

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**May 6, 2002**

**Senators present:** David Balaam, Kris Bartanen(Dean of Students), Terry Cooney (Dean), David Droge, John Hanson, Kathie Hummel-Berry, Chris Kline, Martin Jackson, Hans Ostrom(Chair), Ben Shelton(Student), George Tomlin, Alexa Tullis, Joe Turner(Student), Roberta Wilson

**Visitors present:** Roger Allen, Bill Barry, Bernard Bates, Kat Griffin(Student, ASUPS), Renee Houston, Diane Kelley, Curt Sanders(Student)

Senate Chair Ostrom called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM.

**Approval of minutes:** The minutes of the April 22 meeting were approved as amended.

**Announcements:** Senate Chair Ostrom announced that there would be a short meeting to elect Senate officers on May 14, details to follow by email.

**Special orders:**

Visiting ASUPS senators Joe Turner, Kat Griffin and Curt Sanders were introduced. Joe Turner will be attending Senate meetings in the future.

Martin Jackson announced that the staff has challenged the faculty to a softball game next September, probably the first Friday of classes.

Bill Barry announced the availability of a summer workshop, supported by a Culpepper grant, for people teaching in foreign languages, indicating that interested parties should contact him.

**New Academic Standards business suggested:** Martin Jackson proposed that the Academic Standards Committee review the new policy on 100 level courses. He warned that the transitional class may be out in cold for some courses, and may need some transitional plan to help them through it. Jackson suggested that the policy should be reviewed in that it might be too broad, perhaps applying to a number of 100 level courses that it may not need to apply to. He believes the policy may lead to lots of add/drop behavior at the 100 level, and suggests that there might better be system that singles out designated 100 level courses rather than all 100 level courses. Dean Cooney indicated that there would be no problem requesting a review but that since the policy language was passed by the full faculty, any change recommended by Academic Standards would need to go back to the full faculty.

**M/S/P to charge the Academic Standards Committee to review the new 100 level course policy.**

**News from the Curriculum Committee about Fine Arts Way of Knowing:** Bill Barry reported that the Curriculum Committee had encountered a problem implementing the guidelines for this core category as originally written, and decided to eliminate the words "both orally and" from Guideline III. (Previous wording of Guideline III: "These courses introduce students to methods of aesthetic and formal analysis and require students to reflect critically, *both orally* and in writing, about art and the creative process.") The effect of the change is to require students to reflect critically in writing only within this way of knowing. By explanation, Barry offered that faculty who had submitted course proposals for this way of knowing were surprised to see that both oral and written reflection were required, indicating it was a higher standard than some of the other core areas. The committee admitted they had never discussed that element of the guidelines in particular. The committee felt that they did not want to deal with this situation by simply being lenient in enforcing this more stringent guideline. Barry requested on behalf of the committee that Senate approve this change, and in so doing, set precedent to approve these minor changes this way rather than going back to the full faculty. Droge remembered considerable discussion about the guidelines on the floor of the full faculty, and indicated a preference that such changes be

taken back to faculty. Ostrom asked the deadline for approving these guidelines. Barry indicated that the committee hoped for approval by the end of the semester, but that there should be an adequate number of these courses available to meet the demand, so there is not an immediate problem. He expressed concern that similar situations might come up again, and recalled that when dealing with the old core guidelines, Curriculum Committee did make minor changes with only Senate approval. Barry continued that he would be concerned about newly limiting Senate's authority under the new core guidelines. Jackson asked whether other core guidelines refer to similar things. Barry answered no, that the written guideline was included here so that studio art courses would include some rigorous critique. Kline expressed that this change appeared to serve the intent of the guidelines. Ostrom suggested that it might be best to approve the change, then bring the deed before the faculty, giving them an opportunity to take up the issue at that point if they did not approve of the action.

**M/S/P to accept the change as proposed by Bill Barry (elimination of the phrase "both orally and") and to report the action to the full faculty.**

**Annual reports of standing committees, continued:**

The written reports are attached to these minutes; content of discussion about the reports is summarized herein.

