Meeting Synopsis:

1) Call to order
2) Approval of the minutes from May 13th, 2015
3) Changes to Human Subjects records retention requirements – Barbara Benson and Christine Taylor
4) Approval of APL subcontract
5) Generating a faculty poll on issues related to interdisciplinary research under ABB
6) Good of the order
7) Adjourn

1) Call to order

Rosenfeld called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

2) Approval of the minutes from May 13th, 2015

The minutes from May 13th, 2015 were unable to be voted on in the council meeting, and will be voted on in the next regular meeting of the council.

3) Changes to Human Subjects records retention requirements – Barbara Benson and Christine Taylor

Barbara Benson (Director, Records Management Services) and Christine Taylor (Records/Office Manager, UW Medicine) were present to discuss recent changes to the UW Human Subjects Records Retention requirements. They explained that a meeting with university stakeholders has led to a recommendation that the records retention requirement be changed from the existing 30-year retention period, to a six-year period.

Benson noted this recommended change required funneling through necessary state-related channels before being formally adopted, as the UW is a state agency. She explained that after some substantive discussion, approval for the change was granted.

A council member asked what the underlying motivation was for altering the retention period. The guests explained it was primarily implemented because of economic factors, though other factors contributed. The original 30-year requirement was designated in the 1990s, in response to a records-
related lawsuit brought against the university. The requirement was set to be conservative and protect against future lawsuits of the same kind.

A member asked whose responsibility it will be to destroy records which now exceed the newly adopted six-year retention requirement. The guests noted their offices will handle disposal of old records. They explained that Principal Investigators (PIs) do have the option of retaining their own documentation if they wish for it not to be destroyed.

The guests noted that in the state of Washington, each state agency is required to have a records retention officer. They explained that all documentation related to research at the UW is subject to this new (six-year) requirement.

Taylor and Benson noted that an announcement has been broadcasted explaining this change within the human subject’s newsletter. An additional announcement has gone out to all records management officers and directors throughout the university. Taylor added that her office is planning trainings throughout the next year for further education about this change. A council member noted that the guests may want to consider requesting a ten-minute presentation slot in various departmental meetings, for furthering the spread of this news to faculty and others. The guests agreed this to be a good suggestion.

The council thanked the guests for presenting, and they left the meeting.

4) Approval of APL subcontract

Rosenfeld noted that the FCR Subcommittee on Classified/Restricted Research has read through the request in question, and are recommending approval. He noted the request is from APL (UW Applied Physics Lab), and the Principal Investigator (PI) is DJ Tang. The subcontract is between APL and the company Adaptive Methods, and mainly consists of APL providing “improvements to a US Navy standard acoustic model (used for sensor performance prediction) through a Naval Air Warfare Center (NAWC) Small Business Technology Transfer Research (STTR) Phase II effort.” A subcommittee member noted that they are not considering publications for research included in this contract. In addition, there are no students or internationals involved with the contract. Rosenfeld noted this is a standard request, and that his recommendation is for approval.

After brief discussion, the council agreed the request to be straightforward. The council approved the subcontract request by unanimous vote.

5) Generating a faculty poll on issues related to interdisciplinary research under ABB

Rosenfeld explained that the SCPB (Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting) has tasked the FCR to investigate how ABB has impacted research on campus, and whether there have been any apparent overarching/fundamental issues associated with the conducting of interdisciplinary research at the UW. Rosenfeld noted that one of the options that council considered in their last meeting to answer some of
these questions, was to develop a survey to be sent broadly to UW faculty members (or some subset of faculty members), inquiring into their experiences and opinions on the matter.

After substantive discussion, the council considered including the following questions in the survey:

- Have you ever been discouraged to collaborate in research by your department?
- Do you plan to conduct collaborative research with faculty outside of your unit? (The council noted “collaborative research” needs a concrete definition, Lidstrom noted she would be able to provide a viable definition from the Office of Research).
- Have you been discouraged by chairs or administration to participate in collaborative awards?
- Are you aware of current policy on sub-budgets?
- What is your demographic - college, rank, gender.
  *After each question, a box for comments should be included.
  *No required questions.
  *The council considered the pros and cons of directing the survey at varying demographics of faculty, with some discussion of only broadcasting to junior faculty, and some in favor of broadcasting to all faculty, for returning a larger amount of data.

The council agreed the survey should be advertised as short and easy to complete. Rosenfeld explained he would attempt to compile questions based on the feedback and discussion taking place within the council. It was noted work on the survey should be carried out as soon as possible, with a goal for it to be broadcasted in the fall 2015.

_Council discussion_

Lidstrom (president’s designee) explained that the return of indirect costs is often the impediment to interdepartmental groups working together on research, and ABB has not modified that. She explained that she believes ABB has raised awareness of the issues and impediments to interdisciplinary research on campus, especially in regards to department chairs; she explained she notices more negativity on campus than used to be on the subject. She explained there is no question that there are department chairs who tell faculty they should not do a collaborative project because their department will not receive any indirect costs return.

