is fit to be forwarded to the faculty senate, or if it could benefit from additional changes.
The council engaged in a discussion of potential changes to be made, and eventually engaged in additional wordsmithing of the document. Members of the council were identified to revise the document in accordance with recommendations heard during discussion.

Edwards explained she would update the resolution per the discussion, and forward the revised resolution to the council to be shared before the next FCR meeting.

5) Subcontract review

Frevert noted project under review is titled: “Sonar Simulation Toolset Application, Improvement, Maintenance, and Support;” the Principal Investigator (PI) is Robert Goddard. This is a five-year project with a large list of subtasks, all of which relate to the Sonar Simulation Toolset (SST) software. Frevert explained the project’s major restriction is on publications, as any papers or reports under this project must be reviewed by the Office of Naval Research (ONR) prior to publication. The PI has indicated that no students or foreign nationals are involved.

The council voted in favor of the proposal.

6) Good of the order

Nothing was stated.

7) Adjourn

Rosenfeld adjourned the meeting at 10:15 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, Benjamin Marwick, Mark Haselkorn
Ex-officio reps: Jennifer Harris, Michelle Brault
President’s designee: Mary Lidstrom
Guests: Susan Camber, Lynette Arias, Pedro Fonseca, Kelly Edwards

Absent: Faculty: Donald Chi, Tueng Shen, Nicole Gibran
Ex-officio reps: N’Vida Yotcho, Diana Louden

Exhibits
Exhibit 1 – RESEARCH REGULATORY REFORM Fall 2016 Update.doc
Exhibit 2 – FCR_ResolutionRevisedDraftOct31_fishman_edits
- “Optimizing the Nation’s Investment in Academic Research – A New Regulatory Framework for the 21st Century”
  - Part 1 was previously published 9/22/2015 (included recommendations related to COI, Human Subjects, Animal Research, Fed Agency Inspector Generals and Audits, Uniform Guidance and a proposed Research Policy Board (RPB)
    - Part 1 COGR Summary
  - Part 2 published 6/29/2016, along with full report (included recommendations related to Human Subjects, IP/Tech Transfer, Select Agents and Toxins, Export Controls, and more details on recommendation for RPB)
    - Part 2 COGR Summary (this summary is really well done and includes brief summary of each section of report, along with brief summary of COGR actions/activities related to each)

GAO Report on Admin Burden- Link
- Report includes recommendations related to key agencies coordinating with OTSP Research Business Models Subcommittee to further standardize and report on requirements, explore further use of preliminary proposals to help streamline requirements/burden and to better target requirements on higher risk areas (such as in COI, procurement and subrecipient monitoring).
- Slides from recent FDP Meeting / GAO session on this report

House and Senate bills on research regulatory reform
- H.R. 5583 “University Regulation Streamlining and Harmonization Act of 2016”
  - This legislation is 100% focused on research administration regulatory reform and focuses on recommendations from NAS Report
  - Brief summary of bill (attached)
  - House Committee on Science, Space and Technology, Subcommittee on Research and Technology Meeting to discuss H.R.5583 – 9/29/2016
    - Jim Luther (AVP Finance, Duke/COGR Chair) testimony video
    - Written testimony, including listing of all the recent regulatory changes
- S. 2742 “Promoting Biomedical Research and Public Health for Patients Act” (co-sponsored by Patty Murray)

Uniform Guidance Updates
- OMB/COFAR requested FAQ updates from COGR – COGR submitted 7 proposed FAQ’s (includes FAQ’s on subrecipient monitoring, use of 10% de minimus F&A rate, foreign subs and audit requirements, DS-2 approval process, late issuance of management reports by Federal agencies, utility cost adjustment, and public advance notice of competitive bids). Approval of these is still pending.

Clinical Research / Human Subjects
- Human Subjects Common Rule / Final Rule - expected by end of the year, potentially with changes to biospecimens portions. Will go through OMB/OIRA review one final time. COGR actively pursuing.
• **NIH Single IRB Policy**
  - COGR activities via the Research and Regulatory Reform Committee: actual sIRB Policy & NIH guidance; sIRB Costing allowability; NCATS SMART IRB Project; survey on cost and effectiveness; Good Clinical Practice, etc.
  - Ongoing letters and dialogue from COGR to NIH

• **New HHS Regulation on Clinical Trial Registration**
  - [NIH Office of Science Policy](#) Blog with good summary info and related documents/policies
  - [NOT-OD-16-149](#) NIH Policy on the Dissemination of NIH-Funded Clinical Trial Information
  - [NOT-OD-16-147](#) NIH Policy on Funding Opportunity Announcements (FOA) for Clinical Trials
  - [NOT-OD-16-148](#) NIH Policy on Good Clinical Practice Training for NIH Awardees Involved in NIH-funded Clinical Trials
  - Note: NIH working on clinical trial registration module in eRA Commons that will start tracking info at proposal time and then feed to ct.gov *(as discussed in recent eRA Commons Working Group meeting on 9/23/2016)*
POSTDOC RESOLUTION – DRAFT Oct 31

The Faculty Council on Research recognizes the invaluable service provided by post-docs to key research and education missions of the University. Post-doctoral researchers are the backbone of the University's research enterprise, and provide key mentoring and education to UW graduate and undergraduate students.

The postdoctoral experience is nationally recognized as a temporary and transitional period of advanced mentored training toward an independent research career. As an institution and as individual faculty advisors, it is vital for us to commit to recognizing that postdocs are on a pathway to career independence. The National Academies of Sciences has studied the postdoc experience extensively and put forward clear recommendations in 2000 and in 2014. With this resolution, the FCR outlines the commitments and practices that would strongly support the UW in achieving parity with national guidelines and peer standards.

WHEREAS the 2014 National Postdoctoral Association (NPA) Institutional Policy Report shows that UW peer institutions have an average of 2.0FTE in a central Office of Postdoctoral Affairs;

WHEREAS the NPA Institutional Policy Report found 71 percent of central Postdoctoral Offices 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 (37 percent) one;

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, the National Science Foundation Survey\(^1\) 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, postdocs are nevertheless not represented formally at the UW by either the Faculty Senate or Graduate and Professional Student Senate;

WE MUST, as a university employing over one thousand post-doctoral researchers, commit to fulfilling our obligations toward these vital members of our research and learning ecosystem.

---

BE IT RESOLVED that the University of Washington recognizes the postdoctoral experience 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 transition to appropriate professional roles.

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 supporting a postdoc. As such, best practices should be adopted including the creation and maintenance of Individual Development Plans (IDPs) and annual progress reviews with constructive feedback.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, in keeping with national recommendations, that postdocs are encouraged to form mentoring teams to provide research, career, and personal guidance.

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 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 should support, promote and respect the independence of the Association.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that departments with a significant body of postdoctoral researchers support the appointment of a faculty or staff member with the responsibility of collaborating with the Office of Postdoc Affairs to connect postdocs with programming and facilitate oversight and accountability for University policies.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that offer letters extended to postdocs include at least the following: the compensation the postdoc will receive (in keeping with new FSLA minimums), specific benefits, 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, commitment to professional development opportunities, primary advisor or supervisor confirmed, reference to the Office of Postdoc Affairs for central resources, and any specific responsibilities that must be fulfilled to ensure continued employment/training in the lab.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that unambiguous job classifications be used for postdoctoral research fellows to facilitate tracking and accountability from first hiring to exit.

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

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 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.