

October 15, 1974: At a breakout meeting during a conference at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio, a few of the breakout meeting attendees agree to contribute funds to form a new association. One of the original founders, Ray E. Synder, describes the birth of SUPA in a paper he presented to Patricia Harsche, as an AUTM representative, in March, 2002, as follows:

"At the 1973 annual meeting of NCURA, held at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, DC, part of one afternoon of the total program was devoted to patents. Most of this involved the compliance with Government requirements. Not an exciting undertaking. The truly significant part of this meeting was the principal luncheon speaker, Dr. Betsy A. Johnson. At that time, Dr. Johnson held the post of Deputy Secretary of Commerce, and part of her duties included the oversight of the Patent and Trademark Office. The theme of her speech was astounding. She said that the Government's treatment of the Universities' inventions was disgraceful, and why did we not get together and do something about it.

That was invitation enough. Following the luncheon, in a conversation that included Dr. Ralph Davis of Purdue, Dr. Allen Moore of Case Western, and yours truly, Dr. Moore proposed that we follow up on Dr. Johnson's suggestion. Early in 1974, Dr. Moore took the initiative and organized a meeting at Case Western in Cleveland. The meeting was held at a museum nearby to Case Western. A breakout meeting in the museum's cafeteria was organized by Dr. George Pickar of Miami. He proposed that we form a society of University people devoted solely to the management of patents. He also proposed that we each chip in \$200.00 to get the society started. This seemed a little rich to a few of the attendees, so we settled on the figure of \$100.00.

#### Another Perspective: "SUPA: The Early Years"

In 1990, AUTM president Ed MacCordy asked Immediate Past President Katharine Ku if she would undertake to document the early years of SUPA. Katharine agreed, and after interviews of SUPA founders, created the document "SUPA: The Early Years". According to this document, Dr. George Pickar, a former law professor who was selected in 1973 to head industry relations at the University of Miami, had "frequently suggested forming a group to discuss intellectual property issues as he felt the need for the formation of a professional association." It was Pickar who called for the breakout meeting at the end of the day, October 15, after formal sessions had ended.

"At the breakout meeting, Pickar suggested creating a new society of individual membership in order to promote networking and a greater understanding and awareness of intellectual property issues. The hope of the founders was that members of this society could then become involved with supporting positive intellectual property legislation. Among those

attending the meeting at Case Western on October 15, there was not a unanimity of opinion as to a) the need for another organization and b) what the new organization, if formed, should have as its reason for existence. Considered by many to be the "founding" meeting, George Pickar was to propose a structure for the possible new association. He, Larry Gilbert, and Mark Owens were to draft the Articles of Incorporation. Participants were asked to contribute \$100 to help cover postage and mailing expenses.

There were numerous telephone calls back and forth about "seed" money to found the society and there was reluctance to pay the \$100 fee, the original amount suggested by Dr. Pickar. University representatives that committed \$100 from their respective institutions as their contribution to the founding of this new society (separate from any dues, which were "individual") included:

WARF  
California Institute of Technology  
Purdue University  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
University of Miami  
Northwestern  
University of Utah  
University of Missouri  
University of California

Marvin Woerpel  
T. Lee Stam  
Ralph L. Davis  
Larry Gilbert  
George Pickar  
Earl Friese  
C. W. (Tom) Martin  
Ray Snyder  
Mark Owens"

Following the October 15 breakout meeting, Dr. George Pickar (a former Law Professor) took the lead by drafting proposed Articles of Incorporation and By-laws for this proposed new association, which he named in the draft documents the National Association of University Patent Administrators (NAUPA). He forwarded the drafts to Larry Gilbert under a cover letter dated November 11, 1974, asking Larry to add his comments and then forward on to Mark Owens for his additional comments. Larry, in his comments back to Pickar, suggested the revised name Society of University Patent Administrators (SUPA), because, as reported in the Ku document, Mr. Gilbert "wanted it to be a "SUPER" society and therefore filled the factual descriptor words to fit the acronym."

In a letter dated November 27, 1974 from Pickar to Gilbert and Owens, Pickar reported that Dr. Dvorovitz had offered a meeting room at the Pick Congress Hotel in Chicago for use by the proposed association. This would be the 1975 location of the Dr. Dvorkovitz and Associates World Forum on Technology Transfer to be held on February 3 – 5, 1975. This offer was subsequently accepted and the "charter meeting" for what would become SUPA was set for February 3, 1975.

In a letter from Pickar to Gilbert and Owens dated December 12, 1974, the revised Articles of Incorporation and By-laws were enclosed for them to give a final review prior to their presentation at the charter meeting for approval. They

reflected Gilbert's suggested name of SUPA. The Temporary Officers were listed as George Pickar, President, with Lawrence Gilbert and Mark Owens as Vice Presidents. February 3, 1975 was confirmed as the charter meeting date. And Pickar reported that three \$100 checks for the initial funding of the new association had been received. The By-laws called for a governing board of five Officers. The Officers were: President; three Regional Vice Presidents; and a Secretary/Treasurer. The first Eastern V/P would serve for one year, the Central V/P would serve for two years, and the Western V/P would serve for three years, and thereafter they shall serve for two year periods.

On December 17, 1974, invitation letters to attend the charter meeting of SUPA – to be held at 8 pm in the Grant Park room of the Pick Congress Hotel – were mailed. The mailing was to the attendees of the October 1974 Case Western Meeting, and anyone else whose name was put forward.

According to an attendee listing for the charter meeting, provided to Katharine Ku by Dr. Dvorkovitz in 1990, there were 75 people at the meeting, representing 40 universities plus Research Corporation, Mount Sinai Hospital, and a USDA Research Laboratory. The Articles of Incorporation and By-laws were approved, and five Officers were elected: President George Pickar, Patents and Licensing, University of Miami; VP Eastern Region Lawrence Gilbert, Director Patent Administration, MIT; VP Central Region Ralph Davis, Associate Director Division of Sponsored Programs, Purdue; VP Western Region Clarence Martin, Director Patent & Product Development, University of Utah, and Secretary-Treasurer Earl Freise, Assistant Director Office of Research & Sponsored Programs, Northwestern University.

