Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
2. Introduction of GPSS Representative
3. Approval of the Minutes from February 12, 2014
4. Report from IPMAC on Outside Work Form 1460
5. Update on New Uniform Federal Guidance
6. GIM 1 Review and Submission of Competing Proposals – OSP Proposal Review Criteria and Procedures
7. Adjourn

1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Miller at 9:00 a.m.

2) Introduction of GPSS Representative

Miller introduced Alice Popejoy who is the new GPSS representative.

3) Approval of the Minutes from February 12, 2014

The minutes from February 12 2014 were approved as written.

4) Report from IPMAC on Outside Work Form 1460

Miller distributed a draft of Outside Work Form 1460 provided by IPMAC. Miller explained the outside work form deals with university intellectual property (IP) and this has been discussed by both IPMAC and SCIPC. The issues dealing with university IP stems from a recent Supreme Court case in which a researcher from Stanford worked for an outside company while on sabbatical. The Stanford researcher developed and tested a test for the HIV virus based on the techniques he learned from Stanford. When the company received all the proceeds from the invention Stanford sued on the grounds that the invention belonged to them. Stanford eventually lost because when the researcher worked for the company he signed a form where he “hereby assigned” all future IP to the company. Stanford did have their own IP agreement as well, similar to UW’s, but instead the language states “will assign”. In response to the Supreme Court ruling universities across the country began revising their forms to replace “will assign” with “hereby assign”. SCIPC has been active in working with the university to develop agreed-upon language that both faculty and the administration will accept.

Miller explained the current version is a product of these conversations and asked members to provide feedback. Miller stated that he supports this as it appears to be the most faculty-friendly version that faculty will receive. A comment was raised that this version is remarkably clear and precise. Additionally, it is relatively short and easy to read. A question was raised asking when a faculty member needs to sign
the outside work form. Signing the document is supposed to occur before the project begins if the work is likely to result in a patentable invention. Initially, the administration was planning an initiative to require every faculty members to immediately sign away their rights, but due to the unpopularity with this idea the administration is no longer asking for this. A question was raised regarding the possibility that a patentable invention occurring during the work even if this was not expected to be likely at the onset. Revised language was suggested during them meeting.

A comment was raised expressing sympathy towards faculty’s position on the issue in order to encourage intellectual activity. However, it does not seen to be inappropriate for an employer, who is providing the faculty member’s salary, to have an interest in sharing the IP of a new invention. A comment was raised that this should not come as a surprise to employees who work at a research institution. Discussion ensued. The IP policy will not just impact university faculty but also lab technicians, researchers, staff and post-docs. A comment was raised that the policy is less clear about graduate students due to their complex employment relationship with UW.

A comment was raised that faculty would benefit by signing this version of Outside Work Form 1460 because it helps faculty with the legal aspects surrounding IP. Additionally, this will prevent an outside company from reaching back into UW and asserting their ownership of a faculty member’s IP later in the future. A question was raised asking what happens when a faculty member forgets to fill out the form in advance. Discussion ensued. It is likely the project will not be approved if the research is entering into a relationship that may result in an invention. It is common that faculty will receive a reminder that they are out of compliance when a mistake like this occurs.

5) Update on New Uniform Federal Guidance

Ted Mordhorst (Research Accounting and Analysis) provided an update on new uniform federal rules guiding research. OMB Uniform Guidance was recently updated and published in the Federal Register on December 26, 2013 which replaces eight previous OMB circulars. The rulings are applicable to almost all recipients of federal grants and cost-reimbursable contracts. Each federal awarding agency must implement their changes for new money received on or after December 26, 2014.

A UW working group composed of representatives from central administration was created to review the guidelines and determine what changes are required. A question was raised asking if there has been public comment on these changes. Mordhorst explained that OMB has spent 2 years working on a draft. Mordhorst added that UW, in addition with other stakeholders (state governments, non-profits, Office of the Inspector General, audit organizations), have provided significant input on how should be included. Part of the new updates includes a mandatory review in one year to determine if any adjustments are required. Mordhorst explained that he does not anticipate substantive changes from the recent update.

