

NSF ILO Retreat

June 12 - 14, 2013
Fort Collins, Colorado





Synopsis

Retreat Organization

Agenda team (Bob Bower: EUV, Leonard Katz: Synberc, Brad Trento: CURENT and Rad Roberts, CSNE)

The Agenda Team held conference calls and exchanged e-mails to gather agenda topics, assign discussion leaders to each topic and refine the schedule. The team communicated progress and solicited input during ILO Working Group monthly conference calls leading up to the retreat. Some form of this strategy has been successfully used for ILO Retreat planning for several years now. The agenda was organized around three high level sections as follows:

1. Early Stage ERC Topics
 - a. Role of the ILO and Role of the IAB
 - b. Membership Agreements
 - c. IP Strategies
2. General ERC Topics
 - a. Recruiting and Retaining Members
 - b. Marketing and Communications
3. Late Stage ERC Topics
 - a. Examples of Sustainability Plans
 - b. Sustainability Planning Resources and Strategies

Other agenda highlights included an overview of the updated industry program chapter in the ERC Best Practices Manual and a response from Deborah to questions submitted to the NSF.

Financial Planning

In previous years, the NSF provided funds to pay for the retreat costs as well as much of the travel expense for attendees. This year's funding strategy was based on the fact that there would be no Annual ERC Meeting in 2013. Therefore, the funds budgeted for ILO expenses by each Center for that meeting would be applied to the retreat. In order to pay for the administrative cost of the retreat, the host Center charged a registration fee, just as is done by for the Annual ERC Meeting. Because costs in general are lower in Colorado than in the D.C area, the cost to each Center to send an ILO to the retreat should have been less than what was budgeted to send that ILO to the Annual ERC Meeting. For example, the registration fee was about \$100 less than that charged for last year's Annual ERC Meeting. Hotel and meal costs were also significantly less. Finally, because Denver is a major airport, airline tickets were similar to or lower than those required to fly into the D.C. area.

The registration fee paid for the registration website and registration services, lunches on both days as well as refreshments during the meetings, a dinner event, facility and equipment rentals, transportation services and incidentals. The estimated total cost was divided by the number of people who committed to attending. This resulted in a calculated registration fee of \$250.00.

This system should work well for future years as long as there is sufficient advanced planning to



2013 ILO Retreat



determine a budget and early, firm commitment from attendees to allow the host Center to calculate the fee with confidence.

Event Management

Making all of the arrangements with suppliers/vendors, putting together incidentals (name tags, folders, note pads), checking in registrants and responding to individual problems and needs, and providing for the countless small tasks necessary for a successful meeting is a much bigger job than one person can handle. In the case of this retreat, assistance from other members of the EUV ERC, significantly our Education Director, Kaarin Goncz and our administrative assistant, Becky Burke, provided a necessary layer of coverage and backup. However, of critical importance was the use of the CSU Conference Services Office providing website, registration and financial management. The latter was essential to the processing of the registration fees.

Communications

During the planning stages, the agenda team summarized the evolving plans and logistics both through e-mail and, starting in January, short presentations at the ILO Working Group monthly conference call. It was very important in these early communications to establish the dates and travel logistics for the people who needed obtain trip approval and make travel arrangements. To support this, it was important to have the registration website up as early as possible, in this case, the middle of March. The website contained links supporting all travel arrangements as well as an explanation of the retreat logistics and a continuously updated agenda. The website also provided for registration and the collection of registration fees. The meeting information was repeated in e-mails with attachments sent out on several occasions to the ILO community. Finally, e-mail reminders were sent out in the days before the meeting. These communications were not sufficient, however, as indicated by the number of questions people had about already disseminated information both the evening before and the morning of the retreat. The retreat organizer cannot assume that everyone has read the communications. Therefore, it is important to have at least an informal gathering the evening before the retreat and to have several people involved the morning of the retreat to help gather and direct the attendees. Further, it is extremely helpful to obtain cell phone numbers for attendees to facilitate last minute contact. These strategies proved to be extremely helpful in managing this retreat.

Presentations

The goal of the agenda team was to have as many people as possible involved in the meeting whether presenting or assisting in some manner. This ILO group will easily engage in extended and meaningful discussions so the guideline for each speaker was to plan for about 50% presentation and 50% discussion in the allotted time. This strategy was not entirely successful as some presentations ran long requiring us to consume buffers (breaks) built into the schedule. We were also required to cut off discussion in order to move on to the next presentation. If this guideline is used in the future, the event organizers need to stress the 50% rule and presenters need to make a serious effort to adhere to that rule. That being said, as indicated in the survey at the end of this report, future agenda teams may want to reduce the number of topic/presentations and build in more time for discussion.



