

University Senate Research Committee Meeting  
2 December 2016  
1:00 PM  
156 CL

In Attendance: K Cole, K. Erickson, G. Huber R. Melhem, P. Morel, S. Sant, P. Smolinski, M. Redfern, N. Spice, J. Tebbets, L. Terhorst and C. Wilcox

G. Huber stated that a “read green” email was sent out regarding a training module on Good Clinical Practice. Additional notifications will be sent out in the near future on training modules for Conflict of Interest (COI) and Responsible Conduct of Research and a new CORID module is being developed. R. Melham that the matrix of training modules on the website is confusing and G. Huber said that this is also being revised. C. Wilcox stated that in the future COI certification will not be necessary for grant submission but will required for grant acceptance.

C. Wilcox reviewed the changes made to the revised Research Integrity Policy as a result of the discussion with the University Senate Research Committee (emailed to the Committee in the document Changes in Research Integrity Policy in Response to Advice from the Senate Research Committee) These changes had to do with the allowance of deadline extensions, providing contact information for the Research Integrity Officer, allowing for the Provost to designate a deciding official other than the Dean and language indicating the respondent can appeal the composition of the inquiry panel. After this discussion, a vote was taken and new policy was approved by all voting members in attendance.

C. Wilcox next reviewed the Highlights from the Draft Conflict of Interest Policy that was previously circulated to Committee members. He stated a change to the previous policy is that start-up companies will be able to use University facilities with oversight of the COI committee. With regard to the policy, P. Smolinski asked if the time limits on outside consulting only apply to the time the faculty member is under contract to the University and C. Wilcox stated that that is correct.

C. Wilcox stated that the COI committee is willing to review consulting contracts to check that IP rights are preserved.

Erickson asked when the percentage of time effort is calculated, what is the basis of the calculation. M. Redfern stated the percentage of time is based on a 40 hours per week.

M. Redfern reviewed the Highlights Positions from the Draft Intellectual Property Policy that was previously circulated to Committee members. He stated that the University will claim ownership of IP generated under University agreements (i.e. any contracts or grants) and IP created with substantial use of University resources.

S. Sant asked how “substantial use” this will be determined. M. Redfern stated that further work is being done to define this term.

S. Sant stated that the University sometimes does not make timely decisions on IP disclosures and M. Redfern stated that a Standing Intellectual Property Committee (STIP) is to be formed to which researchers can contact regarding IP issues.

M. Redfern stated the University will not claim intellectual property (IP) generated by faculty while consulting or IP created through the incidental use of University resources. Also, unless otherwise stated, the University will not claim IP created by visitors to the University.

From the document M. Redfern stated that Students own any IP generated as part of a course unless there is a preexisting agreement. R. Melham said that this wording implied that students will automatically be grant IP ownership. M. Redfern suggest this might be reworded to read that the University will not claim IP ownership of IP generated as part of a course.

P. Smolinski stated that the wording “University retains ownership of course recordings” perhaps be changed to the University retains ownership of course recordings recorded using University equipment.

M. Melham stated that it is mentioned that the STIP will consist of 11 members, however only 10 members are named. M. Redfern stated that perhaps the Chair of the COI committee and a post-doctoral researcher added to the membership list.

M. Redfern suggested that members of the Committee not at the meeting be contacted for any input to the Highlights of the Draft Conflict of Interest Policy and the Highlight Positions from the Draft of Intellectual Property Policy.

Action Item: The Committee will send an email to members of the Committee to solicit input on these documents.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 pm.

Minutes submitted by: Patrick Smolinski and Penny Morel