The now approved By-laws called for a Membership Committee, an Annual Meeting & Education Committee, a Nominating Committee, and a By-laws Committee. President Pickar, in letters dated March 31, 1975, asked Ralph Davis, Larry Gilbert, Clarence Martin, and Ray Snyder to serve as Chairs of the respective committees. A Resources Committee was created, with Mark Owens as Chair. Each Chair was then to recruit members for their respective committee.

Larry Gilbert accepted the Chair of the Annual Meeting & Education Committee in a letter dated April 9. Larry noted in this letter the upcoming conferences held by SRA and NCURA and that a brochure about SUPA was needed for distribution at such meetings, which would direct people to Ralph Davis to apply for SUPA membership. Larry also pointed out that SRA has about 900 members, with 600 from the university sector, and that as "many of our present and future members will belong to both organizations, it may be advantageous to hold joint meetings." A draft SUPA brochure was included with the letter. The first SUPA mailing list was to be the attendees at the 1974 Case Western meeting plus any other people who request copies of the Proceedings from the meeting.

The first brochure seeking to attract new members was thus created by Larry Gilbert and read as follows:

SUPA was organized in 1975 to fill a growing need to more fully exploit the university patent resource. The membership of SUPA shall consist of any person who in his university or business activities has some responsibility for the administration of university-generated intellectual property. SUPA hopes to stimulate and foster the transfer of university patent resources to the public sector by: (a) presenting educational seminars to the membership on all aspects of technology transfer from the university point of view; (b) generating self-help programs to enable universities to establish an in-house patent technology and licensing capability; (c) developing a unified university position on legislation that may have impact on university patent rights; and (d) effecting interchange of views amongst university patent administrators.

The brochure then directed "those interested in becoming members of SUPA" to contact Ralph Davis at Purdue.

*Davis*  
On April 15, 1975, Larry Gilbert sent a letter to "Distribution List" (25 people) with his proposal for a combined Annual and Educational Meeting. It was the intent to hold the Meeting at Northwestern, as Earl Freise "has offered the use of his facilities for the meeting which is most fortunate since SUPA is not yet in a position to pay its own way." The Meeting was to be held February 5 and 6, to dovetail with the Dvorkovitz meeting scheduled in Chicago February 2 - 6. "As an alternative, Bruce Dahlo has indicated that we could have the meeting at the Pick Congress since they are taking over the entire hotel." Larry asked for suggestions as to the length and format of the Meeting, but added "Bear in mind that the ultimate goal of SUPA is to enable university patent administrators to acquire skills in developing in-house programs so as to enable them to successfully deliver a product to the marketplace. Our educational programs should be directed towards that end."

On April 28, 1975, Ralph Davis sent a draft membership application form to the four members of the Membership Committee for comment. The proposed membership fee was \$10 with annual dues of \$30. The draft was accepted and SUPA began recruiting members. By the end of 1975, 51 people had signed up, and SUPA was ready to host its first Annual Meeting under the SUPA banner. And although there was a movement to merge SUPA into a larger existing association, such as LES, NCURA, or SRA, SUPA survived as an independent association. It would play a major role in shaping the legislation that would become widely known as the Bayh/Dole Act of 1980.



## The History of the Association of University Technology Managers

October 15, 1974: At a breakout meeting during a conference at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio, a few of the breakout meeting attendees agree to contribute funds to form a new association. One of the original founders, Ray E. Synder, describes the birth of SUPA in a paper he presented to Patricia Harsche, as an AUTM representative, in March, 2002 (the paper is attached as Attachment 1), as follows:

“At the 1973 annual meeting of NCURA, held at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, DC, part of one afternoon of the total program was devoted to patents. Most of this involved the compliance with Government requirements. Not an exciting undertaking. The truly significant part of this meeting was the principal luncheon speaker, Dr. Betsy A. Johnson. At that time, Dr. Johnson held the post of Deputy Secretary of Commerce, and part of her duties included the oversight of the Patent and Trademark Office. The theme of her speech was astounding. She said that the Government's treatment of the Universities' inventions was disgraceful, and why did we not get together and do something about it.

That was invitation enough. Following the luncheon, in a conversation that included Dr. Ralph Davis of Purdue, Dr. Allen Moore of Case Western, and yours truly, Dr. Moore proposed that we follow up on Dr. Johnson's suggestion. Early in 1974, Dr. Moore took the initiative and organized a meeting at Case Western in Cleveland. The meeting was held at a museum nearby to Case Western. A breakout meeting in the museum's cafeteria was organized by Dr. George Pickar of Miami. He proposed that we form a society of University people devoted solely to the management of patents. He also proposed that we each chip in \$200.00 to get the society started. This seemed a little rich to a few of the attendees, so we settled on the figure of \$100.00. Only seven of us signed up initially. To the best of this author's recollection, the original plank holders included George Pickar of Miami; Ralph Davis of Purdue; Larry Gilbert of MIT; Henry Bredeck of Michigan State; Earl Friese of Northwestern; Tom Martin of Utah; and yours truly then of Missouri. There would have been more, but some first had to get the OK from their respective institutions on the propriety of joining such an organization. No University wanted to endanger its Government research contracts, and several were unsure how this would fly.

Thus was formed the Society of University Patent Administrators. Within two years there were more than 50 members. For several of the early years, the SUPA annual meetings were held in conjunction with Dr. Dvorkovitz

and his annual Tech Ex meetings. His meetings provided a forum for interacting with company representatives that might be interested in licensing the Universities' technology. Dr. Dvorkovitz was a true friend and supporter of our organization when support was hard to find. A synergistic interest did not hurt either."

#### Another Perspective: "SUPA: The Early Years"

In 1990, AUTM president Ed MacCordy asked Immediate Past President Katharine Ku if she would undertake to document the early years of SUPA. Katharine agreed, and after interviews of SUPA founders, created the document "SUPA: The Early Years", which is attached as Attachment 2. According to this document, Dr. George Picker, a former law professor who was selected in 1973 to head industry relations at the University of Miami, had "frequently suggested forming a group to discuss intellectual property issues as he felt the need for the formation of a professional association." It was Picker who called for the breakout meeting at the end of the day, October 15, after formal sessions had ended.

