

University Senate Research Committee Meeting  
15 April 2016  
1:00 PM  
156 CL

In Attendance: K. Barlow, G. Huber, R. Melhem, P Morel, P. Smolinski, M. Spring, J. Tebbets and A. Vieira

It was noted that minutes of the March 2016 meeting were sent by email. It was asked if there were any corrections or comments on the document and none were offered. It was stated that these minutes will be sent to Lori Molinaro.

Action Item: The minutes will be sent to Lori Molinaro for posting on the Senate web site.

G. Huber provided an update of the activities of the Research Conduct and Compliance Office. He stated the committee work continues in the areas intellectual property and copyright, conflict of interest and ownership of data. With regard to ownership of data there are many different scenarios that need to be considered. He state that committee on conflict of interest was in touch with many faculty who have previously be involved with the process.

It was asked if the Research Committee could be expecting any proposed policy or procedure drafts in the near future. G. Huber stated that timeline proposed initially was overly optimistic and the committees had not progressed as to the point of having a draft. It is unlikely that a draft will be available by the next meeting of the Research Committee in May.

M. Spring stated that it would be beneficial for the IP, and other, policy review committees to seek input from the research Committee and Faculty Assembly as early as feasible. G. Huber agreed with this.

G. Huber stated that federal mandates related to research conduct and compliance may impose items on policy that were previously handled in a collegial manner.

Dr. Marc Malandro addressed the Committee on matters related to intellectual property and ownership. He stated the IP committee under Prof. Bill Federspeil continues work on both the policy and process related to IP issues at the University. He stated that policy and practice are two different things and have to be address in parallel.

A question arose to with regard to the inventor wishing to be always acknowledged as the owner of the IP as the result of their initial discovery. M. Malandro stated that creation of the IP is a different matter than ownership and that ownership has a legal definition. The person discovering the IP will always be known as the creator but may not be the legal owner of the IP.

M. Malandro stated that in order for IP to be returned to the inventor, it must be first offered to the federal government for ownership. If the government declines this, then the IP can be returned back to the inventor. He stated that the federal government rarely, if ever, chooses to take ownership, however the process to decline ownership can be somewhat lengthy.

It was stated in the past that it was difficult to obtain research contracts with industry due to the restrictive IP policy of the University as to IP ownership, even in the cases where there was little or no chance of IP being developed as a result of the contract with industrial partners. M. Malandro stated that the past practice was conservative and the Office of Research is working on practices that will allow greater flexibility in university-industry collaborative research.

A question was asked whether fee for service work could be done by faculty researchers. M. Malando stated that there can be limitations to this depending on the bond funding that was used to construct the building where the service will be performed. The UPARC facility can be used for such services since the site was a donation and no bonding funding was used. The Office of Research is working on different agreements of this type.

There was a discussion on the date and topic for the next Committee meeting. An email was sent to all members as to a preference of a meeting related to IP with Michael Madison on May 6 versus a meeting on community based research on May 20. The response to the email was most related to if they could attend the May 6 meeting and did not indicate a preference. There was a discussion of the two topics and there was a general preference for the May 20 meeting date with a topic of community based research. It was stated that M. Goodhart will be contacted about possible speakers on topic of community based research for that meeting.

Action Item: A note will be send to M. Madison to state the May 6 meeting will not be held. M. Goodhart will be contacted regarding meeting speakers for May 20.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 pm.  
Minutes submitted by: Patrick Smolinski