**Report of the Student Life Committee:** After Diane Kelly made the report, Ben Shelton (student) affirmed that ASUPS considers the Conspiracy of Hope project a very valuable project, and has put significant funds into it already. He invited faculty participation in the project. Ostrom inquired whether it was Kelly's sense that the committee supported the Student Bill of Rights concept. Kelly answered in the affirmative, but indicated there were still problems with the language that need some work.

**M/S/P to accept the report of the Student Life Committee.**

**Report of the Committee on Diversity:** Bernard Bates made the report. Following the report, Tullis raised a question about categories of diversity, asking whether the committee ever considers returning students as a category of diversity that we may want to increase, stating that returning students add incredible richness to a class. Bates answered that it has not previously been considered as a category, but that it should be. Bartanen countered that she did not think it was accurate to say that we don't consider this population, since services do exist for this population, which generally lives off-campus. Ostrom clarified by asking whether Tullis was specifically talking about recruitment of returning students rather than services for existing students, which was answered in the affirmative. Tomlin pointed out that with the phase out of the OT undergraduate degree program (Occupational Therapy now offers only the Master's degree) a source of returning students was eliminated, since the average age of OT undergraduate degree seeking students was 27. Wilson indicated that transfer students have traditionally been older and wondered if we had reduced recruitment goals for transfers. Cooney said that there had been no policy for reduced recruitment of transfer students, but that admission patterns had followed application patterns, and on the flip side, freshman retention was up. Increased freshman retention, combined with the opening of UW Tacoma may have acted to reduce the proportion of transfer students. Sanders inquired whether the new calling plan had been more effective in recruiting students of color. Bates answered that there is no data on that as yet.

**M/S/P to accept the report of the Committee on Diversity**

**Report of the Library Media and Academic Computing Committee:** Renee Houston delivered the report. Cooney congratulated Houston for doing a splendid job leading the committee in the review of Blackboard software, and expressed a hope that Houston could find a way to share information with the faculty to help make Blackboard more functional for them. Ostrom wondered whether it would be good for all faculty to have web pages. Houston reported that OIS had worked with the OT and PT departments on developing web pages, and that there had been

discussion about trying to make faculty web pages consistent. Cooney reported that Desi Turner had created a template for department pages and offered to work with departments in getting these started. Ostrom pointed out that faculty web pages can act as a tool for recruitment, since it can be beneficial for prospective students to learn about faculty and their resources. Cooney noted that every faculty candidate he had interviewed had thoroughly reviewed the website before arriving on campus. Tullis suggested that involving department secretaries in web page development and maintenance can be very helpful.

### **M/S/P to accept the report of the Library Media and Academic Computing Committee**

**Report of the Institutional Review Board:** Roger Allen delivered the report. In response to a suggestion in the report that the university recognize the contributions of the community representative to the committee, Patrick Coogan, Cooney suggested **a formal Senate resolution for that recognition, which passed by acclamation.** Droge reported he had had problems downloading documents from the web site, and described the web document as Byzantine. He wondered whether it would be possible to rewrite the document and/or develop a more user-friendly manual to guide individuals in the human subjects review process. Allen agreed that there was a need for such, especially since the majority of the full board review projects this year were student projects. Droge emphasized that some faculty members use the web document for teaching, and would prefer it be more readable for that use as well. Cooney inquired how much of the document language was required by federal and other regulations. Allen answered that some but not all of the difficult language is required. Bartanen inquired whether the IRB should see ads for the student newspaper or radio when their intention was to recruit research subjects, before publication. Allen answered in the affirmative. Bartanen indicated that information should go to the Media Board. Cooney opined that was probably not required by federal law, but it is an effort to protect students. Sanders wondered whether the university could be held liable for things that might occur off campus but had been advertised through university media. Allen indicated the committee had discussed that issue, and was concerned about it since personal injury litigation is inclusive. Bartanen pointed out that Fred Hutchison Cancer Center in collaboration with the American Cancer Society was initiating a major smoking cessation study that had been officially approved by the university. Allen pointed out that the host institution always requires approval by their own IRB, regardless of the number of IRBs might have already reviewed a study, and UPS is no different.