June 12th

Arrive at the Hilton Fort Collins

6:00-8:00

Informal Reception at the Hilton

June 13th

8:00

Meet in the Hilton lobby and board the vans to Tamasag

8:30-9:00

Welcome & Introductions

Early Stage ERC Topics

8:30-8:50

Role of the ILO (Bob Bower)



Role of the ILO.pdf

8:50-9:20

The role of the IAB (Leonard Katz)



Role of the IAB.pdf

9:20-10:20

Managing confidential information and intellectual Property

9:20 - 9:50 Membership agreements/NDAs (Peter Ackermann)



Membership Agreements.pdf

9:50-10:20 IP strategies (John Mitchell)



IP Strategies for the ILO v3.pdf

10:20-11:00

Break

11:00-12:00

Best Practices Manual Updates (Erik Sander)



Elysium ILO Consultant Best Pract

12:00-1:00

Lunch



General ERC Topics

1:00-2:30

Recruiting and Retaining Industry Members (Peter Keeling and Rad Roberts)



ILO retreat - Roberts v1.pdf NSF Innovation ILO Jun2013.pdf

2:30-3:30

Marketing and Communications (Brad Trento and Randy Eager)



Randy Eager ILO Retreat-Communicati

3:30-4:00

Break and Open discussion

4:00

Board vans for trip to EUV Labs

4:15-5:15

Lab tour



CSU Lab Tour Intro.pdf

6:30-9:00

Dinner Event and Networking

June 14th

Late Stage ERC Topics

8:30-9:00

Overview of the EUV ERC Sustainability Plan (Bob Bower)



The EUV ERC Sustainability Plan.pdf

9:00-9:20

Role of a Sustainability Director (Mike Gust)



Role of Sustainability Director.pdf

9:20-9:40

Building a plan – who, when, how ... (Saied Agahi)



In the context of this presentation, please read the following disclaimer from Deborah Jackson of the NSF ERC program: *“Although the CIAN Incorporated concept is intriguing, its incorporation needs to be developed entirely outside of the ERC. Specifically,*

- *NSF funds must not be used to fund the creation of the entity;*
- *The NSF supported manpower cannot be tasked to create such an entity;*
- *The NSF imprimatur cannot be used to attract investors into such an entity;*
- *There can be no expressed or implied NSF endorsement of the business entity*



BuildingSustainablePlan.pdf



9:40-10:00	Successful implementation from the point of view of a graduated center (Erik Sander)
	 Erik Sander View from a Graduated Cei
10:00-10:20	Break
10:20-10:50	Questions for Deborah and the NSF
	 QUESTIONS-ANSWERS FOR NSF.pdf
10:50-11:15	Determining the Key Take-aways from the retreat
11:15-12:00	Observations and wrap-up (Erik Sander)
12:00	Lunch

Key Take Aways

As a useful identification of the important topics covered in the retreat, our take away list takes several forms. First, within each of the three sessions, we can identify the ideas and learnings of highest value to the group. In addition, our parking lot list provides subjects for future discussions. This list contains items that stimulated discussion but, because of time constraints or because the items were tangential to the topic, needed to be reserved for future work. We also conducted a survey that helped us define which topics covered in the retreat were of the most value to the participants. This survey also provided an opportunity for participants to suggest other topics they would like to see covered in future forums. Finally, during our wrap-up session, we touched briefly on selected points. The following provides a summary of these areas.

Key Take Aways from Within the Meetings

- The role of an ERC ILO is much broader than many people realize. It would be useful for Center directors, especially new Center directors, to view the list from the retreat presentation.
- The ILO at some Centers may be assisted by people responsible for program or media/communication functions or student ILOs, but, ultimately, the Center ILO is responsible for all of these tasks.
- Partnering with other Center staff members, such as the Education Director, provides for a richer program overall.
- Most Centers conduct at least two IAB meetings a year but these interactions take many different forms. Some Centers conduct frequent (monthly) teleconferences.
- In some Centers, the IAB is involved in reviewing research proposals but their recommendations take the form of guidance. Ultimately, the Center makes the final decisions.