"At the breakout meeting, Picker suggested creating a new society of individual membership in order to promote networking and a greater understanding and awareness of intellectual property issues. The hope of the founders was that members of this society could then become involved with supporting positive intellectual property legislation. Among those attending the meeting at Case Western on October 15, there was not a unanimity of opinion as to a) the need for another organization and b) what the new organization, if formed, should have as its reason for existence. Considered by many to be the "founding" meeting, George Picker was to propose a structure for the possible new association. He, Larry Gilbert, and Mark Owens were to draft the Articles of Incorporation. Participants were asked to contribute \$100 to help cover postage and mailing expenses.

There were numerous telephone calls back and forth about "seed" money to found the society and there was reluctance to pay the \$100 fee, the original amount suggested by Dr. Picker. University representatives that committed \$100 from their respective institutions as their contribution to the founding of this new society (separate from any dues, which were "individual") included:

WARF  
California Institute of Technology  
Purdue University  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Marvin Woerpel  
T. Lee Stam  
Ralph L. Davis  
Larry Gilbert

University of Miami  
Northwestern  
University of Utah  
University of Missouri  
University of California

George Picker  
Earl Friese  
C. W. (Tom) Martin  
Ray Snyder  
Mark Owens"

### Conference Highlights: A Snapshot of University Technology Transfer in 1974

The October 15/16, 1974 conference at Case Western Reserve University was a landmark event. It was titled "Technology Transfer: University Opportunities and Responsibilities" and it drew 118 attendees from 60 U. S. universities and one Canadian university. At that time, per the AUTM Licensing Survey FY 2000, only 10 U. S. universities had 0.5 FTE devoted to Technology Transfer. A Proceedings of the conference was published in June 1975. The Table of Contents, Preface, Acknowledgements, and Listing of Attendees from the Proceedings are attached as Attachment 3.

Dr. Betsy Ancker-Johnson, whose remarks at the 1973 NCURA annual meeting directly lead to the 1974 Conference, attended the 1974 Conference. Her Conference Proceedings paper is titled "On the Horizon: A New Government Patent Policy for Non-Nuclear Energy Research and Development". In this paper, she describes the series of negotiations over Senate Bill 1283, the Non-Nuclear Energy Research and Development Bill, which she states "for better or for worse, S. 1283 will have both a profound and enduring impact on the industrial utilization of university-generated research advances".

It seems clear Dr. Ancker-Johnson was an advocate for university involvement in the transfer of inventions created at the university with federal government funding, and bargained with the Senate representatives on behalf of universities. The original S. 1283 gave ownership of ERDA sponsored inventions to the government - period. Through negotiation, universities were granted the right to petition for ownership and to grant exclusive licenses when warranted, as well as other rights. In her summary, she writes:

"In summary, these are the highlights of the ERDA patent policy.

1. It is a title policy, as distinguished from a license policy.
2. However, the Administrator can waive title and he is encouraged to do so when such is in the best interests of the United States.
3. The Administrator has the option to grant exclusive licenses.
4. There is no mandatory or compulsory licensing of privately-owned patents - such as called for in the original senate version.

5. And finally, there is no surrender of background patent rights as a precondition of participation in a government contract. This precondition was also contained in the original Senate version.

I am hopeful that the settlement which we reached with the Senate will permit the full force of our private inventive capacity to be brought to bear in the successful implementation of Project Independence. We have certainly come a long way from the draft provisions which existed last September. The crucial question is whether we have come far enough."

The first panel session of the Conference was titled "Reports on the Current Status of University Patent Management" in which two surveys on university patenting and licensing practices were described. The first presentation was by Mark Owens, Assistant Vice President, University of California. They conducted the survey for two reasons: (1) to compare their operation with other like institutions; and (2) to help in determining if they should use an outside patent management organization. They sent the survey to 25 universities and received responses from 22. The survey covered the period 1968 -1972. A summary of the findings:

- A. Most, but not all, of the respondents encourage disclosure of inventions.
- B. The majority have a mandatory assignment requirement.
- C. All with an active patenting program share royalties with inventors.
- D. 13 have Institutional Patent Agreements with the U.S. Public Health Service
- E. Expenses for managing a TLO ranged from \$600 to \$470,000. It was admitted that the question was not framed well and thus the range of answers received.
- F. The majority manage the program internally, and 6 have formed foundations to manage the program.
- G. 5 augment their program via non-exclusive contracts with patent management organizations
- H. 5 had more than \$100,000 per year in the 1968 - 1972 time period, with most of the royalty income coming from 1 or 2 licensed inventions.

The second presentation was by E. J. Freise, Assistant Director, Research and Sponsored Programs, Northwestern University. The survey was done as part of a review of the patent policy and administrative procedures at Northwestern and was to gather information which would be helpful in developing a more productive technology transfer program. The survey was sent to 76 selected universities, all among the top 100 universities in federal research funding. They received 50 usable responses from universities with between \$10 million and \$75 million in federal research funding. A summary of the findings:



1. What group administers patent policy: 34 in a Research Office; 7 in a Fiscal Office; 5 in an Academic Office; 3 by a separate Patent Office, and 1 in the Legal Office.
2. Who makes the decision to patent: 27 use a patent committee; 42 had a contract with an outside firm with 22 relying totally on the outside firms decision. 21 of the 42 had contracts with more than one outside firm.
3. Time spent by professional staff on technology transfer: 21 said less than 10%; 20 said between 10 and 50%; 9 said over 50%.
4. How were patent program expenses covered: 14 from direct university support; 11 from royalty income; 8 from indirect cost pool; 7 from a combination of royalty income and direct support; 2 from combination of royalty income and indirect cost pool; and 1 from combination of direct support and indirect cost pool.
5. Statistics: Median number of disclosures is 11; median number of patent applications is 3; Median number of licenses is 2. Thus, about 27% of disclosures are patented, with about 66% licensed.
6. 2 respondents reported large royalty income, with most of it coming from a single licensed invention.

