Working With Industry Recording 03262026

Welcome. I'm Mari Ostendorf.

I'm the Vice Provost for Research and I'm one of your 3 hosts today together with Francois Baneyx, the Vice Provost for Innovation and Director of Commotion and Joanna Glickler, the the Head of Corporate and Foundation Relations.

So we are thrilled to see so many people interested in hearing about working with industry.

And we've been, we've been collaborating on for at least two or three years now on this question of how can we better, you know, better support partnerships between the UW and industry.

This is this is more important than ever now for a couple reasons, both because researchers are increasingly interested in seeing more direct impact from their work, but also the the interest in diversifying funding streams for research.

Today's session is an outcome of our collaboration, but it also aligns with the Provost research, resilience and transformation efforts.

And where again, this this issue of diversifying funding streams is, is a theme that many people have have brought up.

And in addition, you may have seen the the announcement from the president of the draft strategic plan.

This work aligns with his notion of, of, of collaborations, radical collaborations and partnerships, external partnerships for public benefit.

You'll hear about some of the new things that we're, we've done in, in this collaboration between Commotion OR and CFR, but there are ongoing initiatives as well that we'll be talking with the Deans about.

We know you have, there's a lot to cover.

Our goal is for this to be the start of the, the conversation.

We know you have a lot of questions and we look forward to, to talking with you and having this really be a, a start for coming up with a better partnership.

Working with companies is complex.

It takes a team and it takes the the companies, you and our partners, corporate and foundation relations just in both centrally and in the college.

And with that, I will turn it over to Joanna.

Thank you, Mari, Joanna Glickler, AVP for corporate and foundation relations.

I want to join Mari and welcoming all of you to this session about working with industry.

It's really wonderful to have such a robust turn out this morning.

I get to do the honors of introducing some stellar colleagues to make up today's panel of experts.

But before I do that, I want to share a little bit about the structure for today.

We're going to have two segments of about 2025 minutes each, give or take.

One of them will be presented by Mark Cabralis and will be presented jointly by Meredith Reynolds and Hogan Ricks.

And then we'll pause at the end of each to address any questions.

We're asking that you post your questions in the Q&A function along the way.

And folks around you should be able to upvote to help prioritize the questions.

We have a feeling that given the size of this group, we're not going to be able to get to all the questions, but we're going to do our best.

And anything that we don't get to, we'll do some kind of roll up at the end to answer any questions that don't get addressed.

And we'll distribute the responses to this group with the question posers anonymized.

So feel free to put your questions in there.

I'm also hoping that by the end of the session, you'll know where to reach out if you have questions down the road.

So I'll get started with the introductions, starting with Mark Cabralis, who is a Senior Director for Corporate Relations on my central corporate and foundation relations team, which he joined about two years ago, and he manages a small team of his own centrally.

Mark holds an electrical engineering degree from Stanford, and he spent most of his career leading global product teams at a handful of Silicon Valley tech companies in the areas of satellite communications, digital graphics, and digital video compression.

In his last industry stint before coming to UW, Mark led the West Coast University Alliances program at Ford Motor Company, working with leading universities to develop innovative automotive research projects.

And so I think it's interesting that he's been on the flip side of his current role.

He was, he's been at a company doing university relations.

Now he's at a university doing company relations.

And this makes him a terrific bridge and translator across our two cultures.

Meredith Reynolds is the senior manager of Sponsored research intellectual property, working across both Commotion and the Office of Sponsored Programs.

So it's, it's, it's a joint position.

This is a new role designed in part to smooth over and shorten the contract negotiation process, meaning that conversations don't have to be bounced back and forth between offices.

Meredith can handle a breath.

Yeah.

In this role, she negotiates intellectual property terms and sponsored research agreements and helps researchers advance their work through collaborative industry partnerships.

Before coming to the UW, she was a commercialization manager at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, where she focused on pharmacy and pharmacology.

She began her tech transfer career at MIT.

Meredith holds a Master of Science in Biotechnology and Business from University College Dublin and a Bachelor of Science in Biology from the University of South Carolina.

And last but certainly not least, Hogan Ricks is a Senior Contract Specialist in the Office of Sponsored Programs where he negotiates agreements in support of sponsored research with industry, non profit and government partners.

His background is in law and sponsored research, and he previously worked at Auburn University before joining the UW in 20/20/22.

I'll share as an aside that I had the pleasure of seeing Hogan and Meredith in action recently as they negotiated a rather complicated industry agreement.

And they are extraordinary extraordinarily skilled and knowledgeable.

And I noted they are completely unflappable.

So I feel like that's important in an, in a tense negotiation, potentially tense.

Thank you all for being here, Mari.

Mark will kick things off.

Over to you, Mark.

Great.

Thank you, Joanna, for a great introduction.

Hello, everyone, and welcome to today's session on working with industry.

Thank you for being here.

All right, I'll be kicking off today's program with an overview of why and how to engage with industry, and we'll learn about why industry engages with us.

I'll also share about the tools and resources available to faculty that we have available, and then I'll hand it off to my colleagues Meredith and Hogan.

We have a lot of great information to share today, so let's get started.

All right, there's a lot of reasons to consider working with industry.

The key reason would be to diversify your funding sources.

Having more funding options is always better, right?

Currently, your primary funding sources may be from federal agencies and also from foundation support, but finding additional funding paths can be advantageous.

While industry funding won't replace federal support, it can supplement your needs and building these new industry relationships can create some some really beneficial future opportunities that can make an impact.

Working with industry also allows you to stay current on what challenges the industry is facing at the moment, which may direct your research focus or point you in the direction of new companies to approach with your work.

And having close relationships with industry can also be advantageous when applying for federal grants where corporate support is often needed.

So having relationships with industry gives also gives your students work on these sponsored projects some great experience and gives them the potential for career opportunities at these companies.

In addition, you may find your industry relationships can benefit any commercialization opportunities you may have.

All right, what are companies looking for?

So many people new to industry partnerships are always eager to understand what does the company want from the university And it really falls into kind of three main buckets.

Companies partner with universities to Co develop practical solutions to to their challenging problems.

These often start with access to different university resources and then evolve into real, you know, deep engagements that accelerate that new innovation.

Companies also team up with universities to explore bold new research ideas kind of far out their ideas.

Companies can reduce their cost of that research and mitigate their risk by working with universities to gauge the viability of these bold ideas.

Now these partnerships enable early experimentation by tapping into our faculty expertise.

This is why they they come to us for our faculty knowledge and companies are always looking to cultivate emerging talent and and build their workforce pipeline through our students.

All right, the best way to engage with industry is by building direct relationships.

This will really yield the best results when trying to secure potential funding.

And the best way to find those relationships is to connect with industry reps at conferences or workshops that you may be attending through industry specific events where you can make those connections.

But also think about connecting with other faculty.

They can help you find pathways into a specific company you feel might be interested in your work.

You know, Don't hesitate to engage with your unit CFR advancement team.

Also, they can help uncover any existing relationships they may have to help make those introductions with you.