- In the case of membership agreements, simplicity works best. Although there are essential things to cover in an agreement, it should be structured to minimize the need to go to the university or member legal departments.
- Avoid the impulse to create custom membership agreements.
- Use of a two-way NDA as an appendix will reduce the need to change the master membership agreement.
- All Centers share similar strategies in promoting value including, access to graduates, royalty and IP rights, access to information, access to faculty and labs, and access to pre-publications, presentations and reports. But the amount of access may be determined by membership levels and the associated levels of investment.
- It is critical that, in the first year of a Center, all university partnering agreements, IP management, disclosure, industry partner rights, policies protecting students, policies regarding foreign university exchanges and IP management, and industry partner rights and responsibilities are in place.
- Industry partner agreements should be beneficial and equitable to both parties.
- Industry partner agreements should provide for the rights and obligations of company subsidiaries/sister/parent organizations.
- When working with foreign firms, an ERC must assure that there is a true two-way and equitable flow of information.
- ERC members may want to explore research directions that don't map perfectly onto the ERC's core research goals – met through other mechanisms, such as sponsored contract research or fellowship research.
- ERC visibility is enhanced when the Director travels and gives presentations at technology meetings but the impact is even greater when key faculty also play a role in marketing at these events.
- There should be an annual budget for the Industry Program.
- A key factor in retaining a company's membership in the IAB is the continuous existence of a strong ERC champion within the company unit.
- The level of active industry member participation in an ERC is directly related to the benefits accrued.
- Institutional factors (e.g. degree of university commitment, extent to which the center is prized, whether center's policies support cross-disciplinary research and education) are critical. The ERC should be a leader on campus in establishing a systems-level approach to research and development, fostering research and education collaborations with industry, and building strong innovation programs – serving as templates for other programs to establish the “ERC culture” across the partnering universities.
- Post NSF funding cycle, education, outreach, and industrial collaboration programs are typically under the most stress, since the research program can to a degree rely on more traditional funding sources for a university. In order to maintain a true ERC culture, these programs, especially education, must be sufficiently valued by faculty and students such that they will be maintained. This usually requires a core group of faculty dedicated to these functions.
- Due to contamination concerns, some companies do not want to receive a full invention disclosure.



- Signing up Innovation Partners just for the sake of having Innovation Partners does not provide any significant benefit.
- Account management tools such as those used in sales are an excellent way to track and manage relationships with current and potential industry partners.
- Persistence is essential to finding and winning over the right contacts within a potential new member company.
- In negotiating a membership with a new company, it is more important to focus on the internal champion than to spend excessive amounts of time working with the legal department.
- When recruiting a new company, you need to find as senior a contact as possible but also build connections with more than one person.
- Cold calling does not work.
- Put in sufficient effort and creativity to retain members because members who leave do not come back.
- Begin sustainability planning early, before the 5th year. Begin by setting goals for what the post-NSF Center will look like.
- While negotiating and winning sources of income during the life of the Center, expand the vision and time frame to beyond 10 years to help set that expectation.
- Begin implementation well before graduation. A good metric to determine the success of that implementation is, with total funding levels remaining the same or increasing, the percentage of the NSF ERC funding, in relation to that total, decreases.
- Once industry fees have paid for the costs of the industry program, get IAB approval to apply the remaining industry fees to graduate fellowships.
- Identify and engage as many stakeholders as possible as early as possible in the sustainability process planning and implementation.
- A sustainability director can lead efforts to procure funding and provide coordination and leadership to meet the goals and implement the strategies of the sustainability plan. This person is the owner of the sustainability plan.
- An ERC is not well positioned or organized to create commercial entities and bring products based on Center developed technology to market. Although a commercial entity created to meet this need may represent an important strategy, such an entity cannot be created within the ERC, cannot be supported with NSF funds, cannot be staffed with people paid by NSF funds, cannot use the NSF imprimatur to attract investors and will not receive an endorsement by the NSF.
- During the meeting, there was often insufficient time for discussions inspired by the presentations. Future meetings might benefit from shorter and fewer presentations and more time budgeted for discussion.
- Although starting sustainability planning early is a good thing, there is a risk of planning fatigue and a fuzzy concept of the future at a time when there is too much else to do. However, starting too late reduces the leverage (especially in year 6) the Center will have with university administration.
- Build a financial plan and publically track it from year 7 onwards.
- For sustainability planning, consider other funding agencies and programs (NIH, IUCRC)
- Keep the core team engaged and bring them together regularly to discuss funding opportunities.



2013 ILO Retreat



- Consider shared support with the college for staff positions (ILO, ED, AD ...)
- The Center must be prepared to run a very lean post-graduation operation.