### **M/S/P to accept the report of the Institutional Review Board**

**Other business:** Ostrom expressed gratitude to Martin Jackson and George Tomlin for their service as Senate officers this year. Jackson and Tomlin returned cheers for the chair.

### **M/S/P adjournment at 5:13 PM.**

Kathie Hummell-Berry

**STUDENT LIFE COMMITTEE  
FINAL REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE  
2001-2002**

Our charges were:

1. In cooperation with appropriate University departments, examine off-campus student/neighbor relations and recommend changes to policy and programs where appropriate.
2. Consult with the ASUPS concerning the Student Bill of Rights and report to the Faculty Senate about the feasibility of adopting the Student Bill of Rights (and including it in, for example, the *University Bulletin*). (Inclusion in the *Bulletin* is mentioned only as an example of what "feasibility" may mean.)

Regarding Charge #1:

**The SLC spent much of the Fall semester gathering information on off-campus student/neighbor relations and discussing ways to improve them. We reviewed relevant materials from Student Affairs (Logger, Neighbor to Neighbor newsletter, Parent Resource Guide, statistics regarding neighbor complaints, Party Smart flyer, etc). We met with Monica Nixon, Associate Director for Student Services, regarding what her office does to help off-campus students and their relationships with their communities. The consensus was that Monica, whose position is new this year, and her office are doing a fantastic job. Monica also suggested that we review the off-campus student website ([www.ups.edu/student\\_life/off-campushousing](http://www.ups.edu/student_life/off-campushousing)) and make suggestions for improvement. We made several recommendations that have since been incorporated into the site.**

**In our discussions, the need for off-campus students and neighbors to get to know each other kept coming up. Late-summer block parties seem a good way to do this. We suggested to Monica Nixon that her office look into the "Safe Streets" program to see if we could model a program after theirs. Monica Nixon will be pursuing the block party idea with the Tacoma Police Department, the Office of Community Relations, and the North End Neighborhood Council this summer. She hopes to be able to implement it at the end of August/beginning of September. The SLC has requested that Monica give us a brief report at the end of Fall semester (after she has worked here a full year) regarding this kind of programming.**

**Kris Bartanen also brought in a sample letter sent out to off-campus students after their first neighbor complaint. The committee read the letter and made a few suggestions regarding improvements to it that were afterwards implemented.**

**In the Spring, Marilyn Bailey, Director of Community Relations, came to one of our meetings so we could learn what her office does regarding the reporting of neighbor complaints.**

Regarding Charge #2:

**We were not able to get a copy of the developing Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities (SBRR) until the beginning of the Spring semester since it was still in the hands of the ASUPS drafting committee. Our charge was to make a recommendation as to the "feasibility" of adopting the SBRR. In its current state, we cannot recommend that it be adopted. However, the committee recognizes that this document is still in its formative stages and we will better be able to make a recommendation at this time next year. We decided to make recommendations to the drafting committee regarding potential conflicts between the SBRR and existing University documents (the Integrity Code, Faculty Code, Residence Life contract, etc), points that need to be clarified, selection of word choice, framing, etc. Our recommendations are only made to the best of our knowledge. The**

**committee recognizes that the drafting committee must do the groundwork necessary to assure that the document is as clear and clean as possible, and our role is simply to help point out possible problems. We will forward our comments to the drafting committee at the end of the school year. The SLC supports the ideals behind the creation of such a document and looks forward to collaborative work with the ASUPS drafting committee. We therefore recommend that we be charged with continuing work on the SBRR in the upcoming school year. We have been assured by the ASUPS President that the SBRR will be a summer project and the drafting committee would thus have the next draft of the document ready by early in the Fall semester.**

Additional Charge:

The SLC adopted an additional charge while waiting for the SBRR draft to come from ASUPS: that of the upcoming Conspiracy of Hope project. Darrel Frost, a student on the committee, is working on establishing a week-long community service event during the Spring of 2003, called the Conspiracy of Hope (CH). He and the other CH committee members sought out the SLC's input on the project, including input on a draft letter that will be circulated to faculty and staff regarding the project.