And also be open to structured opportunities that UW has on campus with specific industry partners or through company campus visits.

Your CFR colleagues will often connect with faculty to showcase specific research areas during a campus visit that aligns with the company's interests.

Company visits are a great opportunity to showcase your work and the value that it brings.

I do want to, you know, can I just point out, remember that companies are not philanthropic entities and they cannot replace federal funding that may have been lost.

Their main responsibility is to their shareholders, right?

So for them, showing value for showing the value and the benefit of your work is very important.

And that value will entice the company to engage with the UW and with you.

Companies ultimately ultimately need to see a benefit as part of their engagement.

You'll need to become a student of the company you're interested in engaging with, learn what their key needs and challenges are, and be able to articulate how your work will be of value to them.

Use your CFR colleagues to assist you in translating your work into a benefit for the company.

I used to do this as part of my University Alliance role at Ford Motor Company.

I would provide an early review of faculty submissions as part of the RFP process we went through.

I gave feedback to the faculty on their business case, gave them tips on making their value proposition more relevant to Ford's needs.

So again, utilize your CFR team.

They have spent the time working with these companies and can help you connect with the decision makers and help you build that value proposition.

I also wanted to talk about the different ways that industry engages with faculty and students.

Faculty support can can be made in several ways.

Research funding is the primary method to engage with faculty.

This is primarily support for projects that bring together the shared interests of the faculty and the company.

Project ideas can range from solving company technical challenges to finding new ways to create commercial potential for the company, and everything in between.

These projects can be awarded through general calls for proposals that you'll apply for via their kind of main proposal website or through direct personal relationships that you might have.

Other areas of faculty support are through affiliate or membership programs where industry members can interact with faculty, learn more about topics of shared interest, and build new relationships.

And faculty consulting opportunities also exist.

These are shorter term engagements focused on solving a company challenge of interest with a quick turn around.

The primary support for students outside of, you know, talent recruitment is through capstone projects.

Capstones are a great way for students to tackle some real world challenges alongside mentors from the company.

So it gives them that interaction in working within a company structure as well.

But capstone projects are also a great way for faculty to build relationships.

They can use that company mentor as a good stepping stone and relationship builder where that relationship can then lead to future research support on a larger scale.

So it's it's a win win there as well.

Students may also get support through tuition or stipend awards where students may have the opportunity to spend time at company facilities about gaining valuable experience.

All right, I want to also briefly touch on three main funding pathways, sponsored programs, gifts and other revenue.

Each of these pathways move through different processes here at UW on sponsored programs and projects.

These are administered through the Office of Sponsored Programs or OSP, and you'll hear more about kind of that specific detail later, but funding for these programs supports the research project that faculty and companies develop jointly.

These projects are contractual in nature and will contain specific terms and conditions and provide tangible Bennett's back to the company.

Note that all negotiations of sponsored agreement terms falls into the Office of Sponsored Programs.

They've they've got the lead there on the gift side.

Gifts are administered through gift services and gifts are made for public benefit and are non contractual in nature, meaning there are no terms and conditions or no tangible benefits to the company.

Today we do have a new gift category called Proviso Gift.

With this category, charitable funding can be accompanied by light terms and conditions that call for administrative stewardship.

Supervisor gifts are in use now and there will be an information session or more information sessions coming later this spring.

So stay tuned for more details on that.

And also in the gifts category, we have in kind gift contributions.

These can be company donations of equipment, software, training or even Technical Support.

And then finally we have other revenue in that category and this is administered at the school or college level.

This category typically encompasses non charitable funding that doesn't rise to the sponsored program level.

An easy example of revenue in this category is a student capstone funding.

Something that I thought would be interesting to to detail is the different types of funding sources within a company.

Right.

There are many types of funding sources that may be used to fund engagements with universities, and the funding source chosen may also be driven by the type of engagement that is going on.

So I've lifted some of the usual types of funding sources within a company that I'm familiar with.

There may be others as well.

I just wanted to focus primarily on the 1st 3 because that's where the maturity of the university funding will come from.

For example, funding for research projects can come from actually all three of these, they come from central funding, R&D budgets, or through a specific business unit or department.

Departmental funds talking about R&D budgets, though typically large in most companies, right, can be redirected to different areas of research as their needs and focus areas change.

So funding is not always available from year to year within the same research areas.

I'm familiar with this change often.

When I was at Ford, the research areas that we communicated to university partners changed slightly each year.

So some faculty did not necessarily have a match from one year to the next.

So it's something to be something to be aware of when working with industry.

Note that business units or department funding may also change year to year and it may be limited from one year to the next depending on changes to departmental budget fluctuations and really the the company financial outcomes.

So can be tied to the year revenue that each company brings in year to year.

So it may not be able to fund the same number of projects year over year at the department or business unit level.

I also hear that there was interest in understanding the differences between industry and federal engagements.

I just put together this chart on my team and I great comparison of kind of two or the four main categories here for the different areas.

Just talking about timeline expectations, federal grants really give you longer funding cycles, giving you time for exploration, whereas the industry projects typically are one to two years in length driven by market pressure or their fiscal timelines.

So much quicker turn around on that research.

And that's usually also highlighted in the scope of work where they really narrow down what that project deliverables will be.

The success metrics also differ.

Industry likes to have business driven outcomes such as you know patent potential, potential competitive advantages or recruitment outcomes.

When we talk IPP approaches can be very different on each side as well.

Just focusing on industry here.

Companies may seek IP access if it's created to the research, but that's not always a priority for for each project.

So it really is on a case by case you can evaluate that within the project and what their desired outcome is.

When it comes to publishing, companies may ask for a publication review typically 30 days prior to publishing.

Companies are not against publishing at all, they just want to be sure they can put patent protections in place prior to a public disclosure.

It's important for a company to be sure they have submitted all the initial patent paperwork if IP is generated from a project and if it's referenced in the publication.

So that's kind of the reason for their their publication reviews.

And definitely if there are trade secrets involved in a specific project, they may also ask for that to be removed.

But again, this is on a case by case basis.

And lastly, communication style differences, the report outs from industry sponsored research projects, they're made typically to the the Pi you're working with and their department or business unit rather than a larger formal setting or peer review.

But really just it varies by by company and by project, but typically they'll be more focused on the benefit of the research outcomes to the company.

But these are just a few of the ways see the differences between federal and industry engagements.

All right, moving on to resources.

So there, you know, we have lots of resources available to faculty when it comes to industry engagement.

I've separated them into two categories here.

And I'll talk more about these two resource areas in the following slides as well.

We encourage you to connect with your school or college based corporate relations staff, our my Central corporate relations staff and with additional unit development staff.

These folks are more than happy to answer your questions on engaging with industry partners.

They are your first points of contact when you want to engage with companies beyond the the the people in up above there.

There's also tools that our central CFR team provides.

We have a funding opportunities dashboard available to you.

We have tools and quick guides on our Central CFR website and we just recently launched a new corporate front door website and this is a great resource that you can direct your industry partners who are interested in engaging with the UW.