The second panel was on the Fundamentals of Patent Policy. T. L. Stam, Patent Officer, California Institute of Technology described the attributes of a good university patent policy, and also pointed out that federal funding agencies are becoming more aware of the importance of commercialization of federally funded research, and may show favor in funding decisions towards universities that have a demonstrated effective technology transfer process.

G. Willard Fornell, Patent Administrator, University of Minnesota, then gave reasons why the university patent policy should be aligned with the policies of the federal agencies or other groups that are sponsoring research at the university. He provided some examples of the policies of such groups. He noted that the American Heart Association encouraged universities to seek patenting and licensing of inventions sponsored by them, but with two interesting provisions. They were (1) that the inventors income share would be no more than 15% of gross royalty income and with a cap of \$100,000; and (2) the Heart Association would receive a negotiated amount of the royalty income. The American Cancer Society was more restrictive, taking title to inventions they sponsor and, in exceptional cases, the Society might grant an exclusive license for a period not to exceed 5 years and at a royalty rate not to exceed 5%.

For research sponsored by private industry, the issue for him was indirect cost recovery. If the industry sponsor did not pay full indirect costs, then the public and the institution were providing a subsidy to the industry sponsor. The University of Minnesota, to address this issue, set the following policy: (a) if the

company paid the current Federal negotiated indirect cost recovery rate (which is not the full indirect cost rate), the company would receive no patent rights; (b) if the company paid the government rate plus 25% (approximately the full indirect rate), then they would have first right to a limited-term exclusive royalty-bearing license; and (c) if the company paid the government rate plus 50%, assuming it can legally do so, it will assign patent rights to the company.

For research sponsored by the Federal Government, he compared the policies of the eight federal agencies that provided most of the federal funding to universities. The "best" agencies were the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, that had created an Institutional Patent Policy (IPA) in 1968, and the National Science Foundation, which had largely adopted the same IPA approach in 1973. The worst were the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior, from which it "is nearly impossible" to obtain a patent waiver. In between were the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Transportation. These agencies practice a waiver program that, upon formal petition and approval, can permit title to go to the contractor.

In the opinion of Mr. Fornell "All in all, one can say that both presidential patent policy statements, the one promulgated by President Kennedy in September 1963, and the one promulgated by President Nixon in August 1971, have not had a great impact upon the basic patent policy of any particular agency. These patent policy statements are worded in such a way that any agency can read into them its own preconceived requirements and coupled with a term called "agency mission," the agency can be as generous or miserly with patent rights and its relations to contracts as it chooses."

Mr. Fornell then provided some statistics to "uncover the dismal track record of the Federal agencies in managing inventions and transferring technology for public use." He first pointed out that during an average year in the 1963-1972 period, the government filed 3,594 patent applications in the average year, with only 1,638 of the applications maturing as issued patents. This is a far higher than normal abandonment rate, which he attributes to the lack of inventor involvement in the patent filing and prosecution process. He then pointed out that in the 1967-1972 period, the government issued 12,204 non-exclusive licenses (with many being pro forma royalty free licenses to the source of the invention) and 20 exclusive licenses. He states: "Anyone who has been involved in marketing of technology knows that you can't bring forward risk capital with mostly non-exclusive licenses, and that at least a limited period of exclusivity is almost invariably required to bring an invention to commercial realization." And as a final note, "It behooves this group to make whatever efforts it can to

bring about a more widespread use of the license clause in Government grants and contracts for educational institutions, and to also make a sincere effort to increase the utilization of the institutional patent agreement technique."

Wallace C. Treibel, Government Fiscal Relations and Patent Officer, University of Washington, provided some follow-up remarks to Mr. Fornall's presentation. He noted the lawsuit in progress brought by Public Citizen, Inc., the Ralph Nader consumer advocate group, to prevent exclusive licensing of any invention which has any degree of government funding support. Clearly if successful (thankfully it was not), it would have a devastating effect on university licensing. He also noted the efforts "for at least ten years" of the Patent Subcommittee of the Counsel on Government Relations (COGR) "to promote a policy under which non-profit universities may obtain title and licensing privileges with the least amount of red tape."

The following two panels covered Internal Administration of Technology Transfer and Mechanisms for Technology Transfer. The policies and procedures described in these panels are not too different from what is practiced in 2003, almost thirty years later. One theme in these panels and the discussion that followed them was that the purpose of a technology transfer program is not to produce net income for the university. The purpose of such a program is to provide service to the inventors within the university, to see university innovation converted to products and services for the public benefit, and to create new relationships with the industry sector.

Next on the agenda was an address by Norman J. Latker, Patent Counsel, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The DHEW had been the leader in creating the Institutional Patent Agreement -- which made it much, much, easier for universities who entered in the IPA to obtain title to inventions that were sponsored by the DHEW. Had the other Federal Government agencies adopted the IPA approach, as the NSF did in 1973, it is not clear whether the Bayh/Dole legislation of 1980 would have been as necessary and compelling.

Norman began his address with "I think it appropriate to revisit the Constitution and its framers to refresh our memories on the birth of the intellectual property clause." He then laid out the history and process by which we have in the U.S. a strong intellectual property legal foundation. However Norman was troubled by the interpretation by the Federal Government that what the Government pays for (or even partially pays for) it should own. This was under the concept that Government funded research places the Government in the role of "employer" and the contractor (university) in the role of employee. He says: "I thought utilizing this concept in all Government contracting situations to be poor policy,

as it did not maximize delivery on inventive results to the public, or protect the equities of all the parties involved."

He then referenced a 1968 GAO report to the Congress on "Problem Areas Affecting usefulness of Results of Government-Sponsored Research in Medicinal Chemistry", which provided;

"On the basis of our observations, we propose that the Department (DHEW) direct its efforts toward timely determination of rights to potentially patentable inventions in order to reduce uncertainties as to the status of invention rights. We propose also that the Department clarify the intended use of Institutional Patent Agreements, of which only limited use has been made, but which appeared to be a useful device for assigning ownership rights while protecting the public interest."

