1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda

Chair Mark Haselkorn called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. and asked for an amendment to the agenda. The fourth item that calls for information and updates from Mary Lidstrom will be tabled until the December meeting because she was not available for today’s meeting. The amended agenda was approved.

2. Approve minutes from October 2008 FCR meeting

With a few small corrections, the minutes from October 1, 2008 were approved.
3. Announcements
Chair Haselkorn announced that the Faculty Senate leadership has requested of all faculty council chairs a list of ongoing issues that the councils will address this academic year. He handed out a sheet with five current research issues and asked council members to please read through them and send him their comments before he sends the list on to the faculty senate leadership.

Haselkorn asked Jonathan Nurse (via phone) to share with the council news of the Washington D.C. area. Nurse reported on the intensity of the upcoming presidential election, noting the upcoming lame duck session and his work with the committee on higher education concerning research funding. He said he would get in touch with council members concerning the upcoming 2010 federal budget for university funding levels. Nurse reported that he is currently filling in for Barbara Perry, outgoing Vice President and Director of Federal Relations, until a new director is found. He noted that he will be in the Seattle area November 17th-21st and will email his schedule to council members so that they can meet and discuss federal issues. Nurse said he will send his email to Haselkorn with the dates to distribute to FCR members.

4. Requests for Information and Updates
This item was tabled until the next meeting.

5. Discussion
   • AAUP Request for Information (Christoph Giebel, Jeffrey Kim)

Introductions were made for the special guests, Christoph Giebel, Jeffrey Kim, and Michael Eisenberg.

Haselkorn began the discussion by underscoring one of the council’s primary responsibilities, as stated as the first item on the issue list:

   Classified, Proprietary and Restricted Research: review, and if appropriate, approve applications for grants and contracts. Consider the mechanisms by which classified, proprietary and restricted research is accepted into the University.

He noted that the AAUP request went first to the President and Faculty Senate leadership before finally coming to FCR. Haselkorn provided some background on the procedure that typically activates FCR’s review of all university work accepted through outside funding that involves classified, proprietary and restricted information. The INSER proposers did not check the box that indicates the sponsored project includes classified, proprietary or restricted information. Haselkorn noted that this request represents another way to activate FCR involvement. The request included direct questions for the council to respond to.

Special guest Christoph Giebel explained that the School of International Studies (SIS) has in the past always rejected requests by a US intelligence agency for a formal affiliation with SIS. It was the January 2007 establishment of the “Institute for National Security Education and Research” (INSER) at UW as part of the Information School that prompted the AAUP’s recent request for information. Giebel stated the AAUP’s concerns about the institute’s potential effect on faculty governance and the faculty’s role in defending the integrity of the university’s core teaching and research mission. He explained how the questions in the request pertain to FCR as well as to the Senate leadership and to administrators in the President’s office.
Giebel pointed to INSER’s funding of study abroad programs that connect cultural immersion with the understanding of national security issues as cause for concern. He noted that any perception of an association with US intelligence would undermine the ability of UW faculty and students to conduct international research, and would result in a potentially “toxic” effect upon the ability of SIS to partner with international agencies and their host families. Giebel listed his concerns with INSER funding in relation to its disclosure requirements and its strong interest in recruiting to train people in intelligence activities. He pointed to other international study abroad programs that are not funded through the Department of Defense. Giebel noted that INSER requires its students to write a statement about how their studies abroad helped their understanding of national intelligence. INSER’s cultural immersion program places students in home stay situations and yet students are not required to reveal their source of funding. His concern is that, for students who travel to sensitive areas in the world, this program jeopardizes their basic safety and security. Giebel noted that many departments and programs across the campus are concerned about this issue.

Chair Haselkorn noted that FCR is precisely concerned with transparency issues, which is what causes one to check the box and bring FCR into the review process at that point. He described FCR’s function as that of a gatekeeper for external funding that comes to the university. A discussion began about links between the source of funding for INSER and expenditures for study abroad. Regular guest Sue Camber clarified the issue in noting that while the university disperses all external funding, the money is held in a separate pot and there is a direct link to the originating source.

Special guest Jeffrey Kim thanked everyone. He noted that INSER’s objective is to raise the public’s understanding of complex national security issues through support of study abroad programs and curriculum development. Kim sought to clarify INSER’s role in the study abroad programs. He explained that INSER works through other departments, such as Asian Languages and Literature, Political Science, and Near Eastern Languages and Literature, whose students apply for study abroad in the UW’s International Programs and Exchanges Office (IPEO). Departmental committees then select students for study abroad and forward their names and applications to INSER, whose role is to provide funding for their studies.

Kim explained that students traveling through IPEO programs and receiving INSER scholarship monies get full-time medical insurance when they go abroad, and when they return, are required to write an essay about their experience. Kim was asked about the funding source for students and whether it was linked to national security issues. Kim explained that the spirit of INSER’s scholarly program is that if students have better language skills and cultural sensitivity because of their international experience perhaps that will make them better global citizens. He emphasized that students are neither asked nor required to look into national security matters in their travels. Kim stated that INSER is not targeting future intelligence agency people. He likened the program’s focus to that of the National Science Foundation’s travel fellowships where students go out into the world to observe.