All right, you may be thinking, So what does the Central corporate relations team actually do?

Well, the UW Central corporate Relations, me and my team serve as a central connector for multidisciplinary corporate engagements.

We match our industry partners needs and interests with the appropriate resource resources from across all three of our campuses.

We are out building a prospect pipeline of new companies to engage with, to be able to support our faculty and staff in building new relationships and, you know, finding ways to engage with companies and find them matches within the system.

Here, we also develop holistic strategies and stewardship approaches for each of our strategic partners, and that helps us deepen relationships.

And we also work very closely with companies who want to engage more broadly and deeply with the UW.

In essence, we help our industry partners navigate our complex ecosystem.

We help them identify where they can collaborate and also help them find resources to meet their needs.

And we connect them with student talent and faculty expertise through our close collaboration with our unit CFR colleagues.

If you're interested in connecting with industry, your first stop should be your unit advancement team.

Every school, college, and campus unit has an advancement team, and many of these units have staff who specialize in corporate relations.

We encourage you to start with your unit CFR advancement staff.

They are your close partners when it comes to engaging with industry.

If your unit doesn't have ACFR staff, please reach out to me or my team for support in engaging with companies.

The My Central team will support those units who do not have corporate relations staff.

We also work closely with our unit counterparts to assist in building relationships and opportunities with industry to the benefit of the unit.

So remember, reach out to your unit advancement partners early and often.

All right, let's talk tools.

The Central CFR team has created a great database of available funding opportunities for faculty.

From your browser, just go to the Central CFR website at washington.edu/CFR.

You select the For Faculty drop down and choose the Corporate Foundation Funding Opportunities section there.

Bottom of the list, you'll see this pop up show here.

It includes information about who your unit CFR contacts are at the bottom.

So if you're not familiar, that's a good list right there.

But once you close this pop up, you'll see the complete listing of opportunities.

The dashboard is updated regularly and includes corporate and foundation opportunities throughout the the list.

So right now there are over 600 opportunities, which is fantastic.

So hopefully you'll be able to find something that is in your area.

There's a great selection of both foundation corporate specific proposal opportunities to delve into and definitely use this tool often to find engagement opportunity matches.

Don't forget to connect with your unit CFR team or my team if you have any questions on the corporate RFP requests, All right.

We also have a lot more resources for faculty on our central CFR website from that same location as before.

I go to the faculty drop down again and this time she was working with corporations.

That's the second item on the list.

Here you'll find information and resources to support you in engaging with industry.

There's information on how to work with companies, how companies engage with universities, and challenges involved in these engagements.

So a lot of what I've been talking about this morning, there's also information on different types of funding, Ndas and some detail on intellectual property questions as well.

So you'll find a, you'll also find a helpful guide that we just created to work with industry called Building Successful Industry Partnerships.

There's a link to this document in the first paragraph on that page.

You'll also find in the right column of the web page some great quick links to access more helpful information.

And then we've also included some industry quick guides that you can e-mail these PDFs to your industry partners who are looking for more detailed information on engaging with you Done.

So I hope these are useful to you in supporting your conversations with industry partners.

OK, this is my last slide.

So we're getting ready for Q&A.

In October of 2025, my team launched a new corporate front door website.

This is the primary entry point for interested industry partners looking to engage with the University of Washington.

This site was developed because we heard from industry as part of a corporate assessment that we did, that it was hard for them to find out how to engage with the UW, where to go to find out more information, right?

So we, the site was developed to give industry a first point of entry to explore all the ways to engage with the university all in one location.

And this is also a great place to point to your industry contacts who want to know the breadth and opportunity breadth of opportunities available to engage with us.

You can find our corporate front door at washington.edu/partner with UW or you can just enter partner with UW into your browser.

It should take you right there.

It's a dynamic website, easy to maneuver some some great information and links to to information that partners want.

We've got our corporate relations team info there, so if they're new to the UW, they can contact my team and then we'll get them to the right folks within the university and we have a nice contact us form that they can fill out if they're not sure how to engage my team.

Will, you know, work with any interested partners to understand their needs, match them with the appropriate connection point within the university, and kind of get that deepening of a relationship with us.

We've got some great response so far to the website and we've already received some solid requests for engagement, so things are going great.

One area to note I wanted to bring up is that we do highlight two stories of impact on the front page to give industry a feel for how collaborating with the UW can make an impact.

These are rotated periodically, so if you've been involved with published stories that may entice more conversations with industry, please send me the link to the story and I can add it to our rotating list.

It'd be great to do that.

All right, well, thank you everyone.

Now we can open up for questions.

Joanne and I are available to answer your questions well as the rest of the panel on this segment before we move on to the next section of our website.

Thank you, Mark, so much for that.

I thought my question, my Q&A facilitation skills were going to be really taxed here, but we have just three questions.

So one of them had to do with whether this was going to be shared afterwards.

It's being recorded and it will be shared afterwards.

So stay tuned for that.

There's a question here, what faculty who are both Seattle Children's Research Institute and UW Pediatrics affiliated for those faculty, who do they engage with when it comes to the offices of sponsored programs, both the UW and Seattle Children's Research Institute OSP offices?

I think the answer depends on where your research lab lives, but I'll ask maybe Carol to respond to that one or or someone else in OSP.

The agreement will be either with Seattle Children's Fred Hutch or the University of Washington.

So if the agreement is going to be between the University of Washington and the outside entity, then it would be the University's Office of Sponsored Programs.

Hopefully that answers the question.

If if the question really is about how to who to engage with, around getting help working with the companies, you can always start with your UW folks and they will direct you accordingly.

If you should be working with the corresponding folks at at another institution.

Another question in the mix here for the opportunities listed on the website, would these be opportunities that we should work with CFR folks to apply approach or are these opportunities faculty can pursue on their own?

I think the answer is fair to say both.

If you need help, you can reach out to corporate and foundation relations colleagues within your units or centrally if needed, but you can certainly pursue them independently.

They're they're up for the out there for the for the for the offing.

Does the CFR department support support all UW units?

School of Medicine, our central team can support broadly, but the School of Medicine has its own very skilled embedded corporate and foundation relations team.

And we always encourage our colleagues or or or faculty to begin with their home unit.

As Mark pointed out, not every school and college has has a specialty in corporate and foundation relations that everyone has an advancement team to help with fundraising, but not everyone has this specialist.

So if you happen to be in a unit that lacks the specialist, you can start with our central team, but medicine has a very robust corporate and foundation relations team.

Let's Scroll down.

We have a few more questions.

I'm going in order here because I'm not seeing any sort of up up voting happening to help prioritize them.

We have found that working with industry via OSP is difficult due to significant delays negotiating agreements.

In one instance, we had an industry partner abandoned the project altogether due to delays.

I think there's an opportunity to identify how these negotiations can be streamlined while still protecting UW interests.

I, I think it's fair to say that there are a lot of, there's a lot of progress in this space, including I mentioned earlier Meredith's new role, which was meant to minimize the back and forth happening between the, between OSP and and commotion when it comes to sort of non standard IP terms.