Parking Lot

Throughout the retreat, attendees identified topics of interest that were outside of the planned agenda but for which there was a high interest in further examination at some future forum such as the monthly ILO Working Group conference call or the ERC meeting breakout sessions. These topics were put into a parking lot for future reference. The list of topics follows:

Parking Lot Topics:

- Membership Agreements and dues – agreement change process
- Contamination Concerns
- Student role in IP – startups with IP agreements
- Definition of the IAB
- Bylaw modifications
- IP education
- Relationship management tools and project management tools – can the NSF recommend and provide centralized tools for ERC use
- Challenges in hiring international students
- Student ILO Experiences
- IAB dues, payment and billing
- ILO budget benchmarking (industry program budget)
- IAB proposal review and IP contamination
- Impact on Perfect Pitch of sequestration
- Cross fertilization breakout session at ERC-wide meetings – with participation by graduated ERCs

Retreat Survey

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following:	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The ILO Retreat met my expectations		1	1	7	4
The subject matter dealt with important topics of ILO focus		1		6	6
The time allocated for discussion was about right		4	1	8	
My participation in this retreat will benefit my ERC's program		1	2	4	6
We should continue to hold an ILO Retreat every year		1	1	5	6



2013 ILO Retreat



How satisfied were you with the following:	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Registration Process and Website			3	10
Meals		1	5	7
Tamasag Facilities			4	9
Hilton Facilities			5	8
Dinner Event at the Fort Collins Brewery		1	2	10

What topics were of most value to you?

- Role of the ILO-3
- Role of the IAB
- Marketing and Communications-4
- Sustainability -5
- Membership agreements -3
- Intellectual property-3
- Lead generation
- NDA/CDA
- Contamination - 2
- Best Practices Manual
- Recruiting and Retaining Industry Members

What topics would you like to see expanded (possibly in the monthly conference call)?

- Tools for relationship management-2
- ILO budget benchmarking and distributions - 2
- Networking with other ILOs
- Other funding opportunities beyond SECO
- Best Practices manual
- Entrepreneurship activities or programs implemented by ERCs

What additional topic(s) would you like to see in future ILO retreats?

- Tour was not very engaging
- Explicit discussion on membership agreements
- See Parking Lot – 3
- Discussion and demos of software for relationship management - 2
- Document Management between institutions
- Membership agreements and dues change process

	No	Maybe	Yes
Would you be willing to help organize the next retreat?	5	4	4
Do you plan on attending the next ILO Retreat?	1	1	13

Those who said no to the question about organizing a retreat would like to do it in some future year but not next year. In several cases, it will be a renewal year review. One Center wanted to be better established before they hosted a retreat.



2013 ILO Retreat



Attendee List

FIRST NAME	LAST NAME	AFFILIATION	TITLE	ERC NAME
Peter	Ackermann	UC Berkeley	Industry Liaison Officer	SynBERC
Saied	Agahi	University of Arizona	Chief Industry and Innovation Officer	CIAN
Robert	Bower	Colorado State University	ILO	EUV
Evan	Castro	National Science Foundation/University of Portland	WINS Student	
Seth	Crossno	NC State University	ILO	FREEDM Systems Center
Lawrence	Dunn	University of Texas at Austin	Industrial Liaison Officer	NASCENT
Randy	Eager	Carnegie Mellon	ILO	QoLT
Michael	Gust	University of Minnesota	Industrial Liaison Officer	CCEFP
Douglas	Hausner	Rutgers University	ILO	C-SOPS
Deborah	Jackson	NSF	Program Director	
Leonard	Katz	UC Berkeley	Director of Research & Industry Relations	SynBERC
Peter	Keeling	Iowa State University	Innovation Director	CBIRC
Scott	Keller	UCLA	ILO	TANMS
Silvia	Mioc	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	Director of Innovation and Industrial Collaborations	Smart Lighting ERC
John	Mitchell	ASU	Industrial Liaison Officer	QESST
Christian	Nilson	Stanford University	ILO	ReNUWiT
Rad	Roberts	University of Washington	Industry Liaison	Sensorimotor Neural Engineering
Erik	Sander	Elysium Holdings / Univ of Florida	CEO	
Peter	Seoane	NC A&T State University	Industrial Liaison Officer	Revolutionizing Metallic Biomaterials
Thomas	Snyder	NC State University	Industrial Liaison Officer	ASSIST
Brad	Trento	University of Tennessee	ILO	CURENT



Photos