Norman then explained why the argument that providing title to government-sponsored inventions to universities gave the university an "unjustified windfall" really had no merit. He then explained the two methods by which DHEW can provide title to inventions to universities. The first is to defer determination until the invention is identified. The university petitions for title after the invention has been identified. The university first determines if nonexclusive licensing will result in obtaining further development funds. If exclusive licensing appears necessary for further development towards commercialization, the exclusive term is limited to five years from first commercial sale or eight years from the date of the license, whichever occurs first. The Government does retain "march-in" rights.

The second method is the Institutional Patent Agreement program, under which a university with patent management capabilities are afforded a first option to any invention made under their grant, subject to the same conditions of the deferred determination method. Norman reported that since January 1, 1969, DHEW entered into 41 new IPAs, bringing the total to 56. Under the deferred determination program, average processing time from receipt of a petition to final determination is 15 to 20 weeks. Under IPAs, 167 patent applications were filed since 1968 by institutions exercising their first option to invention rights, which resulted in 29 nonexclusive licenses and 43 exclusive licenses. And under the deferred determination program, since July 1, 1968, 178 petitions have been reviewed, 162 petitions were granted, which resulted in 15 nonexclusive licenses and 35 exclusive licenses.

Norman also pointed out that the ability to guarantee invention licensing rights has opened the door for university-industry collaborative research projects, as such rights are necessary for industry to justify investments in university research. And he closed his remarks, noting that there remain many people in

the Congress and in the public sector that still do not see the merit of university management and licensing of university created but government sponsored inventions, saying "As the man said, the price of liberty (and property) is eternal vigilance."

### **SUPAs Formation: Next Steps**

Following the October 15 breakout meeting, Dr. George Picker (a former Law Professor) took the lead by drafting proposed Articles of Incorporation and By-laws for this proposed new association, which he named in the draft documents the National Association of University Patent Administrators (NAUPA). He forwarded the drafts to Larry Gilbert under a cover letter dated November 11, 1974, asking Larry to add his comments and then forward on to Mark Owens for his additional comments. Larry, in his comments back to Picker, suggested the revised name Society of University Patent Administrators (SUPA), because, as reported in the Ku document, Mr. Gilbert "wanted it to be a "SUPER" society and therefore filled the factual descriptor words to fit the acronym."

In a letter dated November 15, 1974 from Picker to Gilbert, the draft Articles of Incorporation were transmitted for Gilbert's comments and revisions and then forwarding to Mark Owens for his comments. Florida was selected as the State for incorporation as it was Picker's home state and "as good as any in which to incorporate from the standpoints of the expense involved and the liberality of its laws." Picker also reported that the first \$100 check had arrived, from Ralph Davis of the Purdue Research Foundation.

On November 19, Gilbert forwarded the draft Articles of Incorporation with his comments to Mark Owens, asking if Mark would be at the Dvorkovitz University-Industry Forum in Chicago in February, as that was the planned location for the second meeting of the new association.

In a letter dated November 27, 1974 from Picker to Gilbert and Owens, Picker reported that Dr. Dvorovitz had offered a meeting room at the Pick Congress Hotel in Chicago for use by the proposed association. This would be the 1975 location of the Dr. Dvorkovitz and Associates World Forum on Technology Transfer to be held on February 3 - 5, 1975. This offer was subsequently accepted and the "charter meeting" for what would become SUPA was set for February 3, 1975.

In a letter from Picker to Gilbert and Owens dated December 12, 1974, the revised Articles of Incorporation and By-laws were enclosed for them to give a final review prior to their presentation at the charter meeting for approval. They reflected Gilbert's suggested name of SUPA. The Temporary Officers were listed

as George Picker, President, with Lawrence Gilbert and Mark Owens as Vice Presidents. February 3, 1975 was confirmed as the charter meeting date. And Picker reported that three \$100 checks for the initial funding of the new association had been received. The By-laws called for a governing board of five Officers. The Officers were: President; three Regional Vice Presidents; and a Secretary/Treasurer. The first Eastern V/P would serve for one year, the Central V/P would serve for two years, and the Western V/P would serve for three years, and thereafter they shall serve for two year periods.

On December 17, 1974, invitation letters to attend the charter meeting of SUPA - to be held at 8 pm in the Grant Park room of the Pick Congress Hotel - were mailed. The mailing was to the attendees of the October 1974 Case Western Meeting, and anyone else whose name was put forward.

On January 3, 1975, Mark Owens wrote to Pickar that he would not be attending the charter meeting, but indicated his \$100 check would be coming shortly (it was received on January 16).

According to an attendee listing for the charter meeting, provided to Katharine Ku by Dr. Dvorkovitz in 1990, there were 75 people at the meeting, representing 40 universities plus Research Corporation, Mount Sinai Hospital, and a USDA Research Laboratory. My initial count was 77 people, but then I noted that Ray Snyder was listed as representing three universities (University of Idaho, Vanderbilt University, as well as the University of Missouri). The Articles of Incorporation and By-laws were approved, and five Officers were elected: President George Picker, Patents and Licensing, University of Miami; VP Eastern Region Lawrence Gilbert, Director Patent Administration, MIT; VP Central Region Ralph Davis, Associate Director Division of Sponsored Programs, Purdue; VP Western Region Clarence Martin, Director Patent & Product Development, University of Utah, and Secretary-Treasurer Earl Freise, Assistant Director Office of Research & Sponsored Programs, Northwestern University.

The now approved By-laws called for a Membership Committee, an Annual Meeting & Education Committee, a Nominating Committee, and a By-laws Committee. President Picker, in letters dated March 31, 1975, asked Ralph Davis, Larry Gilbert, Clarence Martin, and Ray Snyder to serve as Chairs of the respective committees. A Resources Committee was created, with Mark Owens as Chair. Each Chair was then to recruit members for their respective committee.

Larry Gilbert accepted the Chair of the Annual Meeting & Education Committee in a letter dated April 9. Larry noted in this letter the upcoming conferences held by SRA and NCURA and that a brochure about SUPA was needed for distribution at such meetings, which would direct people to Ralph Davis to

apply for SUPA membership. Larry also pointed out that SRA has about 900 members, with 600 from the university sector, and that as "many of our present and future members will belong to both organizations, it may be advantageous to hold joint meetings." A draft SUPA brochure was included with the letter. The first SUPA mailing list was to be the attendees at the 1974 Case Western meeting plus any other people who request copies of the Proceedings from the meeting.