But I'd, I'd like to invite anyone here from OSP to respond to that as well, or, or Mari, anyone who wants to jump in there on that question because I think there's a lot to say here.

Mari would like to answer the question.

Go ahead, Mari.

Thank you.

No, I was going to suggest Meredith should start because we hired Meredith to help with this problem.

Yeah, absolutely.

I really encourage folks and we'll talk about this a little bit more in Hogan and I's presentation as well to work with us early.

So bring commotion in early, bring CFR in early, especially if you're handling something complex.

So for industry sponsors that are particularly interested in kind of the hot button terms, intellectual property, kind of the risk indemnity, warranty section, publication, etcetera, I strongly recommend you bring us in before we're even at the contract negotiation phase at OSP to help speed things up.

We can set expectations for the sponsor of what it's like to work with the university.

So a lot of sponsors we work with are really familiar with working with other kind of corporations and universities are a little bit different.

We prioritize, you know, public benefit, we prioritize publication.

And so making sure we're communicating those things early as what it's like to work with the university, especially a public university, is important.

And I think it really helps with that negotiation process.

We also have some more tips and tricks, but I don't want to give all of our presentation away, so we'll address that more later, too.

Thank you, Meredith.

OK.

It sounds like UW is really willing and excited to work with.

Gosh, where did that question go?

Work with industry partners?

Are there instances where mutual agreements are not reached, preventing the partnership from developing?

If so, how often does this occur?

Mari OK, yeah, I guess I would probably say Carol might be better at answering this.

But yeah, there are instances where mutual agreements are not not reached.

I don't we try to minimize that.

Sometimes the companies have terms that we simply can't agree to because of state laws and but mostly they understand when when you talk to them.

So I don't know, Carol, do you have a sense of the how often it is Sure.

The the frequency of that happening is very, very low.

I've been with the university over 20 years, all in OSP.

And during that time, I can only think of six instances where we were unable to come to an agreement on the terms and conditions.

Sometimes these things do take some time and I want to appreciate the earlier question, but the good news is that we are able to be creative and think through, you know, what are the interests of both parties to get to a satisfactory conclusion for everybody on the term.

So it is not often that we are unable to get to an agreement.

Sometimes it's sometimes it's difficult.

But you know, as said, we're working on trying to figure out where we can be more flexible and finding ways to bring the the time to negotiation down.

Yeah, I will also pipe in very briefly.

I think that's, you know, one important aspect of this is managing expectation for industry and what they can do with the University of Washington and establishing what we can and cannot do.

So there is some work that is ongoing on this.

So Nate Zyadiki, who is right here, he's working on AC-3, which is a joint committee reporting to both the Executive Office and the Faculty Senate.

And thinking about how we can streamline this engagement so that the the expectation are set clearly early on and so that we can move forward without having a misinterpretation of what can and cannot be done in an agreement.

All right, somebody asked if their website presented also contains information for pre award and post award team processes and that it does not.

So that would be probably covered in Meredith and Hogan's and if not, we can follow up in the in the roll up of Q&A afterwards.

Somebody says questions too long to post.

Who can they contact afterwards?

You can ask me, you can ask Mark, we can get you to the right place.

We're here to help Cheryl, who do we work with are partnering with cities, counties and and ports.

Does UTIP have standard service agreements or templates for this kind of work?

I don't know the answer to that.

I consider those public entities and where this is, you know, we're focused in the corporate and foundation relations on private entities.

Does anyone know the answer to that one, Mari?

I would say one of the things we're thinking about is so right now, a lot of that expertise is really in some of the different units.

One of the things that we're thinking about is standing up a central team that would have that expertise to be able to serve more units.

Great, thanks.

Mark, can you drop into the chat?

They're working with industry Link that you mentioned in your conversation.

Someone's having a hard time finding it.

How can we work with faculty to convince them that working with industry is worthwhile?

Well, I would say that the turn out here is is encouraging.

And I think one way we can do that is to continue to provide information and to try to make it easy, you know, information about working with industry and try to make it easier to work with industry.

Mari also would like to respond to that one.

No, no, no.

I'm just clicking to get them as put them in the answered column.

Joanna, I don't know.

Oh, I see.

That's what you're doing.

It says Mari Ostendorf would like to answer this question.

So no, no, no, no, no.

OK, I got it.

All right.

Sorry.

Sorry, do you have more resources on best practices to communicate with industry, How and why, How to structure inquiries?

What type of employee engagements are appropriate to appropriate to ask?

I think that's a bigger question that might warrant a bigger answer and it might even warrant a kind of a deeper dive session in the future.

Does anyone want to take that one?

Our website, our CFR web corporate and foundation relations website has some tools.

I encourage you to explore it.

I don't know if they answer these specific questions.

Yeah, I, I guess that I think I would agree with your start, Joanna, is this is an area we could provide more resources and a reason for having this conversation is to help us know what more we can do.

So thank you.

That's right.

OK.

I think that we are, I'm afraid to keep going with the questions right now because I don't want to cut the next piece short.

So I'm going to make a call and ask to hand things over, to pause on the question responses for now and hand things over to Meredith and Hogan for their presentation.

And if people want to upvote some of these questions that you see in the Q&A, that will be helpful for me as they accumulate and figure out which ones we can respond to in the moment.

All right, handing it over to Hogan and Meredith.

Thank you.

Good questions everyone.

Thanks everybody.

It's great to be here today.

This section is presented by the Office of Sponsored Programs and Commotion.

So that's Hogan Ricks and myself.

So we'll be talking about getting a research agreement in place like before.

This is going to be very much industry focused and you know we're going to be talking a lot about intellectual property in research agreements because that is typically something industry is interested in.

They want to know who's bringing what to the table, who owns what at the end, who's responsible for managing that intellectual property, as well as a quite a few other kind of questions and considerations about public disclosures and confidential information, things like that.

So we're going to be talking functionally about what our offices do, how to work with us and kind of the hot button issues there.

So OSP and Calmotion are very much mission and vision aligned.

However, we work in different places within the research life cycle.

So when you think about OSP, you should think about actual negotiation of the research agreements, kind of functionally asking those questions of are we, you know, reporting to the right folks, are we compliant?

Do we have the right budgets?

Is the scope of work correct?

Is the research agreement itself kind of organized properly?

And are the terms kind of following the legal statutes that we have and what are placed on the university commotion is a little bit different.

We work in a lot of different areas with throughout the research life cycle.

So we can be involved before the project begins, and we encourage you to reach out before the project begins to try to help set up a project in a way that is friendly towards the IP and protective of your existing IP.

Any new IP, while kind of offering what a industry sponsor might want to see in a research agreement to give them that kind of upside, to encourage them to work with the university.

So we can get started pretty early in that phase.

But Call Motion really shines and is really truly involved after intellectual property is developed in protecting that intellectual property and advancing it towards the market.

All right.

