



As of 11/10/2017 and subject to change

All events at Arizona State University SkySong, unless otherwise noted.

Highlighted text indicates a move between buildings.

Monday, Nov. 13, 2017	
8:00 AM–2:00 PM	<b>Check in and Registration</b>
9:00 – 9:10 AM	<b>Welcome Remarks • Building 3</b> <i>Tony Boccanfuso, UIDP</i> Building 3, Synergy I & II
9:10 – 9:40 AM	<b>Discussion of Survey Results</b> <i>Paul Lowe, Kansas State</i> <i>Lisa Weller, Boeing</i> Building 3, Synergy I & II
9:40 – 10:20 AM	<p><b>Differences in University Culture and Industry Business Interests and the Impact on Working Together</b> <i>Mike Ludwig, University of Chicago</i> <i>Wendi Yajnik, Sanofi</i> Building 3, Synergy I &amp; II</p> <p>Ever wonder why one University may accept contract terms that another will not? The first part of this session will highlight how a University’s culture, mix of academic programs, and faculty recognition/rewards processes can influence the level of faculty interest in working with industry sponsors and the University’s flexibility with terms and conditions of the agreement. Topics for discussion include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Differences between Publics and Privates in public service mission, indemnification limits, and applicable law</li> <li>• Differences in faculty promotion and tenure processes that can influence interest in pursuing funding that is unlikely to generate publication opportunities</li> <li>• Differences in graduate and professional programs that place value on experiential learning in addition to published works</li> <li>• Differences in how research is distinguished from service or testing and willingness to take different approaches to agreement terms for each type</li> </ul> <p>The second part of this presentation will focus on the cultural differences between academic institutions and their pharmaceutical partners and how the changing landscape on both sides is helping to promote the academic-pharmaceutical partnership.</p>



10:20 – 10:30 AM	<p><b>Overview of Breakout Sessions</b> <i>Elizabeth Adams, University of Virginia</i> Building 3 Synergy I &amp; II</p>
10:30 – 11:00 AM	<p><b>BREAK</b></p>
11:00 AM – 12:30 PM	<p><b>Concurrent Track Sessions • Building 1</b></p> <p><b>Introductory Track: Contract Negotiation Strategies</b> <i>Julie Watson, Marshall, Gerstein &amp; Borun</i> Building 1, Global 201 The presenters for this session will provide both examples of negotiation strategies as well as provide suggestions to enhance your negotiation skills.</p> <p><b>Advanced Track: Current Issues in university/industry contracting for Data Use Agreements</b> <i>Jilda Garton, Georgia Tech</i> <i>Brian Annino, Georgia Tech</i> Building 1, Innovation 241</p> <p><b>Advanced Track: Current Issues in university/industry contracting for the Biomedical Sector</b> <i>Steve Harsey, University of Arizona</i> <i>Keith Spencer, GSK</i> Building 1, Ingenuity 301</p> <p>University-industry contracts in the biomedical section can present special challenges that are either unique to this sector, or arise with increased frequency. This session will provide an opportunity to engage in a guided discussion on topics such as what terms are appropriate for transfer of human biological specimens from universities to industry, sharing of demographic information on human subjects, what role know-how plays when assigning IP rights, and how companies may approach publication of university research resulting from collaboration. We will also discuss the proliferation of corporate compliance language and how this may be handled. Case studies will be used to illustrate the issues and foster discussion.</p> <p><b>Advanced Track: Current Issues in university/industry contracting for the Corporate Sector</b> <i>Linda Duffy, Carnegie Mellon University</i> <i>Jackie Kulfan, PPG</i> Building 1, Discovery 349</p>