The SLC would be happy to continue to give input to the CH committee during the next academic year if the CH planning committee and the Senate so desire.

**Suggested Charges for the 2002-2003 school year:**

1. Give comments on the revised Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities
2. Continue giving suggestions on the Conspiracy of Hope project
3. Hear again from Monica Nixon. We'd be interested to have a report back from her at the end of the Fall semester regarding the "Safe Streets" block party implementation as well as regarding any new headway she and her office will have made into improving off-campus student / neighbor relations.
4. Survey the campus students and faculty to find out what problems that they may see that the SLC could help with. A similar survey was conducted a few years ago and proved fruitful. We would like to survey the faculty too, to see if they notice any problems that should be examined (an example of such a problem might be work-study students being assigned night-shifts on campus and thus not being able to function well in class etc).
5. Review the 2001-2002 Conseling, Health, and Wellnes Services Self-Study. Each year over a five-year period, a different department in the Student Affairs Division conducts a self-study and is evaluated by a team comprised of external and campus evaluators. Houston Dougharty suggests that the Student Life Committee be charged annually with looking at the previous year's Student Affairs' department self-study.

**Committee on Diversity Annual Report  
May 2002**

**The Committee on Diversity (inaccurately referred to as the FDC) received four charges from the Faculty Senate on September 11, 2001.**

**1. Continue to work with the Office of Admission staff to implement the telephoning project.** The telephoning project, initiated during the 1999-2000 academic year, was conducted for the first time in the spring semester. The project initially targeted potential African-American applicants. This year African-American, Hispanic, Native American and Native Alaskan applicants were contacted. Students were called after they had received acceptances from the university. It was felt that contacting all self-identified minority students who merely request an application was an unwise use of faculty volunteer's time. Also, working from the list of accepted minority students would better allow Paula Meiers in Admissions to determine the usefulness of faculty phoning. For more on this issue, I would direct the reader's attention to the committee minutes of 10/09/01. Also, for the first time, faculty volunteers were given the option of attending "telephoning parties", making these calls from the university's phone bank in Jones Hall ("The Link"). Committee member Eric Orlin was the lead on this year's effort. He did a fantastic job organizing the event and he deserved many thanks.

**2. Continue to work with the director of Access programs and the faculty support committee to collaborate with Access programs and to implement the Speakers' Bureau.** The director of Access programs, and committee member, Kim Bobby reported that Julian Edgoose, Ili Nagy, and Nancy Bristow were appointed to the Faculty Support Committee for Access Programs. Development of a speaker's bureau still is progressing but still needs committee support. No further committee interaction with Access program or work on the Speaker's Bureau was taken this year.

**3. Present a revised draft of the University Statement on Diversity to the Senate during the fall 2001 semester and facilitate University-wide deliberation regarding the statement.** The Statement on Diversity has had a long (now three year) history. The document was returned from the senate, with revisions. The committee incorporated senatorial revisions and new committee member suggestions and created a new draft (see minutes of 11/6/01). It reads as follows:

**Faculty Diversity Committee  
Diversity Statement Subcommittee  
DRAFT 5 (11/06/01)**

**We Acknowledge**

- the richness of commonalities and differences we share as a university community.
- the intrinsic worth of all who work and study here.
- that education is enhanced by investigation of and reflection upon multiple perspectives.

**We Aspire**

- to create respect for and appreciation of all persons as a key characteristic of our campus community.
- to increase the diversity of all parts of our community through commitment to diversity as a recruitment and selection criterion.
- to foster a spirit of openness to active engagement among all members of our campus community.

**We Act**

- to achieve an environment that welcomes and supports diversity.
- to insure full educational opportunity for all who teach and learn and work here.
- to prepare effectively citizen-leaders for a pluralistic world.