I will briefly describe what the Office of Sponsored Programs is and then later in our talk I will highlight a few key terms which your OSP reviewer is likely negotiating with an industry sponsor so as to provide some sort of insight into what occurs when an agreement is in OS.

PS Q for review.

The Office of Sponsored Programs at UW is the office responsible for reviewing, negotiating, approving, and administering externally funded research projects and research related agreements on behalf of the University.

Included in that activity here for this slide are proposals and pre award submissions such as just in time information, which is more commonly associated with federal activity and the next and for the purposes of today, awards agreement.

Awards and agreements capture OS PS responsibilities related to agreement negotiation and signature and post award captures OS PS responsibilities related to the review and signature of amendments to existing research related agreements.

And there's more.

The office also has a sub awards team which issues sub awards to our collaborating entities.

And then apart from the daily tasks of an OSP reviewer, our office maintains and overseas Gems which are EU Dubs sponsored programs policies And many of you may have frequent interaction with our Gems through GEM 19 or GEM 40 with non standard IP terms.

And then finally, OSP supports campus through more general assistance when guidance or other information is needed.

So a common question we also here at OSP and throughout this process is what is commotion?

How does it fall within this scope and discussion, especially early in that research life cycle?

So commotion, among its many facets, serves as U Dubs Technology Transfer Office.

So it guides UW innovations from research to real world impact.

That might mean licensing.

That might mean forming a startup.

That might mean licensing to the sponsor themselves.

That can take on many forms.

It could also make the decision or mean we are making the decision to open source something.

So there's a lot of different kind of approaches we can take, but we want to know kind of early what the goal of the project is to what the researchers goals are, what the sponsors goals are, and try to kind of marry that and align them.

So Commotion protects the UW intellectual property, licenses technologies to industry partners and negotiates agreements, supports startups and spin offs through mentoring resources and sending connections, connects researchers with industry, acting as a bridge for collaboration and commercialization, and evaluates and manages invention disclosures to advance innovations towards the market.

So I started talking about this a little bit earlier, but we work together very closely and we are working to kind of smooth that transition and that work between the two offices even more so in the future.

So we work to align sponsored research agreements with IP and commercialization needs, which is particularly important for industry sponsors who have more kind of obvious commercialization needs and expectations.

We coordinate across the award life cycle to ensure that both funding and IP considerations are addressed early.

We support researchers when projects might generate new IP, so we help figure out what to do with it once there is IP and commotion.

And OSP, as folks have mentioned, has a new dual role supported by myself.

So that is the senior manager of sponsored research IP who conducts consultations and creates customized research plans.

I also work very closely with our IP research agreement terms and I'm able to be a little bit more creative and agile kind of in making sure that we have IP terms that are friendly to the university, supportive to the company's goals, supportive to the researchers goals, follow kind of all of the IP legal norms and follow our policy, but you know, have kind of that flexibility to make some changes and alter as the fact pattern kind of needs.

Next, I will discuss some of the common agreement types that OSP manages.

This is not an exhaustive list.

I'll start with the sponsored research agreement itself.

OSP will negotiate & these agreements whether they are funded or unfunded.

OSP also reviews and signs fellowship agreements.

Teaming agreements, which are commonly used for proposal development in advance of a competitive submission.

Confidential Disclosure agreements, which are commonly used to enable the parties to share confidential information that is needed to evaluate the feasibility of entering into a sponsored research agreement.

And data transfer and use agreements and material transfer agreements, which enable the sharing of data or materials to be used in sponsored research.

So what does that process look like?

We've drafted a loose sponsored industry engagement workflow.

We understand and as anyone who's been through this process knows, it is not always a linear stepwise process.

There are twists and turns.

There are questions that come up later on that you know, we wish we may have addressed earlier.

So I acknowledge that this is maybe a little bit of a rose colored glasses vision of this and we are working to smooth it out.

So first we recommend starting with a conversation, right?

So you found a potential sponsor, you have this great idea, the sponsor says, great, you know, let's let's pursue that.

We really recommend working with CFR and commotion to help kind of smooth out this process, set up expectations.

As I mentioned before, a lot of sponsors are really familiar with working with other corporations and they have kind of aligned interests between UW and a sponsor.

We often see kind of friction or questions around how to work with the university.

Why do we need to publish so quickly?

Why do we need to, you know, really focus on ownership of IP, things like that.

So having that conversation and setting expectations early is crucial.

Next, we recommend defining the project, putting together a scope of work and a budget.

So we have researchers and their units do that.

We then route that through an EGC one to the researcher and the unit route, the EGC one to OSPOSP is responsible for finalizing the agreement.

So that's negotiation, review of the fact pattern, making sure that all compliance, you know, questions have been answered and OSP is responsible for signing these agreements.

Once everything has been signed and the funding has been sorted, the project can begin.

And I'd like to bring up that we have kind of a new more formalized IP consultation process.

So historically, commotion has always of course been available for IP consultations for really any questions or any reason.

But we now have kind of a more formal IP consultation process and a new role myself to kind of fill those questions and gaps.

So IP consultations are a really great way to support researchers or sponsors and understanding IP expectations, developing customized plans for unique IP situations, crafting or refining agreement language to address specialized IP needs, and planning ahead to organize the project in an IP friendly way.

So I've included my information here.

Again, please feel free to reach out to me for support.

I'm always here to help and always happy to help.

If you do have an innovation manager at Commotion that you work with routinely, please feel free to reach out to them as well.

All right.

So if you have consulted with Meredith on intellectual property, then following that consultation and once the direction of your project is clear, you are ready to submit the matter to OSP for review.

So first, you will route an EGC one to OSP, which includes the scope of work, a budget if there is one, a template agreement if the sponsor has provided one, along with other background information which you believe will assist the OSP reviewer and their review.

If the sponsor did not issue a template for UW's review, then OSP can prepare and issue one of our own.

From there, our office will negotiate the agreement with the sponsor and consult with other offices at the university as needed.

And then once OSP and the sponsor have reached an agreement on all terms, OSP approves the matter in Sage.

And I do want to note that OSP is the only office that should sign agreements which enable research for the university.

If you as a faculty member are asked to sign an agreement, please feel free to contact us and we are happy to review and provide guidance as needed.

So continued participation.

So your OSP negotiator, commotion representative, CFR representative, and any other stakeholders on campus that will work with the sponsor to negotiate that research agreement.

We work really closely with researchers throughout this process to ensure the agreement aligns well with the research plans, the laws, academic needs and expectations, IP management and the team's commercialization goals.

As I mentioned earlier, we have quite a few terms in these agreements.

These are a selection of terms that are most negotiated in industry sponsored research agreements, specifically intellectual property, the Washington Innovation Advantage program, which is an optional program.

We'll discuss more in a moment.

Publication rights, confidentiality, liability, indemnification and termination rights.

So first we'll talk about intellectual property.

And to frame this, when we're talking about intellectual property in a industry sponsored research agreement, we are in most scenarios talking about new useful, non obvious, potentially patentable innovations or copyright that may have some sort of commercial use such as software that could be used in a product.