	<p>Share your experiences and best practices in University-Corporate contracting in this interactive workshop! We'll present the different constraints that universities and manufacturing corporations must work within when negotiating research agreements based on our experiences. Then we'll lead an open discussion among attendees and collect best practices and insights from the group.</p> <p>This session will focus on four areas of University/Industry research agreements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>∞ Publication Rights</li><li>∞ Indemnification</li><li>∞ Access to Background IP</li><li>∞ Intellectual Property Licensing</li></ul>
12:30 – 2:00 PM	<p><b>Working Lunch during Concurrent Sessions • Building 3</b></p> <p><b>Introductory Track: Overview of Contract Accords</b> <i>Connie Armentrout, UIDP</i> <i>Jilda Garton, Georgia Tech</i> Building 3, Synergy I</p> <p>This session will provide an overview of the Contract Accords. The Accords have been developed by UIDP working groups, starting with the very early meetings of UIDP. The Accords are reviewed regularly and updated to reflect the current trends and added to as new topics arise.</p> <p><b>Advanced Track: Toolkit Agreements to Accelerate Negotiations</b> <b>Keith Spencer, GSK</b> <i>Charles Adelsheim, Varian</i> <i>Richard Liwicki, Oxford</i> Building 3, Synergy II</p> <p>This session will discuss Toolkit Agreements (such as the Lambert Agreements) and explore how such approaches could be used in the US and the benefits they would provide to academia and industry. Over the last decade the Lambert Toolkit Agreements has been introduced in the UK to facilitate easier and faster negotiations between industry and academia. Recently updated, the Toolkit is set of template agreements that capture common research collaboration scenarios and provide a framework for collaborators to discuss and negotiate common terms such as IP and publication. Rather than being pre-negotiated, these templates provide a familiar starting point for organizations to reach agreement more quickly.</p>



2:00 – 2:15 PM	<b>BREAK</b>
2:15 – 3:00 PM	<p><b>New Contracting Models such as MN-IP, and Penn State – Impact on Negotiations</b> <i>Leza Besemann, University of Minnesota</i> <i>Mark Schmidt, Deere and Company</i> Building 3, Synergy I &amp; II</p> <p>Many academic institutions have developed new models and programs for intellectual property (IP) terms in sponsored research agreements. While the University of Minnesota and Penn State University pioneered initial models, other institutions have followed with similar programs to give industry partners a choice of IP terms that best fit sponsor business goals and expected outcomes for sponsored research projects. This session will explore these programs, discuss university and company positions related to these programs, and the rationale behind engagement and partnering decisions around these programs.</p>
3:00 – 3:10 PM	<p><b>Introduction to Breakout Sessions</b> <i>Linda Fuester Duffy, Carnegie Mellon University</i> Building 3, Synergy I &amp; II</p>
3:10-3:25 PM	<b>BREAK</b>
3:25 – 4:10 PM	<p><b>Breakout Session 1 • Building 1</b></p> <p><b>Background and Foreground IP - Introductory Track</b> <i>Sophia Herbert-Peterson, Georgia Tech</i> <i>Charles Adelsheim, Varian</i> Building 1, Global 201</p> <p>Intellectual Property issues abound in nearly every industry/academic interaction. This case study based session will cover the basics of identifying and defining foreground and background IP, as well as other types of IP that you will likely encounter in your day to day practice. We will also discuss common issues surrounding IP and standard solutions.</p> <p><b>Export Control</b> <i>Bob Hardy, COGR</i> <i>Mary Beran, Georgia Tech</i> Building 1, Innovation 241</p> <p>Export controls are an increasingly significant concern in contracting for research or technical services with university personnel when controlled</p>



	<p>technologies may be involved. This session will address particular export control issues that may arise day-to-day in industry and academic collaborations. Participants will learn the basic regulatory regime and discuss key issues often faced in these relationships.</p> <p><b>Capstone Projects</b> <i>Carolyn Brougham, Northwestern</i> <i>Mark Schmidt, Deere and Company</i> Building 1, Imagination 249</p> <p>Capstone projects are central to the learning experience of students at many universities. They allow students to tackle real-world problems facing industry today and serve as a vehicle to provide valuable, career-relevant experiences that can help improve job prospects. Companies benefit from getting energetic, innovative, and fresh ideas, access to the best and brightest students in the field allowing the company the chance to recruit top talent. During this interactive session we will explore how to develop U-I capstone projects, potential pitfalls to navigate around, and best practices for this type of U-I collaborations.</p> <p><b>Using Research Foundations as University Contracting Vehicle</b> <i>Lisa Lorenzen, Iowa State University Research Foundation (ISURF)</i> Building 1, Ingenuity 301</p> <p>Ever wonder how universities with research foundations differ from those that don't have such an entity? This session will highlight some of the different ways in which foundations are structured.</p> <p><b>Tax Exempt Bonds</b> <i>Bill Catlett, UT Austin</i> <i>Christine Jost-Price, Sanofi</i> Building 1, Discovery 349</p> <p>How do "tax exempt bonds" impact industry sponsored research? This session will describe how universities cope with IRS Rev.Proc. 2007-47 as they manage "private use" of their academic research facilities.</p>
4:15 – 5:00 PM	<p><b>Breakout Session 2 • Building 1</b> (repeated from Breakout Session 1)</p> <p><b>Background and Foreground IP - Introductory Track</b> <i>Sophia Herbert-Peterson, Georgia Tech</i> <i>Charles Adelsheim, Varian</i> Building 1, Global 201</p>



