Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes from November 12, 2014
3. Chair’s report
4. Elimination of outside work annual reporting requirement
5. Uniform grant guidance
6. UW open access mandate
7. Adjourn

1) Call to order

The meeting was called to order by Rosenfeld at 9:00 a.m.

2) Approval of the Minutes from November 12, 2014

The minutes from November 12, 2014 approved as written.

3) Chair’s report

Rosenfeld reported that the recent Faculty Senate meeting was devoted primarily to the new faculty salary policy proposal. The legislation will likely be voted on in Spring Quarter and will change the current process to a merit-based tiered system.

Rosenfeld reported on recent discussions by the Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization (SCIPC). The president is planning to develop new policies around intellectual property in which SCIPC and FCR will play an active role.

4) Elimination of outside work annual reporting requirement

Lidstrom reported that the long standing requirement of faculty, librarians, and other academic personnel to report their outside work activities on an annual basis has been eliminated. In the past, annual reports of all outside professional work for each fiscal year were supposed to be submitted through the UW 1461 online system. With the UW Outside Professional Work Policy (Executive Order 57) being revised the reporting requirement was eliminated and the online system has been decommissioned.

Lidstrom explained that her office took a close look at the requirement and found no reason to continue implementing the requirement. The requirement was first developed to gather information for deans and chancellors about outside work being performed by UW faculty within their units. However, the current merit review process gathers this information in a much better way. Additionally, the
percentage of compliance with the policy is low (25-33%) and her office commonly receives incomplete
information.

Lidstrom explained that an email would typically be sent out explaining the elimination of the
requirement. However, due to the recent changes to the 1460 process to request approval for outside
work the decision was made not to send an email notice to avoid confusion. Lidstrom stressed the
changes do not eliminate the entire process for conducting outside work, just the annual reporting
requirement.

A question was raised asking how many problems occur as a result of non-compliance. Joe Giffels
(Associate Vice Provost for Research Compliance) explained the problem is relatively rare where the
university finds out from the press, or learns from C4C, that a faculty member is serving as a consultant
for a company without contacting UW. Lidstrom explained that in their efforts for evaluating compliance
and risk her office is taking similar amounts of effort by targeting post-approval monitoring, such as the
Physician Open Payment Act in which drug companies and device manufacturers have to post payments
to physicians.

Members discussed effective mechanisms in communicating changes to the faculty. The information will
be available on the website and an announcement will likely occur at a department or school level.

5) Uniform grant guidance

Giffels provided an update on federal uniform grant guidance. The changes to award requirements will
become effective on December 26th for all agencies to implement. Giffels explained that federal
agencies were originally required to publish their changes on June 26th which never happened,
promoting UW to develop a team to review agency implementation policies as they are released to
determine what deviates from the uniform guidance. In the meantime, the team has developed a
document which summarizes the comprehensive list of changes to UW’s practices that would be caused
by this uniform guidance. The document is available online and Giffels is interested in any feedback to
ensure the changes are clearly explained. A suggestion was raised that MRAM would be the appropriate
body to disseminate the document to research faculty who will be impacted by the changes.

Discussion ensued about policy changes for different agencies, including NIH and NSF. Giffels explained
the changes will probably not be too different from current practices, but that is not certain until the
agencies release their changes.

Members suggested changes to the document addressing several issues, such as prior approval,
administrative and staff costs, 90-day close out deadlines, publication and printing costs, indirect costs,
and pre-award costs. Concern was raised that releasing the document now might be too early. A
comment was made that the university should still attempt to communicate the changes.

Discussion moved to grants with state agencies. Lidstrom explained that when federal funds flow
through state agencies (and UW acts as a sub-recipient) UW receives full indirect cost rates. A question
was raised asking if the award is technically from the state or federal agency in this scenario. Lidstrom
explained the award depends on the terms of conditions and structure of the grant.

6) UW open access mandate
Marwick was present to discuss a possible senate resolution urging UW to develop an open access mandate. Open access in general refers to public online access to scholarly products that is unrestricted by financial barriers. OA takes many forms, but the two major types are:

- **Green** – publication in any journal but with the author submitting their revised, final draft to an open access repository.
- **Gold** – similar to PLOSONE, PeerJ, and eLife.

Marwick listed the reasons for open access, including:

- Allowing researchers to read their articles, leading to more citations and ultimately better dissemination of knowledge.
- Allowing small and medium sized companies which do not have access to the latest research to further the growth of the economy and job creation.
- Allowing researchers and doctors in poor countries to have access to leading research.
- Deflate the margins of capitalist exploitation of public spending.

Currently, there are 238 institutional mandates for open access in which 48 academic senates have voted unanimously in favor for the requirement. Marwick explained that the first mandates appeared in 2004 with the rate of institutions doubling by 2008 when Harvard and MIT adopted their mandates. In 2007 the UW Office of Research issued a statement of position supportive of open access and encouraged researchers to publish in open access journals. This followed with a Class C resolution in the Faculty Senate in 2009 recommending that faculty adopt open access practices. Marwick stated this is the time for a mandate because UW now has the institutional capacity to allow for such a requirement.

Marwick explained that the University of California system uses an automatic harvesting tool that continuously searches the web for publications which submits to its library and populates into a database. Marwick noted that UW Libraries is interested in this tool which would reduce the faculty burden by streamlining manual deposit. Discussion ensued about the impact on smaller research journals. Marwick explained there a longitudinal studies which show there is no direct effect on journals going under or libraries cutting subscriptions.

Marwick provided a sample resolution that highlights several key ideas:

- No exclusive license.
- No copyright transfer.
- No questions asked opt-out waiver

A question was raised asking if UW is obligated accept any document that a faculty member writes. Marwick explained that the mandate would require UW to accept any faculty product without reviewing the format. Concern was raised about ethical violations in posting any and all documents that are created, especially products that can be considered inappropriate, inflammatory, or when information must be restricted. Discussion ensued. A comment was raised stating that UW already has a policy on what is considered acceptable content which would cover these concerns. Members discussed the administrative burden and costs to the university to implement such a system. One estimate suggests that it would cost UW $1 million to implement with an additional $400,000 for operating costs. Additionally, the funding would have to come from tuition or indirect costs which would require UW
Libraries to cut funding elsewhere. A suggestion was raised to determine how the University of California system funds their program.

Discussion ensued about how to introduce the resolution to the Faculty Senate and the possible concerns that would be raised, such as funding, opt-out policies, and impact on promotion/tenure considerations. Rosenfeld commented that FCR will draft a resolution in coordination with the Faculty Council on University Libraries.

A question was raised asking if publications hosted in other open access journals would just create redundancies. Marwick explained the system would just create a link to the article located in the other repository which could be done by the harvesting software tool. Discussion ensued about the effectiveness on using similar harvesting tools and its reliance on Orchid. A comment was raised stressing the need to discuss open access with other stakeholders across campus that would not lead to the university creating an administrative burden for publishing research documents.

7) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Rosenfeld at 10:30 a.m.
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