The first brochure seeking to attract new members was thus created by Larry Gilbert and read as follows:

SUPA was organized in 1975 to fill a growing need to more fully exploit the university patent resource. The membership of SUPA shall consist of any person who in his university or business activities has some responsibility for the administration of university-generated intellectual property. SUPA hopes to stimulate and foster the transfer of university patent resources to the public sector by: (a) presenting educational seminars to the membership on all aspects of technology transfer from the university point of view; (b) generating self-help programs to enable universities to establish an in-house patent technology and licensing capability; (c) developing a unified university position on legislation that may have impact on university patent rights; and (d) effecting interchange of views amongst university patent administrators.

The brochure then directed "those interested in becoming members of SUPA" to contact Ralph Davis at Purdue.

On April 15, 1975, Larry Gilbert sent a letter to "Distribution List" (25 people) with his proposal for a combined Annual and Educational Meeting. It was the intent to hold the Meeting at Northwestern, as Earl Freise "has offered the use of his facilities for the meeting which is most fortunate since SUPA is not yet in a position to pay its own way." The Meeting was to be held February 5 and 6, to dovetail with the Dvorkovitz meeting scheduled in Chicago February 2 - 6. "As an alternative, Bruce Dahlo has indicated that we could have the meeting at the Pick Congress since they are taking over the entire hotel." Larry asked for suggestions as to the length and format of the Meeting, but added "Bear in mind that the ultimate goal of SUPA is to enable university patent administrators to acquire skills in developing in-house programs so as to enable them to successfully deliver a product to the marketplace. Our educational programs should be directed towards that end."

On April 28, 1975, Ralph Davis sent a draft membership application form to the four members of the Membership Committee for comment. The proposed membership fee was \$10 with annual dues of \$30.

Ed MacCordy of the Office of Patent Coordination at Washington University responded to the Gilbert April 15 letter in an unexpected way. MacCordy, in a letter to Gilbert dated May 22, 1975, strongly supported the formation of SUPA, but indicated a growing concern "concerning the exclusivity of the formulative efforts, especially the self-installation of the founders in firm control past the time when (hopefully) the new members will outnumber the founders many fold." Ed then suggested "a voluntary resignation of all installed officers, effective at the February meeting for the specific purpose of broader based elections at that time."

Gilbert responded in a letter dated May 28, 1975, in which he indicated he had forwarded MacCordy's letter to all the Officers for comment. Gilbert noted the letter "is well thought out and I can't disagree with it in any respect." Gilbert also included in his response a letter to Roger Ditzel from Niels Reimers, with the comment "The point I would like to make is that SUPA may wind up as a subgroup of LES or perhaps of SRA. I, for one, am not ruling either of these possibilities out, and at the February meeting intend to put the issue on the floor".

The letter from Reimers to Ditzel (dated May 14, 1975) reported on Reimers attendance at the LES Board meeting in San Francisco on May 8, and discussion relating to the formation of SUPA. Ditzel had submitted a committee report to the LES Board (Ditzel was Chair of the LES Committee on University Licensing) which included information on SUPA's formation. Reimers reported that LES was concerned that it was apparently not serving the needs of the university community very well and "Means for LES becoming more relevant to university patent administrators was a topic discussed in some detail." Also from Reimers, "I pointed out the different dynamics of our licensing compared to industry licensing, our cordouroy instead of cashmere coats, and that an LES meeting to be attractive to university licensing persons would either have to be useful from an educational sense, or, preferably, useful in marketing his technology. Also cheap." Ditzel was then asked that his committee consider and make recommendations as to how LES could become more relevant and useful for university licensing individuals, with some suggestions including LES discounting the cost of attending LES meeting by university people, programming at LES meetings more relevant to university licensing, or a separate "special interest" segment of LES meetings for university licensing people.

On June 10, 1975, Ralph Davis, the Chair of the SUPA Membership Committee sent a letter with the application for membership to the SUPA mailing list. The criteria for membership was: "Any individual who has some responsibility for the administration of inventions and/or intellectual property of an institution of



higher learning shall be eligible for membership in SUPA." The Membership application fee was \$10 with annual dues of \$30.

In a letter dated June 16, 1976, Vladimir Dvorkovitz offered SUPA President George Pickar "all the meeting rooms you may require for any SUPA meetings at no cost to you." He also offered free access to lunches, banquet, and cocktail parties for SUPA members. It should be noted that university people had been offered this at prior Dvorkovitz events, one assumes to encourage universities to bring their technologies to the event.

Homer O. Blair, the then President of LES, wrote a letter dated July 29, 1975 to the LES Board members reporting on a meeting with Larry Gilbert. Larry reiterated the Reimers opinion that LES did not address all the needs of university patent administrators. After "Larry points out that SUPA is and probably would always have to be a small organization with comparatively few assets" they then discussed SUPA "allying itself with LES but still retaining some distinctiveness by becoming a 'section' of LES." Homer proposed Larry attend the October 12 LES Board Meeting to discuss the situation further, in coordination with Roger Ditzel (Chair of the LES University Licensing Committee) and Niels Reimers, a LES Trustee.

The idea of affiliation with another group continued to increase, as reflected in the letter of welcome dated December 3, 1975 sent to incoming member Stuart Wilson (The University of Connecticut), which included a copy of the by-laws and a listing of the 52 current members. The letter of welcome included "One of the items which will be discussed at the annual meeting is the possibility of SUPA establishing a loose affiliation or perhaps becoming a division or section of an existing organization whose interests overlap or compliment those of SUPA. Possible groups might be the Licensing Executives Society (LES), the Society of Research Administrators (SRA) or the National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA). Information on these organizations will be available at the meeting. Please give some thought to these possibilities and if you are unable to attend, I would appreciate your comments and thoughts on the subject."