Upon seeking advice from the senate chair, we have circulated this draft to the staff and student senates for their approval or suggested modifications of language. Both groups have endorsed the document as-is as of the end of April 2002.

**4. Work with appropriate offices and governing bodies to explore initiatives regarding disability as an aspect of diversity.**

**Committee member Ivey West had been previously charged by the committee to meet with individual academic departments to discuss awareness of the needs of students with disabilities, including mental illness. We discussed ways in which we might be able to support her in this project. It was agreed that West would continue to contact departments herself, and that the committee would provide backup if departments hesitated to schedule meetings.**

**Committee member Margi Nowak led one of the workshops for January's Professional Development Week. The workshop was entitled "Singing in a Different Key: Disability Awareness in the Workplace".**

**Further committee discussion on this charge is reviewed in the minutes of 10/23/01.**

**Additional Business:**

**B. Bates and R. Gibson expressed concerns about faculty diversity at UPS in the meeting of 11/20/01. The committee expressed interest in pursuing this topic, leading to a presentation on 2/13/02 by Beverly Smith (HR) who provided a summary of the strategies for advertising positions at the University. Her discussion centered primarily on faculty positions. Also presenting that day was R. Gibson who provided a statistical report (as of Nov-1-2001) of the numbers and percentages of employees by job category, race, and gender. The committee invited Academic Vice-President Terry Cooney to meet with the committee on 3/12/02 to discuss the university efforts to diversify the faculty (see the minutes of 3/12/02). The committee is interested in continuing to pursue topic in the next academic year.**

**Suggested Future Charges for the Committee:**

1. Continue to work the Office of Admission staff on ways to evaluate and regularize the telephoning project.
2. Continue to work with the director of Access programs and the faculty support committee to collaborate with Access programs and the Speakers' Bureau.
3. Present a revised draft of the University Statement on Diversity to the Senate during the fall 2002 semester and facilitate University-wide deliberation regarding the statement.
4. Work with appropriate offices and governing bodies to monitor and support disability as an aspect of diversity.

5. The Diversity Committee should discuss the potential merits and drawbacks of establishing some 5, 10, 15 and 20-year benchmarks for both recruitment and retention of different groups of students, faculty and staff of color.



Questions for the senate:

**Charge #2:** Should this be a standing charge?

**Charge #3.** Should we be recharged with this? Do we have a continuing role to play? Should it be up to the senate to take it to the next step (present to full faculty)?

**Charge #4.** Should this now be a standing charge?

**Date: May 6, 2002**

**To: Faculty Senate**

**From: Renee Houston, Chair Library Media and Academic Computing Committee**

**Subject: Library Media and Academic Computing Committee Year End Report**

The committee completed most of its charges this year, but still has some work to complete. In order to work toward accomplishing our goals more effectively, we created two subcommittees - an intranet subcommittee and a teaching with technology subcommittee to focus the committee's efforts on some of our more specific charges. The intranet subcommittee reviewed several websites for ideas to inform options we might like to include on the faculty website. At the end of the Spring term, Dean Washburn presented a prototype of a new faculty web page at which time we were prepared to offer concrete suggestions to enhance the usability of the web page for faculty.

A great deal of our year was spent working with OIS identifying technology issues that concern faculty. To that end, we both discussed the importance of planning for more electronic classrooms and reviewed technology for adoption. Concerning the former, in order to address the growing needs of faculty who would like to use electronic classrooms, we recommended that the Assistant Dean work in conjunction with OIS to develop a plan for creating more classrooms with technological capabilities. In the case of the latter, we reviewed, with OIS, Content DM and courseware. In particular, we recommended the university-wide adoption of Blackboard to the Technology Planning Group. In our report we highlighted the importance of providing training for faculty who would like to use courseware in their classes.