Lidstrom noted that the Office of Research did not previously capture data on whether there are multiple investigators on a project. However, they have now figured out how to obtain this information, and by fall 2015 they will have a good list of eligible Principal Investigators, not including graduate students or individuals engaged in postdoctoral research. She noted compiling the list for PI eligibility has been difficult, but once the list is compiled, the Office of Research plans to begin contacting those eligible to find out if they have “sub accounts.”

The council noted that everyone involved in an investigation should receive some form of credit, and that this is a possible additional incentive beyond fiscal returns. There was some discussion on if there...
needs to be a “lead” PI on interdisciplinary projects, the answer generally being that there does need to be a single lead PI.

Rosenfeld noted that because of an economic deficit his department has sustained, they are obligated to attempt to gain additional revenue. He explained that department members are trying to generate high-enrollment classes to make graduate programs more sustainable. He noted in the near future, there will be a great deal of pressure to hold onto as much revenue as possible within graduate programs.

Lidstrom noted it would be very useful for deans to receive information from the possible survey that the FCR may broadcast.

Haselkorn noted the council could consider a focused survey sent to promotion & tenure committees on what constitutes a collaborative project for faculty, as well as what they attribute credit for, and if projects are considered even if they do not bring money back to the department.

Lidstrom recommended visiting the Board of Deans and discussing this topic. She noted the council could make a difference by doing this, and it would also raise visibility of the issue.

A member noted he asked stakeholders of his unit if they felt these sorts of problems existed in a recent meeting. He noted they expressed that they could not collaborate extensively within their own unit. He asked about indirect costs as well, and if it stimulates more research. He noted he got an “earful” on this question. He explained that a large factor in this equation for his unit is that indirect cost returns sometimes pay for teaching when the unit has recently sustained retirements, enlarging the incentive to receive them.

Rosenfeld noted the council will take up discussion of the proposed survey again when they meet in the fall.

6) Good of the order

   **Catalyst Sharespaces retirement**

A council member explained that a decision has been made by UW-IT to retire the file-sharing software Catalyst Sharespaces at the UW over the course of the next academic year (2015-16). The decision was driven by the software’s high costs to maintain. It was noted that, as the council is concerned, a new file-sharing software else will need to be identified and employed to suit its needs. A member asked what will be replacing Catalyst’s electronic feature capabilities, seeing as these features are well-used by the UW community.
A question was raised concerning how the council will conduct campus surveys if Catalyst software is completely retired. It was not known if all Catalyst functions would be retired, or only the file-sharing “shared space” software.

**Federal Demonstration Partnership**

Haselkorn explained that the FDP (Federal Demonstration Partnership) will be conducting sessions to discuss research associated with a number of topics, and added that he believes the FCR should consider participating in this discussion. The council thanked Haselkorn for the suggestion, and consideration of joining this event will take place in a later meeting.

**Revision process for EO No. 36**

Rosenfeld explained that IPMAC (Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee) has been tasked with revisiting EO (Executive Order) 36, the Executive Order that governs all IP policy on campus. This policy has not been revisited since the mid-1990s, and many pieces are missing and/or outdated. He noted a series of “listening sessions” have been held, wherein individuals and experts who hold interest in the designated associated topics of each session were asked to make a short presentation for those in attendance. Notes were taken on the sentiments expressed in the sessions, and both IPMAC and SCIPC (Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization) will be meeting together for the first time ever this upcoming Friday (June 10th) to discuss the results, and begin to generate a list of priorities in revising the UW’s IP Policy.

**FCR Open Access Resolution**

Rosenfeld noted the Senate voted to approve the Class C Resolution on Open Access. The resolution was drafted and finalized by members of the FCR in association with members of the Faculty Council on University Libraries (FCUL). He noted that the outcome of this approval will likely be a series of recommendations for upgrading/changing the university’s open access policy and existing repository software. He noted this topic has implications for every individual on campus, but the issue is especially important to the notion of “who owns what” (i.e. faculty publication rights). He noted he would continue to report back to the council on the outcome of this topic. He also noted he would like to involve the FCR more as the recommendations are solidified.

7) **Adjourn**

Rosenfeld adjourned the meeting at 10:30 a.m.

---

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

**Present:**

**Faculty:** Cecilia Aragon, Mark Haselkorn, Gina-Anne Levow, Benjamin Marwick, Mike Rosenfeld (Chair), Daniel Vogt

**President’s Designee:** Mary Lidstrom

**Guests:** Barbara Benson, Christine Taylor
Absent: Faculty: Todd Scheuer, Tueng Shen, Juliet Shields, John Slattery
Ex-Officio reps: Diana Louden, Tom Gebert, Steve Carlin