Larry Gilbert did present the issue at the February 5, 1976 Annual Meeting in a session titled "LES and SUPA - Where Does SUPA Go From Here". However it seems no conclusions were reached, and it was not until May 1978 that the issue reappears in the SUPA records, when a vote of the membership was taken on whether to hold two meetings per year (yes 23; no 38); where to hold the next Annual Meeting (in conjunction with the Dvorkovitz Fair in Atlanta in February 1979, with 23 votes, won over during the LES meeting in New Orleans in November 1978, with 17 votes); and whether to affiliate with another

organization (yes 33; no 28) with LES the favorite (19 votes) over NCURA (9 votes) and SRA (4 votes) and Other (1 vote).

In March of 1976, the first application for membership from a person employed by a commercial firm was received. Under the by-laws, this would not be permitted. The applicant argued that he does have an interest in university patents from the point of view of potential licenses for his company. The issue was presented to then President Roy Woodrow, who suggested an affiliated or associate membership category be created.

On September 23, 1976, Raymond Woodrow, in his capacity as President of SUPA, testified before the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Scientific Planning and Analysis of the House Committee of Science and Technology - with Regard to University Patents and Federal Grants and Contracts. Thus, SUPA was now on the government policy making radar screen, setting the stage for future SUPA interaction with government policy-setting groups. The testimony is attached as Attachment ?.

President Woodrow also responded to an August 3, 1976 request for comments on the proposed FPR Revision covering University Patent Policy prepared by the Ad hoc Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Patent policy. In his response letter dated October 5, 1976, he qualified his response saying it was not an official position of SUPA, but his response did represent comments he had received from a number of SUPA members.

For the 1977 Annual Meeting, the Dvorkovitz group sent to all SUPA members a letter promoting the SUPA/Dvorkovitz relationship and that they were sponsoring the two SUPA luncheons and other items. His flyer about his technology fair also included the program for the SUPA meeting. This did not sit well with Roger Ditzel, and in a letter dated November 23, 1976 to Ray Woodrow, he said: "I was not at all happy with the distribution by Dvorkovitz of the SUPA program and the apparent capturing of SUPA by the Dvorkovitz organization. And further "I object to this sponsorship, not because I don't like free meals, but because I believe it is absolutely wrong and even unethical for SUPA, as an organization, to accept such sponsorship."

Roger's letter provoked responses from both Larry Gilbert and Ray Woodrow. It was pointed out the free lunches, etc. had always been provided to university people participating in the Dvorkovitz events, but that there was the possible appearance of sponsorship and influence by Dvorkovitz. Woodrow concluded: "I have asked Earl Friese to set up a special meeting in Chicago for the officers and new trustees to consider this question thoroughly. I expect that we will do just this."

President Woodrow sent a letter dated December 16, 1976 to all SUPA members. Enclosed with the letter was a survey form covering institutional patent policies. Woodrow said: "We started with several suggestions from which a preliminary form was designed and given a trial at six institutions. The results were used to modify the questionnaire further into the form in which it is now sent to you." A summary of the survey results are given in Attachment ?

In a letter dated February 22, 1977, newly elected Trustee Edward MacCordy proposed to his fellow Trustees (Ray Woodrow, Ray Snyder, Clarence Martin, Cynthia Hanson, Earl Freise, Ralph Davis, and Howard Bremer) a new mechanism for serving the membership. "The mechanism I propose is simply an on-going dialog among the trustees by correspondence during the year, much in the form of this letter." He then identified the following areas for such a dialog:

1. As less than half the SUPA membership attended the annual meeting, what other major activities are necessary to serve the needs of the entire membership. A professional instructional program on licensing and related matters had been suggested as one possibility.

2. The possibility that the next annual meeting in Chicago be a joint one with the LES regional Meeting normally held at the same time and location.

3. The by-laws need revision, e.g., they saw that 50% of membership must be present at the annual meeting to conduct business (not the case at the last business meeting) and that the trustees are required to meet immediately following the business meeting (they did not).

4. The committees are all chaired by officers or trustees. To get more involvement of the membership (now over 100), it would seem time to expand the committee structure and get the active involvement of other non-officer and non-trustee members.

5. What is the authority of the President to take positions on public issues as representing SUPA. Should public positions taken by SUPA grow from a required procedure.

Another survey has developed in March 1977 by Ray Woodrow. The Department of Commerce had requested information on what was happening with university owned patents. Commerce had the USPTO generate listings of patents owned by specific universities. Woodrow then sent the individual listings to the universities with a request to complete a form as to what had transpired with these patents. The results of the survey were presented at the 1978 SUPA Annual Meeting, and they are also attached hereto as Attachment ?

In a letter dated October 27, 1977 from President Woodrow to the SUPA membership, he urged the members to support the "Uniform Federal Research and Development Utilization Act of 1977" (H.R. 6249). Earlier (June 10, 1977),

Woodrow had sent a letter to The Honorable Ray Thornton, Chairman, Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology providing some suggested revisions to the draft Bill.

Larry Gilbert, some two and one-half years following his initial proposal to LES that SUPA become a "section" of LES, again raised the issue in a letter dated February 16, 1978. The letter, to LES Past Presidents, Officers, and Trustees and to SUPA Officers and Trustees, requested permission to again bring up the subject for discussion at the next LES Trustees Meeting in New Orleans. Per Larry "The SUPA membership has not been able to come to grips with its future and, in particular, with the concept of affiliating itself as a University Section with a larger organization such as LES."

In April of 1978, William Burke, VP Eastern Region, sent a letter to a number of universities seeking "evidence that the HEW and NSF Institutional Patent Agreements have had a positive effect on industrial support at your university." He cited 1976 statistics that of \$3.7 billion spent of research at universities, only \$122 million came from industry. Per Burke: "It seems certain that an institutional patent agreement policy for all federal agencies is a necessary precondition to the expansion of this ridiculously low level of R & D support by private industry." Thus, it seems a SUPA strategy was emerging -- to get the IPA approach of HEW and NSF extended across all government funding agencies.

On May 12, 1978, Secretary-Treasurer Mary Spores sent a notice to all SUPA members of the annual dues of \$30, and set June 15, 1978 as the date to pay up or have your membership terminated. Thus started a process to more rigorously follow up on payment of annual dues.