Intellectual Property issues abound in nearly every industry/academic interaction. This case study based session will cover the basics of identifying and defining foreground and background IP, as well as other types of IP that you will likely encounter in your day to day practice. We will also discuss common issues surrounding IP and standard solutions.

**Export Control**

*Bob Hardy COGR*

Building 1, Innovation 241

Export controls are an increasingly significant concern in contracting for research or technical services with university personnel when controlled technologies may be involved. This session will address particular export control issues that may arise day-to-day in industry and academic collaborations. Participants will learn the basic regulatory regime and discuss key issues often faced in these relationships.

**Capstone Projects**

*Carolyn Brougham, Northwestern*

*Mark Schmidt, Deere and Company*

Building 1, Imagination 249

Capstone projects are central to the learning experience of students at many universities. They allow students to tackle real-world problems facing industry today and serve as a vehicle to provide valuable, career-relevant experiences that can help improve job prospects. Companies benefit from getting energetic, innovative, and fresh ideas, access to the best and brightest students in the field allowing the company the chance to recruit top talent. During this interactive session we will explore how to develop U-I capstone projects, potential pitfalls to navigate around, and best practices for this type of U-I collaborations.

**Using Research Foundations as University Contracting Vehicle**

*Lisa Lorenzen, Iowa State University Research Foundation (ISURF)*

Building 1, Ingenuity 301

Ever wonder how universities with research foundations differ from those that don't have such an entity? This session will highlight some of the different ways in which foundations are structured.

**Tax Exempt Bonds**

*Bill Catlett, UT Austin*



	<p><i>Christine Jost-Price, Sanofi</i> Building 1, Discovery 349</p> <p>How do “tax exempt bonds” impact industry sponsored research? This session will describe how universities cope with IRS Rev.Proc. 2007-47 as they manage “private use” of their academic research facilities.</p>
5:15 – 6:00 PM	<p><b>Recap of Day One • Building 3</b> <i>Connie Armentrout, UIDP</i> <i>Richard Jacobinas, Solvay</i> Building 3, Synergy I &amp; II</p>

**Tuesday, Nov. 14, 2017**

8:00 – 8:30 AM	<p><b>Recap from Day One</b> Building 3, Synergy I &amp; II</p>
8:30 – 9:30 AM	<p><b>Panel: Building a Budget for a Project Funded by Industry</b> <i>Brea Hutchcraft-May, Monsanto</i> <i>Lynne Mumm, Iowa State</i> <i>Cat Gerstenschlager, Boeing</i> Building 3, Synergy I &amp; II</p> <p>Universities and industries approach budgets from different perspectives. A panel comprised of university and industry representatives will provide insight into their diverse approaches to budget methodology, which include detailed university budgets, fully burdened, and total project cost.</p>



9:45 – 10:30 AM

**First Breakout Session • Building 1**

**MTAs - Advanced Track**

*Steve Harsy, University of Arizona*

*Mark Ralph, Boehringer-Ingelheim*

Building 1, Global 201

Terms in agreements that cover the transfer of materials from industry to academia raise a variety of issues that can be difficult to solve. This session will take a look at MTA terms that can derail a transfer. Areas such as intellectual property rights to university-generated IP, the implications of transfer of proprietary vs commercial materials, and publication limitations will be explored by use of sample terms drawn from MTA negotiations. Special cases such as transfer of mice, stem cells, and human tissues may be covered as time permits and audience interests dictate.

**Teaming Agreements**

*Erin Hall, MIT*

Building 1, Innovation 241

This session will focus on the ins and outs of the teaming agreements that universities and industries enter into prior to developing joint proposals. A general overview of when and why they are needed and the terms that should and shouldn't be included. There will also be time for questions and discussion on individual institutions preferences.