Given the nature of the committee's charges, the committee continues to work on all of our charges:

1. Function as an advisory committee to OIS and the Library, with special emphasis on faculty issues and concerns regarding technology use
2. Consider ways of ensuring that the committee is aware of faculty sentiment regarding technology issues
3. Continue an ongoing assessment of technology use in the classroom
4. To continue to develop and publicize the technology web site
5. To consider ways to reduce "information overload" for faculty regarding technology initiatives, programs, and courses on campus

But, we have not completed:

3. Continue an ongoing assessment of technology use in the classroom

Although we convened a teaching with technology subcommittee to address this issue, a great deal of our time during the Spring semester was spent reviewing courseware which required extra meetings and eliminated time the subcommittee had available to meet.

Charges from the senate for the next year could include:

1. Reviewing the process of acquisition of new technologies
2. Function as an advisory committee to OIS and the Library, with special emphasis on faculty issues and concerns regarding technology use

3. Continue an ongoing assessment of technology use in the classroom

4. To continue to develop and publicize the technology web site

5. To consider ways to reduce "information overload" for faculty regarding technology initiatives, programs, and courses on campus

In order to focus more on charge two, for next year we plan to create subgroups consisting of a LMAC committee convener and relevant parties. This will insure that interested faculty will be included in the discussion of the adoption of a particular piece of software which may support their work.

Report to the Faculty Senate  
Institutional Review Board Activities  
AY 2001-02  
May 6, 2002.

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) has held seven meetings, thus far, during academic year 2001-02. The final meeting of the academic year will be held during the week of May 20, primarily for the purpose of reviewing protocols for University funded summer student research.

IRB membership AY01-02

The Board was composed this year of the following members:

Roger Allen, Chair	Physical Therapy
Patrick Coogan	Community Representative
John Finney	Associate Dean & University Registrar
Lisa Ferrari-Comeau	Politics & Government
Judith Kay	Religion
Mary Rose Lamb	Biology
Kathy Stewart	Occupational Therapy
Tom Wells	Exercise Science
John Woodward, Secretary	Education

Review of Human Research Protocols

During AY01-02, the Board reviewed eighteen protocols received from both faculty and student researchers representing the following departments:

Education	2
Exercise Science	2
Occupational Therapy	7
Physical Therapy	4
Psychology	2
Religion	1

Following receipt of required revisions, all protocols received Board approval and all investigations are currently underway.

In addition to protocols requiring full Board review, departmental representatives reported reviewing twenty-four additional protocols which, in the designate's judgement, qualified for either exempt or expedited review.

Any and all members of the University community are welcome to review the substance of Board discussions and decisions via the minutes posted on the University web site.

Institutional Animal Care and Use Subcommittee

In addition to reviewing human subject research protocols, this year saw the implementation of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Subcommittee (IACUC). Officially, the IACUC operates under the IRB umbrella, yet has a separate membership complement. Currently chaired by Alyce DeMarais (biology), the first meeting of the IACUC will be held on May 8, 2002, to review two protocols. Alyce has expressed willingness to provide a "beginning of the year" report on initial IACUC activities to the IRB and Senate next Fall.

### Noteworthy Issues Addressed

During the course of this year's reviews and discussions, two noteworthy issues were raised which established important precedents for future human subject research on campus. The first arose via a request from an outside drug manufacturer to solicit subjects from the UPS community for drug safety trials. They requested permission to post flyers on campus offering students a sum of money in exchange for their participation as drug safety test subjects. The Board gave thoughtful consideration to issues regarding the use of University facilities to recruit human subjects for external research. The Board concluded, in essence, that such requests could only be considered if the external research entity submitted their protocol for review by the UPS IRB and that solicitation of subjects on campus would not be allowed without UPS IRB review and consent.

The second important human research issue involved obtaining informed consent from brain injured patients with metacognitive disorders. Among other cognitive impairments, by their nature, metacognitive disorders result in the loss of an individual's ability to predict and judge the consequences of his/her actions. The Board did not wish to discourage research which might ultimately be of benefit to individuals affected in this way, however, the validity informed consent was certainly open to question. This concern was returned to MOT student, **Robynn Stolte**, and her faculty advisor, **Juli McGruder**, PhD, OT, to research the issue. They returned an exhaustive and well reasoned literature review along with an algorithm for determining how appropriate and valid informed consent may be obtained for such patients. Their work now stands as an excellent template should issues of this nature arise in the future.