Mordhorst discussed the timeline in which the UW working group will be ready to implement the required changes:

- April 15th – Initial discovery of what has changed from previous guidelines
- May 15th – Review of impact to UW systems
- June 1st – Mapping UW policies and procedures
- June 26th – Federal agencies release their respective implementation plans
- September 30th – Draft changes to UW policy
• December 1st – Approval and publication of changes to UW policies and procedures
• December 26th – Federal implementation begins

A web page has been established which contains links to the Final Uniform Guidance document and other documents/presentations outlining the new guideline changes.

Mordhorst explained the largest impact will be bringing all agencies into one system when applying for awards. Language around cost-sharing will be stronger, stating that cost-sharing is either mandatory or prohibited as part of the project. Members discussed cost-sharing. A comment was raised expressing concern that similar language should be applied to in-kind donations. Members discussed changes to indirect costs, impact from sub-contracting with outside entities, cap-setting by the federal government and UW’s relationship with COGR.

6) GIM 1 Review and Submission of Competing Proposals – OSP Proposal Review Criteria and Procedures

Carol Rhodes (Associate Director for Office of Sponsored Programs – “OSP”) presented on upcoming changes to OSP proposal review criteria and procedures. GIM 1 was originally published many years ago and contains guidance on preparing proposals. At this time GIM 1 is very outdated and no actual policy statement current exists. There is a large variance in what OSP reviews at the proposal stage along with how review comments are provided. This has encouraged OSP to develop proposed review criteria which sets the expectations on what OSP will require to conduct an efficient and transparent project review. Rhodes stressed this is not easy because each proposal is unique but there are fundamental criteria that OSP can review, such as eligibility requirements.

In order to develop changes to procedures OSP had to first identify the policy changes. This was originally conducted through workgroup findings and risk assessment analysis with managers and directors. OSP presented a draft of the new GIM 1 language to the Office of Research and provided an executive summary outlining the review criteria. OPS piloted the proposal with nine proposal reviewers over a one-month period and revised the policies, criteria and guidelines based on user feedback. OSP will share its results with Dean’s level of review before final adoption.

GIM 1 scope is competing proposals. Rhodes clarified that this does not refer to competing continuation or clinical trials, but actual competing proposals based on scope of work. GIM 1 reinforces OPS authority in the submission of proposals and sets out principle investigator (PI) responsibility regarding programmatic, administrative and compliance aspects of the proposal. The role of PIs is to provide the assurances required by eGC1 as it goes through the review process. In addition to the required assurances, the PI is required to provide substantive project information to reviewers, such as:

• Project scope
• Personnel (qualified/available)
• Budget information
• Regulatory compliance information
• Sub-recipient information and commitment letter

It is the department’s responsibility to ensure that all PIs are aware of these policies. A question was raised about certain assurances, like ensuring that a participant is not disbarred. Conducting background
checks to determine the status of participants it is difficult, especially if they are post-docs from outside the country. Rhodes explained that there are tools available to easily screen participants and emphasized that due diligence is required in order to comply with the rules and regulations.

OSP review criteria include:

- Sponsor and University eligibility requirements are met.
- Sponsor formatting, page limit, and technical requirements are followed.
- University business data is correct.
- Sponsor’s specific budgetary requirements are met.
- Facilities and Administrative (F&A) costs are calculated in accordance with GIM 13.
- The proposal meets mandatory cost-share requirement or, if prohibited by sponsor, cost-share is not presented in proposal. If cost-share included, it is intended to be cost-share, the cost-sharing unit/party has reflected its approval and the cost-share is consistent with federal requirements.
- All proposed sub-recipients meet the University’s documentation requirements in GIM 7.
- The requisite compliance approvals have been obtained and compliance information is complete.

Staff members are conducting two sessions on the review criteria to determine what is expected. Changes will be finalized in May and OSP will continue to prepare content to be published on its webpage, along with useful resources. Changes may be adjusted after implementation if OSP sees that PIs are having difficulties submitting proposals. Rhodes explained that the shift of work on PIs will not be dramatic but there may be post-submission issues at the time of award that were not dealt with at the proposal stage. Rhodes stressed that the important results of these new changes are developing a uniform review of proposals that go to OSP and making it clear and transparent about what OSP expects in EGC1.

7) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Miller at 10:00 a.m.
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