**Service Agreements**

*Elizabeth Adams, University of Virginia*

*Dan Thompson, Arizona State*

Building 1, Imagination 249

Service contracts are becoming increasingly important to collaborative relationships between university and industry partners. For companies, service contracts are often vehicles to take advantage of the world-class resources available in a university. For universities, service contracts are often vehicles to gain exposure to companies performing R&D and commercializing technology. Service contracts have a set of typical considerations and features distinct from research contracts related to:

- Intellectual property
- Publication
- Confidentiality
- Export control
- Performance standards



	<p>-Budget and costing -Tax Join this session to better understand the nature and composition of service contracts as well as the role that service contracts may play in U-I collaborations.</p> <p><b>Research Agreements</b> <i>Sally O’Neil, Stanford</i> Building 1, Ingenuity 301</p> <p>This session will focus on recent company requirements that universities have to that corporate sponsor’s specific policies and procedures. These cover areas such as conflicts of interest, anti-bribery, anti-corruption, anti-kickback and fair market value for funding received. Payments for the research can be contingent upon the university agreeing to comply with the sponsor’s policies. But universities all have their own policies that they are required to follow in all of their research projects. Many of these policies are mandated by federal, state and local laws and regulations. What universities can’t do is revise these policies for each industry sponsored project. Time permitting, the session will also cover revived pressures from industry to pre-set licensing costs during research agreement negotiations. Some companies that formerly agreed to negotiate licensing fees after an invention is disclosed are now seeking to pre-set, or at least cap, licensing costs.</p> <p><b>Background and Foreground IP - Advanced Track</b> <i>Sophia Herbert-Peterson, Georgia Tech</i> <i>Charles Adelsheim, Varian</i> Building 1, Discovery 349</p> <p>An interactive session focusing on thorny foreground and background IP issues that arise in industry/academic interactions. Many of these issues have no clear solution, but an understanding of the differing perspectives of industry and academia frequently proves to be of value. Be prepared to participate in the discussion.</p>
10:40 – 11:25 AM	<p><b>Second Breakout Session • Building 1</b></p> <p><b>NDA’s</b> <i>Steve Harsy, University of Arizona</i> Building 1, Global 201</p> <p>Non-disclosure agreements are frequently needed when companies and universities wish to have confidential discussions regarding a potential</p>



relationship. While they are often short agreements, there can be pressure to execute them quickly so that discussions can commence, so the challenge is to understand the issues and move to closure quickly. We will discuss ways to resolve potential sticking points, like definition of confidential information, carve-outs to confidential information, and open records laws with which many institutions have to comply.

**Teaming Agreements**

*Erin Hall, MIT*

Building 1, Innovation 241

This session will focus on the ins and outs of the teaming agreements that universities and industries enter into prior to developing joint proposals. A general overview of when and why they are needed and the terms that should and shouldn't be included. There will also be time for questions and discussion on individual institutions preferences.

**Visiting Scholar/Researcher Agreements**

*Paul Lowe, Kansas State*

*Chris Brandt, Kansas State*

Building 1, Imagination 249

A visiting researcher can set the stage for an excellent experience for the collaborating faculty, as well as the host university and its industry partners. These interactions serve to strengthen collaborations between industry-university partners, improve the quality of the research, and help align university research agendas to produce more relevant outcomes. In addition, the interactions provide the collaborating researchers with a broadened perspective that can advance their careers. Structuring these types of partnering interactions are not without complications that require advanced considerations. This session will present a case study to stimulate audience participation. Key elements to consider will be discussed and the audience will have the opportunity to identify gaps in these points that have created complications at their own organizations. Sample Visiting Researcher Agreement language will be discussed with the primary objective of providing participants with strategies on how to structure these types of industry-university interactions in a more collaborative and expedient manner.

