



Research Council

Minutes

Date: January 30, 2017 Start time: 11:30p.m. Adjournment Time: 12:30p.m. Location: 150 Sugar Hall

CHAIR	Kevin Baer
SECRETARY	Elizabeth Stammerjohan
ATTENDEES	Dr. Jeffrey Anderson, Dr. Kevin Baer, Dr. Katherine Boswell, Dr. Sean Chenoweth, Dr. Khalid El Sayed, Dr. David Irwin, Ms. Megan Lowe, Dr. Sami Nazzal, Dr. Elizabeth Stammerjohan, Dr. John Sutherlin, Dr. Jana Sutton, Dr. Richard Thurkill, Dr. Paul Wiedemeier
ABSENT (EXCUSED)	Dr. Joydeep Bhattacharjee, Dr. Adam Pate, Dr. Neil White

Agenda

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS	Minutes approved without corrections.
DISCUSSION TOPICS	<p>The main item on the agenda was to discuss how the RC could assist the Director of the Research Corporation of Louisiana in fostering a supportive research environment. Dr. Sutherlin emphasized the importance of each area seeking grants. One way to facilitate this is for each Department/School to develop a faculty profile of research interests. A grant writer (to be selected by the end of the week) will then be able to pursue grants that are matched with faculty research expertise.</p> <p>Dr. Sutherlin addressed the purpose of the Louisiana Research Corporation of Louisiana as being a go between faculty and commercialization for intellectual property in order to provide more funding for the University and faculty research. Dr. Sutherlin pointed out some improvements that have already happened included hiring a new and more experienced patent attorney, and an almost done partnership with Segway Science Management, who he described as the link between faculty intellectual property (IP) and commercialization. At this point Segway's expertise is primarily Pharmacy, Health Science, and his own expertise is Environmental sciences, primarily water issues.</p> <p>Dr. Sutherlin expressed an interest in meeting with faculty in each college by the end of February. He explained that there would be one grant writer whose job is to help faculty in colleges. In addition to the one full time hire, two Graduate Assistants experienced in grant writing will be brought in. Dr. Sutherlin said that all colleges should consider grant writing with regard to all hires (whether this is about grants per se, or professional services contracts. The plan is to apply for larger grants (although perhaps more competitive, they are not necessarily more paperwork), and/or leverage smaller grants into larger grants (perhaps by partnering with an historically black college such as Grambling).</p>

Dr. Sutherlin said in reviewing our minutes, there were two issues that kept recurring. One was greater communication with the research director, and the other was indirect costs. Dr. Sutherlin says he will be a regular attendee at research council meetings. Dr. Sutherlin said he would start with a moodle page, wherein a calendar could be placed so faculty could access it. If there is no communication from faculty on the Moodle page, he doesn't see the value of a separate web site. Also, Dr. Sutherlin will circulate information about the LRC, such as the business plan.

The second concern of the research council seemed to be the allocation of indirect costs. Although there will be no going back to previous grants, he hoped to be able to start following previous ULM grant policy for grants written after about February 15, 2017.

Dr. Nazzal asked whether the same percentages would go to the principal investigator if Segway was involved. Although there are both national and international guidelines, UL System guidelines would prevail if they were in accordance with those other guidelines. Dr. Sutherlin suggested that studies that resulted in saleable intellectual property could benefit from a short (3 month) delay in publishing, in order to protect (patent wise) the property, and then publishing could go forward. In addition, limited publishing might be feasible, if not everything was published. Dr. Sutherlin noted that some departments might be able to move through the process more quickly than others. Dr. Sutherlin provided the example that devices could be protected for as little as \$500, and publishing could come after that. Dr. Sutherlin pointed out that sometimes what was desirable was less control of the patent, and more about share of royalties. Such things would vary by industry sector and case by case.

Dr. El Sayed asked if the role of Segway was in filtering ideas for patenting or in commercializing ideas, since there is already a committee in Pharmacy that makes the filtering decisions. Dr. Sutherlin said there are two questions: Is it patentable, should it be patented. Dr. El Sayed was concerned that since Segway wouldn't be financing these commercialization's themselves, that they would be sucking up percentages that could go to the university or PI. Dr. Sutherlin said that since we don't have the money to commercialize we're not giving up much. Dr. El Sayed again said that he suggested that we go ahead with patenting, and only bring in Segway at the commercialization stage. Dr. Sutherlin said it's a decision that should be made on a case by case basis.

Dr. Irwin wanted to point out that there might be significant contract services revenue out there, and that the whole research group (office/corporation) shouldn't overlook contract services because they were so involved with patents. He gave an example of how his colleagues had spent many hours on a contract services proposal, only to have it ignored. Dr. Sutton thought perhaps it might have been a misunderstood request for pro bono work. Dr. Sutherlin said such misunderstandings might be avoided by focusing on the funding source from the beginning. Dr. Wiedermeier stated he was glad to see that the corporation was interested in supporting contract services as well as grants. Dr. Sutherlin reiterated that departments should look at grants and contracts as sources of staff or graduate assistants as well.

Dr. Baer asked is there was some desirable balance between contract and pro bono work, and Dr. Sutherlin responded that he thought all ULM faculty were probably doing enough pro bono work. There was also discussion of putting up a survey for comments and suggestions. Dr. El Sayed thought there definitely needed to be a

	<p>separate meeting between Dr. Sutherlin and people who worked in grants to address such things as purchase time frames, and ways to speed the process. Dr. Sutherlin agreed it needed to change. At this point many faculty needed to get back to classes, and the meeting was adjourned.</p>		
CONCLUSIONS	An update on the progress of the RCL will be addressed at the next meeting.		
ACTION ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
None			

Approved by committee/council chair Yes on 05/01/2017