So we're thinking about innovations that could be used by some market.

So there are sometimes other types of intellectual property that we want to try to keep out of kind of muddling with this.

For example, copyright for any sort of paper you might write or copyright for your individual writings of, you know, a description of your project.

So we want to try to make sure we keep those separate.

So in these agreements, we're talking about who owns the invention, copyright and discoveries made during the project.

We're really careful to keep two kind of buckets of intellectual property within these research agreements.

That is the foreground IP or sometimes referred to as project IP.

This is intellectual property that is developed as a direct result within the project.

So it's funded by the project and it is developed within the project.

So that is typically can what a industry sponsor would expect some sort of access to in some way.

We also have a separate bucket background IP which is developed prior to the research agreement or separate from the research agreement.

So it was not funded by the sponsor, but it is necessary or useful in the project in some way, so we bring it to the project or the sponsor brings their background IP to the project.

So we want to keep those concepts separate.

Typically this includes a short option to take a license to IP developed under the project.

So foreground IP, we're giving the company the right, but not the obligation to take a license typically for three to six months to any foreground IP developed under the project.

We want to avoid providing any rights to research developed separately.

So background IP in research agreements, this has to be licensed separately.

So why does this matter to researchers?

Your ability to patent, license or further develop your work and use it in future research too depends on IP terms in the research agreement that we put in upfront.

So it's very important that we're addressing this even if you don't think your project is necessarily the most IP focused project.

I'd also like to talk a little bit about the Washington Innovation Advantage program, which is a unique program we have here at UW.

You'll often hear it referred to as WYAP.

It is a entirely optional streamlined and prepackaged IP licensing program that allows sponsors and UW researchers to mutually opt in to preset financial terms for commercial licenses to foreground IP.

This is done within the research agreement, so it must be set up when the research agreement is drafted.

We can't start a project and then go back later and decide to add these terms.

So why this matters?

It can reduce negotiation time and financial uncertainty.

It can speed up agreement execution and remove some of the common IP barriers, making industry collaboration faster and easier to launch.

So for example, sometimes we'll see industry sponsors ask for ownership of all of U Dubs IP, or we'll ask for a free license to kind of, you know, make and use any IP that we make within the project.

And so it's really important that we have this kind of option to put in front of sponsors in case they want to kind of ensure or make sure they have access to it.

So it's a good negotiation tool in those situations where we have sponsors asking for a lot that is kind of outside of the bounds of what the state can offer.

Next, I will discuss publication rights, but I'd also like to preface the next few slides by saying the goal is not for you to walk away with an academic understanding of these key terms, but more so to provide background information as to why OSP believes these terms are important and how they can affect the research our investigators are conducting.

So publication rights are the contractual provisions that allow university research researchers to publish their results.

Industry sponsors typically will receive an opportunity to review publications before they are released so as to protect any of their confidential information, and this also enables them to file patents before results are published.

Your OSP reviewer is structuring their agreements so that there is a clear path to publication because the freedom to publish and disseminate research results and is an essential component of UW and its fundamental commitment to maintaining an open academic environment.

If non standard publication terms which amount to a publication restriction are required by the industry sponsor.

The University's Faculty Council on Research will review the matter and approve or deny requests to accept the publication restriction.

This is important for our investigators to know conceptually because overly restrictive publication terms can affect institutional requirements, student degree requirements, and your academic freedom, and that if your trainees to publicly disseminate research results.

Next, we will discuss confidentiality and in the context of industry sponsored research agreements.

Confidentiality refers to the obligations governing how each party agrees to handle non public information which is disclosed during the research relationship.

Confidential information will typically include information such as a company's proprietary technical information, but we do see some industry sponsors that seek to include the research results themselves in the definition of confidential information.

And confidential information is generally subject to a few reasonable use restrictions, such as prohibiting the information from being used outside of the research project or limiting access to the confidential information to only the employees at UW who need to know it.

And then from UW's perspective, the confidentiality terms are usually subject to the university's publication rights and the university's obligations under the Washington Public Records Act.

This term matters to the faculty to understand because overly broad confidentiality terms can limit what you can discuss within your lab, with trainees, with faculty members and other labs at the university, with collaborators outside of the university, and even what you can share at conferences prior to publication.

Next, we will discuss liability and in the context of industry sponsored research agreements.

Liability clauses allocate the financial and legal responsibility for damages or claims that arise from a research project, and common types of liability that can arise in a sponsored research project are personal injury, property damage, infringement of an intellectual property, misuse of research results, data privacy violations, and many more.

So as a general rule, your OSP reviewer is structuring their agreements such that each party is liable only for the negligent acts and omissions of its own employees.

And your OSP reviewer is also disclaiming liability for a variety of damages.

And by doing this, they are protecting the UW from liability exposure related to damages arising from the sponsors lost profits, any business interruptions or lost business opportunities to the extent they may arise from the negligence of UW personnel.

And then also research is experimental in nature.

So your OSP reviewer is also disclaiming all warranties to the research results themselves and this includes disclaiming the warranties of merchant ability and fitness for a particular purpose.

And the behind the scenes strategy within OSP here is that our approach is to align U dubs liability exposure to mirror that which is covered by UW self insured funds so that essentially the research activity activities themselves become insured risks.

And this term is important for investigators to understand because non standard liability which is required by an industry sponsor can expose an investigator's lab and the UW more broadly to significant financial risk.

And the next, and closely related to liability, is indemnification.

Indemnification simply means that one party to an agreement has agreed to defend and pay for claims that are brought against the other party to the agreement.

And as a general rule, your OSP reviewer is structuring the indemnity provisions and their agreements such that the indemnity obligations apply mutually to the UW and the sponsor, with each party's indemnity obligations limited to damages arising from its own negligence.

The practical implication here is that this allocation requires each party to defend and identify the other party for claims only attributable to its own negligent conduct.

So as a quick example, we can easily imagine a scenario where a sponsor provides a defective piece of equipment to the university which causes personal injury to a member in the P is lab.

Because this injury resulted from the sponsor's negligence, the sponsor will step in and indemnify the university for any resulting claims which are brought against the university.

And as you could imagine, indemnity provisions are a bit more complex in a company's template agreement.

But the university's position on indemnity is somewhat uniquely informed by its status as a governmental entity.

And as a governmental entity, U Dubs.

Ability to provide indemnity to a third party such as a company sponsor is informed and somewhat limited by state law, which we can discuss in the Q and A portion if there is any interest.

You should know that your OSP reviewer is structuring the indemnity obligations to align with the university's self insured funds and other insurance policies so that also the obligation to provide the indemnity itself is an insured risk.

And this matters to our investigators because if a company sponsor requires a non standard indemnification term that can expose your lab and the Utah more broadly to significant financial risk.

Next we will discuss termination rights and these are actually important to the university in the context of industry sponsored research agreements.

Termination rights are the provisions in our agreements that allow the parties to end the agreement before the project has completed, and this is typically subject to reasonable notice and the sponsors agreement to pay for work performed and committed costs.