**Gifts, Fellowships/Internships and Student awards**

*Brooke Groves-Anderson, Stanford*

Building 1, Ingenuity 301

Strong corporate relationships with universities deploy a variety of



	<p>mechanisms. One avenue is through providing gift support. This session will focus on when gift support makes sense (and when it doesn't), how gifts are administered, and how they can benefit both the company and the university recipients.</p>
11:25 – 11:45 AM	<b>BREAK</b>
11:45 AM – 12:30 PM	<p><b>Third Breakout Session • Building 1</b></p> <p><b>MTAs – Special Topics</b> <i>Steve Harsy, University of Arizona</i> Building 1, Innovation 241 Terms in agreements that cover the transfer of materials from industry to academia raise a variety of issues that can be difficult to solve. This session will take a look at MTA terms that can derail a transfer. Areas such as intellectual property rights to university-generated IP, the implications of transfer of proprietary vs commercial materials, and publication limitations will be explored by use of sample terms drawn from MTA negotiations. Special cases such as transfer of mice, stem cells, and human tissues may be covered as time permits and audience interests dictate.</p> <p><b>Federal Flowdown</b> <i>Cindy McDonald, Boeing</i> <i>Dana Rewoldt, Iowa State</i> Building 1, Imagination 249 Government contracts with difficult FAR clauses make subcontracting for Industry and University challenging. This session will cover some examples of difficult FAR clauses that can present issues for Industry and University. The session will also cover relevant contractual language for bridging the gap these FAR clauses create.</p> <p><b>Visiting Scholar/Researcher Agreements</b> <i>Paul Lowe, Kansas State</i> <i>Chris Brandt, Kansas State</i> Building 1, Ingenuity A visiting researcher can set the stage for an excellent experience for the collaborating faculty, as well as the host university and its industry partners. These interactions serve to strengthen collaborations between industry-university partners, improve the quality of the research, and help align university research agendas to produce more relevant outcomes. In addition, the interactions provide the collaborating researchers with a broadened</p>



	<p>perspective that can advance their careers. Structuring these types of partnering interactions are not without complications that require advanced considerations. This session will present a case study to stimulate audience participation. Key elements to consider will be discussed and the audience will have the opportunity to identify gaps in these points that have created complications at their own organizations. Sample Visiting Researcher Agreement language will be discussed with the primary objective of providing participants with strategies on how to structure these types of industry-university interactions in a more collaborative and expedient manner.</p> <p><b>Research Agreements</b> <i>Sally O’Neil, Stanford</i> Building 1, Global 201</p> <p>This session will focus on recent company requirements that universities have to that corporate sponsor’s specific policies and procedures. These cover areas such as conflicts of interest, anti-bribery, anti-corruption, anti-kickback and fair market value for funding received. Payments for the research can be contingent upon the university agreeing to comply with the sponsor’s policies. But universities all have their own policies that they are required to follow in all of their research projects. Many of these policies are mandated by federal, state and local laws and regulations. What universities can’t do is revise these policies for each industry sponsored project. Time permitting, the session will also cover revived pressures from industry to pre-set licensing costs during research agreement negotiations. Some companies that formerly agreed to negotiate licensing fees after an invention is disclosed are now seeking to pre-set, or at least cap, licensing costs.</p> <p><b>Gifts, Fellowships/Internships and Student awards</b> <i>Brooke Groves-Anderson, Stanford</i> Building 1, Discovery 349</p> <p>Strong corporate relationships with universities deploy a variety of mechanisms. One avenue is through providing gift support. This session will focus on when gift support makes sense (and when it doesn’t), how gifts are administered, and how they can benefit both the company and the university recipients.</p>
12:45 – 2:00 PM	<b>Networking Lunch • Outside of Building 3</b>
2:00 – 3:15 PM	<b>Consortia - Different Arrangements and Sponsors • Building 3</b> <i>Mary Barber, Arizona State University</i> <i>Todd Glenn, Arizona State University</i>



	<p>Building 3, Synergy I &amp; II</p> <p>This session will be centered around consortia-related agreements. We will discuss the benefits and challenges of creating a consortium while focusing on drafting, negotiation strategy and general contracting practices.</p>
3:15-3:30 PM	<b>BREAK</b>
3:30 – 4:30 PM	<p><b>Master Agreements • Building 3</b> <i>Robin Beach, University of Illinois</i> <i>Jackie Kulfan, PPG</i> Building 3, Synergy I &amp; II</p> <p>In this session, participants will review the role and scope of master research and service agreements in academic/industry collaborations. A general overview will be presented, with the majority of the session reserved to discussion among participants as to how different institutions and companies use master research and/or service agreements to build and maintain relationships.</p>
4:30 – 5:00 PM	<p><b>Concluding Comments • Building 3</b> <i>Paul Lowe, Kansas State</i> <i>Mark Schmidt, John Deere</i> Building 3, Synergy I &amp; II</p>