Chair Haselkorn posed some questions to Kim about the nature of the research agreement INSER has with the university. Kim was asked if INSER operated under any special research agreement that says it can’t have certain transparency. He was asked if the agreement is a negotiated or special one, and if so, what are the requirements about non-disclosure elements. He was also asked if there was any classified work involved. Kim replied that INSER’s research agreement follows required ethical guidelines, has no phrasing about non-disclosure, and does not concern classified information.
Haselkorn next asked guest Giebel if there are certain funding sources that the university should have a blanket policy of not accepting. In response, Giebel noted INSER’s website, outlining as part of its goals the study of national security and intelligence issues, as a concern for the study abroad programs. Giebel pointed to the INSER summer internship website that linked students with different intelligence agencies in the Washington, D.C. area. Haselkorn sought to clarify Giebel’s concerns by asking him whether he had any objections to the given funding source if everything about the award was open, transparent, and without any special condition. Giebel noted that the dilemma is the fact that INSER’s focus on national security and intelligence is at odds with the interests of the study abroad programs. Guest Kim noted that the characterization of INSER in the Stranger was inaccurate, and as the new Director of INSER, he has kept the web pages unchanged and hopes to have a public discussion about them, like this. He explained that INSER staff created the website and that he will work on more carefully wording the web pages.

Chair Haselkorn asked council members to consider the review process and the mechanism that triggers the council’s review. Council member Jeanne Small inquired if INSER students were required to study a critical language, much like the international Boren scholarships. Kim replied that the language requirement is determined by the selection committee and that the INSER program places no preference on language study and only restricts the study of either English or French. Special guest JW Harrington inquired about the criteria INSER uses to select students. Kim noted that each department writes its own criteria and that INSER only requires that students are US citizens and that they have a minimum 3.0 GPA. Council member Apurva Jain asked Kim about the reporting line in INSER and whether it required anything about national security issues. Kim responded that the report is similar to other funding reports and that it only requires that they show how the funding was well used. Special guest Marcia Killien asked Kim about whether the funding agency knew student names. Kim replied that they only list student by number and no identification is given to them. He described it as a very safe way to protect student privacy. Killien asked if was then possible for someone else to come in and change the rules. Kim spoke about creating an INSER strategy planning committee that would advise about complex issues like this. Haselkorn asked Kim if he would be comfortable with having FCR undergo a special post-award review. Kim replied that he would like to have INSER reviewed by FCR.

Council member David Fluharty asked Giebel to clarify his safety concerns. Giebel reiterated his concerns for the safety of students, faculty, and host partners in that they could potentially become a target of intelligence activity. Haselkorn asked Kim if it would ever be possible for a faculty member to be with an INSER funded student in a study abroad trip and not know it. Kim replied that it was possible but not likely. He emphasized that INSER does not always do the recruitment of students—participating departments generally do it. Special guest Michael Eisenburg, Dean Emeritus of the Information School, stated that INSER would work in any circumstances with other programs and departments to ensure the safety and security of study abroad participants. He added that INSER would be open to developing its guidelines and policy procedures and that he would only reject any effort to eliminate INSER.

Chair Haselkorn thanked the guests Christoph Giebel, Jeffrey Kim, and Michael Eisenburg for coming. He then directed the council to look toward the process, asking them to consider when something happens occasionally or someone forgets to check the box if the system is robust enough, or do they need to add additional criteria within the review process. A discussion began about the oversight function of the council. FCR’s oversight function begins with all “sponsored activity” and at issue was the question of whether INSER violated the classified, proprietary, and
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restricted research guidelines. There was agreement that no one had heard any violation by
INSER that would trigger an FCR review. Council members discussed the research application
form and university resources put in place to trigger research reviews. Killien remarked that
“research” has a very restricted meaning and that it might be helpful to use a more generalized
phrase such as “sponsored activity.” Haselkorn noted that there are six questions in the request
that pertain to FCR’s purview. He asked council members if they should follow up in this
particular case. He also inquired if they wanted to formalize post-award reviews. Stenkamp
reminded that he would oppose a post-review that would have consequences for the report
since the university has already accepted the funding. He noted that the response should be to
improve for the future. Killien inquired if they asked for “status reports” as part of the review
process. Haselkorn noted that they have never required them. There exists a “complaint
mechanism” but no mechanism for intentionally not checking the box. Council members
acknowledged the challenges facing international study abroad research related to safety and
security and suggested university administrators who might deal with the issues.

Haselkorn ended the discussion by noting that he will get back to David Lovell, Faculty Senate
Chair, and that this issue might be addressed at the next Senate Executive Committee meeting.

There was no time to address the remaining agenda items.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:38 a.m.
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