The termination clauses and our agreements will detail how the parties may terminate, along with what happens to funding, equipment, data, publications and even intellectual property.

And it's important to know that the University generally requires liberal termination rights to protect your academic freedom.

And by doing this, the University allows investigators to discontinue a project if it is no longer scientifically interesting, valid, or feasible without undue restriction or penalty.

A common question that Hogan and I receive is how do I accelerate my agreement review process?

I understand that sometimes this is a complex question and has lots of different kind of facets.

But in general, our advice to you is make sure that your EGC 1 includes scope of work.

Make sure that budgets are accurate and aligned to the scope of work.

Align expectation around IP early, especially if it's something that's important to your sponsor.

So work with Commotion and myself to do that.

Align publication rights.

Again, helping kind of set expectations and the need to publish and explaining, you know, a university's need to publish to a sponsor is helpful.

And I recommend working with OSP and CFR to do that.

Correctly identify compliance concerns when routing an EGC 1.

So we'll rely heavily on our units to disclose potential compliance concerns like export control, privacy and IRB considerations.

And then I also recommend that folks bring in us when we're discussing highly complex multi party agreements.

So we've certainly seen an uptick in these in recent months and years.

Joanna, Mark Hogan and myself can certainly attest to that.

So for example, we'll see complex and gift and sponsored research agreement hybrids.

We see quite a few nonprofits providing funding, while a for profit entity, perhaps a pharmaceutical company is providing a drug for a study or multiple pharmaceutical drug or companies are providing drugs for a study.

And they all are kind of involved in one project and they have competing interests.

So having those conversations early is incredibly helpful so that we can kind of help set expectation.

So just a quick note on what researchers and departments should avoid.

Another common question.

So negotiating agreements alone, you do not have to walk this path alone, nor do we want you to.

So please reach out.

Please do not feel the need to negotiate your research agreement.

Your job is to set up the project and put together the scope of work and kind of think about your goals and how this helps you achieve your kind of academic goals.

But please do not negotiate agreements alone.

You don't have to.

You also should not sign research agreements or binding term sheets.

You should avoid promising ownership or royalty free licensing of UW invented IP.

You should avoid agreeing to long publication delays and reviews.

You should avoid negotiating FNA rates without OSP involvement and making public disclosures of confidential information or data of potentially patentable information without some sort of confidentiality agreement in place.

So this could potentially corrupt or prevent us from filing a patent application later down the line.

So it's important to think about kind of who you're disclosing this information to and if you have a confidentiality agreement.

So once your sponsored project is completed, first of all, congratulations, you've successfully completed a sponsored research project and potentially developed some translatable IP.

That's fantastic.

So Commotion takes it from here.

Commotion Reports We recommend that you report any innovations to Commotion and work with your innovation manager to establish how to protect the AP Manage sponsor reporting and encumbrances because these research agreements often require us within a relatively short time frame to report innovations to a sponsor.

Develop and commercialize the IP further, whether that be the sponsors decision to exercise likely their option to that project AP or if that's to license it to multiple parties after that option has expired or form a start up.

There are a variety of different approaches, so work with us to kind of manage those and then commotion is responsible for physically licensing the IP as well.

I've included some helpful links and contact information for OSP and I've done the same here for commotion.

We also have some helpful resource links for items that we've mentioned throughout this presentation.

And now we have some time for questions.

I'll let Joanna speak to that.

Thank you so much, Meredith and Hogan.

Before we get to questions, and there are some good ones in there, I was remiss in not introducing a couple of other experts here who may be able to answer some questions.

Adam Bueno is assistant vice Provost for shared research facilities in the Office of Research.

Also in the Office of Research is Carol Rhodes, formerly the head of OSP but now the assistant vice Provost for Research, Compliance and Administration, and Nate Snidecky, professor of mechanical engineering and chair of the Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property Policy and and Practice.

So let's get to the questions and thank you so much for doing your uploading 'cause that really helps in the sorting.

So the first question is, please clarify.

Are there standard service agreement templates at all or standard recommend recommended language?

Who wants to take that one, Carol?

I I can speak to that.

Because Sponsored programs doesn't handle service agreements.

There are no templates available from OSP, although the Office of Research is coordinating together with other units across the university to help develop template language.

And so because a lot of the clauses can carry over from a sponsored program type agreement to a service agreement, there is some expertise and knowledge there that we can help with developing templates or library of clauses.

So we recognize that's a need because units would like to be provided templates from which they can work.

So we are looking forward to developing some of that.

Great question.

Thanks, Carol.

What if, oh hold on a second, what if a project has both funding from federal funds and companies?

How do people balance the competing interests slash requirements?

For example, a capstone project.

It might be a capstone project, but using data from federally funded data.

That doesn't seem worth the effort to deal with the conflict for that small amount of money.

Can someone address that one?

Everybody wants to take that.

I'll take a stab at it.

There may be some real live examples that have currently run through USP.

You know, that can help form the answer a little bit.

It it, whether it's worth it or not, I think is a difficult thing to answer.

There can be some limitations on how the data can be used if it was generated off of a federal program and then used later on other projects that are, you know, sponsored by industry.

However, we have a lot of that that exists at the university and there are certainly clauses that work very well for that, that are palatable for the industry sponsor.

And there are probably more limitations on that there.

There's a perception that there are limitations on that federal data that maybe are not quite there and there's a lot of broader usage of that data that's allowed.

So we're happy to, you know, look at any particular situation and give more detailed answers.

But I think that the barriers really are things that we can work through very easily.

We have, like I said, a lot of situations where data that was generated on a federally sponsored program are used downstream.

So I hope that helped answer that question a little bit.

I'm not quite sure if it was about using federal data downstream.

So, yeah, and I can address, I just wanted to add that increasingly federal agencies are wanting data to be open, in which case it would not be an issue.

Meredith, of course I can address the intellectual property considerations as well for federally funded projects crossing over to kind of industry funded projects.

So if you are bringing intellectual property from a federally funded project or potentially kind of Co developing the intellectual property, we do so have some really helpful language that's now standard in our templates that references and I won't get into the details too much by Dole.

If you're familiar with the legal framework of by DOLE, all intellectual property developed under a federal funding source is subject to by Dole.

Companies are usually quite familiar with this.

And so we are usually very upfront with kind of including the by DOLE language, our standard by DOLE language and companies are usually quite receptive to that.

In certain scenarios they are not, but I can work with you to kind of address that and make sure that if they are not comfortable with the buy dole funding that we are absolutely not using anything from a federal source, but that is pretty uncommon.

All right, thanks, Meredith.

All right, next question.

You mentioned engaging OSP and commotion early, but sometimes the timeline is very short for getting your proposal from concept to submission.

What's the reasonable timeline for this process in negotiation?

Who wants to take that one?

I can take that one as well.

So of course, I recommend reaching out as early as you can.

So if that is, you know, within a couple of days of you needing to route an EGC one, that's OK.

That being said, if you don't have the time or you know, the conversation happens really quickly and you submit an EGC one, the OSP team is very much engaged with me and reach reaches out to me routinely.