### Recommended Activities/Charges for AY02-03

In addition to the ongoing review of research proposals using human subjects and the parallel work of the IACUC, this year's Board wishes to pass on the following two recommendations for next year's IRB activity.

1) The fundamental charge of the Board is review and oversight of research involving human subjects. Review is and has been handled in a well ordered systematic fashion. However, oversight of approved research to this date has involved no more than requesting final reports from investigators at the conclusion of the study. It is recommended that next year's IRB establish a set of internal guidelines for the oversight of ongoing research. This could include, but not be limited to random site visits, checks to make sure consent and anonymity procedures are being followed, and/or standardizing the final reports from investigators. We do not make this suggestion with any intent to either increase the burden on IRB members, or throw up barriers to researchers. Rather, oversight is admittedly too thin at this time, and more thought and follow through needs to be dedicated to this component of the IRBs responsibility.

2) Recommended language for consent forms includes a section titled "No Compensation for Injury." This section typically states some variation on the following:

"In the event of physical or emotional injury resulting from participation in this study, no monetary compensation will be made. By consenting to participate, I am fully aware of the potential risks and will hold the investigators harmless for any physical or psychological harm which may result from participation in this study."

Although this is essentially boilerplate from consent forms used in human research throughout the country, it has been pointed out by current Board members that this section places the burden of monetary risk entirely on the individual subject who altruistically volunteered to participate in the study. Although the Board has no intention of recommending the establishment of a subject's compensation fund, there was significant sentiment for reviewing the language of this section with University administration and legal counsel, so that investigators are not asking subjects to waive all rights to compensation in the event they are injured or disabled as a result of their voluntary participation. It was also noted that a subject's approval of this section may also be interpreted as waiving any rights to outside disability insurance compensation, or other avenues not related to the investigators or the University. The Board recommends thoughtful consideration towards redrafting this language towards affording reasonable protection for researchers, the University, and research subjects.

## Acknowledgements

The Board wishes to pass on special thanks to **Alyce DeMarais**, who has taken the lead role in the highly detailed tasks of establishing the charter Institutional Animal Care and Use Subcommittee.

Members of the Board would also like to take this opportunity to extend special thanks to our community representative, **Patrick Coogan**. Mr. Coogan is a retired Weyerhaeuser patent law specialist and long time resident of Tacoma. He has served on the IRB for the past two years without compensation of any kind, save the diverse intellectual stimulation derived from reviewing research protocols and sharing in the good company and respectfully thoughtful discussions which characterize monthly Board meetings. Entities such as the IRB cannot credibly exist without the integral involvement of conscientious individuals who are not affiliated with the institution. They serve a unique oversight role in this important process which helps protect the well being of human volunteer research subjects, faculty and student researchers, and the University as a whole. I can say, with complete confidence that all members of the Board will support this conclusion, that Pat Coogan has been an enormous asset to the Board. His careful preparations, well reasoned opinions, unique and seasoned perspectives, and articulate discourse have raised the level debate and scope of consideration during all of our deliberations since he joined the Board. I would like to request and recommend that the University send him a formal acknowledgment of thanks for the generous gift of his invaluable participation.

Finally, the members of the Board would also like to express particular thanks to Associate Dean, University Registrar, and perennial Board member, **John Finney**. Through the years, John has been the glue holding the continuity and operations of the IRB together. His office has served as the main depot for receiving all protocols and correspondence related to the IRB. His contributions to Board deliberations have always been insightful, honest, and representative of the sound hand of reasonability. He does a huge amount of the work behind the scene. We wish to give him due credit and overdue sincere thanks.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger Allen, PhD, PT  
Chair, Institutional Review Board  
Associate Professor, Physical Therapy