Hogan and I are probably communicating about half a dozen agreements per day.

So just make sure that you reference, you know, in your EGC one that you have questions, comments or concerns about intellectual property or some other item, and your reviewer will reach out to me or the relevant stakeholder and make sure we address it as quickly as we can.

Thank you, Meredith.

All right.

What determines whether a project is classified as a service agreement handled by a Dean's office versus the research agreement handled by OSP?

Who wants to take that one?

Yeah, I actually will drop a link in the chat that points to the criteria to consider when deciding is a sponsored program or is this a service agreement scenario.

And I guess the the hallmark with that is if there is work that's going to be done that is primarily for the benefit of the customer, then that is likely more of the service agreement scenario.

And so that page that I'll drop in the link to that has more fleshed out criteria to consider, which I won't cover here because there's quite a bit.

Thanks, Carol.

OK, Here's one for IP protection.

The industry often would like to go through the sponsor project that would be handled by OSP.

However, it's often hard to proceed due to the high overhead, which is exactly the same as the federal, federal funding overhead.

Do we have any solutions for potential potentially lowering the overhead?

Who wants to take that one?

I can take a stab.

I would say generally no.

And the university is not permitted by the federal government to offer an industry sponsor a lower rate than the federal government itself receives.

Yeah, kind of simple as that, right.

All right, next question way like this one.

It's interesting to know how to work with OSP.

However, that is assuming the relation relationship has gotten that far along.

While it can be challenging for us researchers to even get there in the 1st place, how to pitch industry an idea that is mutually beneficial so they consider sponsoring our work.

I understand this is usually much different than a grant, more like selling a business ideas, it's going to be covered at all.

You might question person who asked the question might have missed a part of Mark's presentation talking about the value proposition that's important to develop for companies and and how your corporate corporate relations colleagues either within your unit, your home unit.

And if those people aren't, if you don't have embedded corporate relations people, you could start with our central team.

Mark and his team can help you frame your work in a way that offers a value proposition to industry if possible.

Mark, would you add to that in any way?

No, that was great.

Yeah, utilize your CFR teams.

Exactly.

There you go.

Great.

Thank you.

Next question, question in order.

How can I list my lab as potential research partner or industry consultant?

Additionally, I've collaborated with several companies through design studio courses.

Is it possible to post these future partnership opportunities on the partner with UW website?

That's an interesting idea.

Anyone want to weigh in on whether I'd like to mark hand that one off to Adam?

Yeah, I was going to say Adam may have a great insight on that.

So just to clarify, it's, it's how to how to market yourself to these companies.

I think, I think so.

I mean it's kind of getting getting their availability out there in front of companies.

Yeah, but this is this is Adam the design studio point.

So I think it really connects with some of the working with companies directions that you've done and maybe you're not doing now, but but you could think about incorporating that sounds great.

I will be fully honest having been at the university for a few months, I'm not totally familiar with Design Studio.

However, you know, the directory that we've recently established a company with the homepage, this is something that's readily available to to companies, something we're promoting in that space.

And it's a really easy way of just giving companies a general idea of what you're doing, the capabilities you have and updated contact information so that they can engage with you on, on, on those fronts.

Outside of that, you know, we're making ourselves available for those companies as well.

So that kind of in a similar relationship with Mark that Mark has with these companies, we can also then put them in touch with the groups or the the resources at the university to help them with their project.

So I just want to add, you know, the current web page we have and, and Adam you can put in the chat is really more aimed at maybe other categories of facilities.

When we put that together, we weren't thinking about things like design studios.

But if you can think if, if you can think of a place that you fit in or or not that Adam would be a good person to reach out to.

Super.

Thank you.

We are not going to get to all these questions, but we have maybe time for a couple more.

How do non disclosure agreements fit into these processes?

Often industry wants that before they'll even proceed past initial meet and greet idea generation conversations.

We find it's getting an NDA signed is extremely time consuming and in our position many times to just ask them to trust us while the NDA works it way works its way through the system.

Who wants to take that one?

I can.

I, I, I would say it's helpful if you route an NDA on an EGC one.

If you can include the date that you are scheduling a meeting with the company and the OSP reviewer can try to prioritize the NDA review in line with that date.

As with anything that routes the OSP, the sooner you can get it to us, the better cooked we are to meet the deadline.

Great.

OK, here's one.

Does CFR and or commotion assist in market analysis?

For example, potential demand in revenue for the impact of a developing product.

This may help with pitching in kind gifts and or sponsorships, strengthening the likeliness of support.

We don't do that in CFR.

What about commotion, Francois?

Yeah, I would say that that we do landscape analysis that is associated with intellectual property protection.

If we have a start up as part of their process as they go through our programs, they may benefit from from our resources to conduct this type of market analysis.

But we do not have the dedicated resources to do that.

All right.

Should PIS or departments expect to be copied on OS?

PS e-mail negotiations with industry partners, maybe someone from OSP?

I would say I always do.

I I'm tempted to ask Carol if that is an office requirement.

I don't know the answer to that question, but I I do we don't.

In OSP, there hasn't been traditionally a policy one way or the other on that.

I would say unfortunately does depend.

There are times when it wouldn't be necessary to also clutter the Pi inbox with the back and forth that can occur, especially for instance, if it's back and forth on something like indemnification that Hogan was talking about.

However, there are often times where it's necessary to involve the Pi in the awareness of what's being discussed because we may need an acknowledgement from the Pi or confirmation that something can move forward a certain way because it might impact the more programmatic part of what's going on.

And so it, it, it does depend, I think if API wishes to be aware of the emails that may go between OSP and a sponsor, they can certainly request that in the EGC 1.

Thank you very much.

We have run out of time for questions.

I know Francois would like to say a few words to close this out.

These are great questions.

Trust that you will get answers to them in some form of follow up that will that will work out.

So I want to hand it, I want to thank you all for the questions.

I want to thank my colleagues for the good answers.

And I want to hand it to to Francois, Thank you.

I see that we've got one minute to close.

You know, first, thank you to all the presenters and panelists and thank you to all of you for attending.

There is a pent up demand for this type of information.

And what we wanted to do here is really to help clarify what we're doing and showing what is happening under the hood because this is important for everyone to understand.

We want to work with you.

We do realize that the federal landscape is changing and that's industry sponsorship is going to be important.

So we're going to keep these conversations open and make sure that we can do the best for you.

Help us to do so by communicating early and often with OSPN commotion so we can move forward in the most productive way and the fastest way possible.

We also did not cover some things that many of you are interested, for example, how can we sponsor graduate student with industrial fellowship and so on and so forth.

And this could be an opportunity for an additional workshop.

So please reach out to us and let us know what was valuable in this workshop and what you would like to hear next, because this is all aligned with what we're trying to do through the Provost Research, Resilience and Transformation initiative and through our new strategy plans.

So looking forward to your comments.

Thank you, everyone.

We appreciate your time and thank you again, all panelists and speakers.

Cheers.

Bye bye everyone.