Another letter from Mary to the membership dated June 1, 1978 announced the results of a survey as to the location for the 1979 Annual Meeting, and that it would be held in conjunction with the Dvorkovitz World Technology Fair in Atlanta. It also listed the appointed committee chairs: Program Chair G. Willard Fornell (University of Minnesota); Nominations Chair Earl Freise (University of North Dakota); Education Chair Ray Snyder (Patent Licensing Consultant); Blanket Agreement Chair George Stadler (University Patents, Inc); By-Laws Chair Theodore Wildi (Laval University Quebec).

Newly elected SUPA President Howard Bremer, in a letter dated July 6, 1978, sent a copy of "the proposed bill for a uniform Federal patent policy for small business, universities, and non-profit organizations for your review and comment." This appears to be the first emergence of what would eventually become the Bayh/Dole legislation, and thus the start of a campaign to advise on the content of the legislation and on obtaining support for its passage.

In a letter dated August 14, 1978 addressed to Dr. Martin Rachmeler, Senator Bob Dole began: I should like to apprise you of my activities in the area of patent legislation and its relationship to the problems of transfer of technology." The letter continued by referring to "the unfortunate situation in HEW's biomedical technology program." Dole then explained his actions to correct that situation and: "I plan to follow up the amendment by introducing, on September 13<sup>th</sup>, along with Senator Bayh, a bill which would establish a government-wide patent policy."

Ray Snyder sent a letter to Howard Bremer, dated September 19, 1978, in which he reported on giving a short presentation at the American Medical Association Conference, and his interest in providing information about SUPA and its member universities at other such meetings, as sourcing for future medical related products. Ray's view was: "For the future, I am hoping that we can look beyond our politicking stage and put the problems of dealing with the Government behind us. We should start planning for the day when we can do a better job of getting the inventions out of the University laboratories and into the channels of commerce."

By October 10, 1978, in a letter from President Bremer to the SUPA membership, it was announced that 15 Senators "have already agreed to co-sponsor the bill." However more sponsors were needed, so the letter was accompanied by a listing of all Senators and the name and telephone number of the Senator's staff person. Howard "strongly recommended" that copies of any letters sent to Senators also be sent directly to the related staff person. Howard also requested that any comments to improve the bill be sent to him and a committee "of our most experienced advisors" would distill the comments into a consensus position. He also reported that the Senators wished to obtain case histories for review by the GAO "that have resulted in either delay or frustration of the technology transfer process due to government involvement in determining ownership or conditions of ownership."

In November, 1978, Mary Spores sent address labels for SUPA members to O. A. Neumann, a Senator staff person, so that "material relevant to bill Dole-Bayh S. 3496" could be sent to the SUPA membership.

In a letter dated January 9, 1979, Sheldon Elliot Steinback of the American Council of Education, Division of Government Relations, requested several organizations (SUPA, COGR, AAMC, NASULGC) to contribute \$500 each to retain Norman Latker as an advisor on patent related legislation. Sheldon noted: "As you all know, Norm Latker, Patent Counsel at HEW for over the last decade, was removed several weeks ago and is presently 'of counsel' to a law firm in D.

C. It is not an exaggeration to state that during his tenure in office he operated as a 'lawyer's lawyer' to both our patent counsel in the field and to the Washington-based associations. He has followed all the current patent issues in depth and has conclusively demonstrated his personal commitment to the best interests on colleges and universities in the patent area."

Under a cover letter dated January 12, 1979, Professor Barry Leshowitz (Arizona State University), who had served in 1977 and 1978 as a Congressional Science Fellow and aide to Senator Robert Dole, circulated a preprint of an article titled "The Demise of Technology Transfer in DHEW". His cover letter starts "As you probably have heard, Norman Latker has been terminated as HEW Patent Counsel. His termination represents a dismal chapter in a long and inglorious effort to have an effective federal patent policy." His paper starts "In what some have called an unparalleled display of bureaucratic tyranny, HEW fired it's Patent Counsel, Norman J. Latker on Dec. 13, 1978, after 22 years of uninterrupted government service. He was given no notice, no written explanation of the charges and no severance pay." Per Barry, "Latker's difficulties stem from testimony he provided at Senate hearings on federal patent policy held by the Senate Small Business Committee last Spring. Representing DHEW, Latker testified that for almost a year all requests by scientists and their universities for patent rights to their inventions had been 'frozen' by the HEW General Counsel. The net effect of the HEW decision was, according to Latker, resulting in bottling-up of potentially life-saving technology from this country's major medical laboratories."

The 13 page article, with another 7 pages listing all the inventions that had been "frozen", was a scathing indictment of the practices of the HEW in delaying important medical advances from reaching the public. Latker was portrayed as a hero in getting the freeze lifted, and the HEW General Counsel Mr. Peter Lebasz and his boss, Secretary of HEW Joseph Califano as villains for the abrupt firing of Latker, in retaliation for Latker's actions. In a press release dated January 9, 1979, "Senator Bob Dole (R-Kan.) today demanded the HEW Secretary Joseph Califano justify the firing of Norman Latker as Supervisory Attorney Advisor for the Departments patent office." Also "Latker also provided information for Sen. Dole, which was used to write legislation making it more difficult for HEW to hold on to patent rights."

SUPA President Bremer forwarded the Leshowitz article (with permission from the author) and other items about the Latker firing, to the SUPA Board members on January 24, 1979.

On March 12, 1979, President Bremer sent to Board members a suggested by-laws revision to add an affiliated member category and an member-emeritus

category. And in June, he forwarded to the Board information on a proposed National Technology Innovation Act. According to Senator Adlai Stevenson (D-Ill), the sponsor of the bill "if innovation is not encourage, the economy will stagnate, inflation will continue, and improved employment opportunities will not be forthcoming."

In July of 1979, Mary Spores received a brochure from Miss Sirpa Saarinen, in response to a letter from Mary with information about SUPA. The brochure described TECHNOTE, a data base system created by Control Data Corporation. For \$100 per year, people with technologies for sale could add a 1000 character entry into the data base, The data base could be reached for searching through CDC's CYBERNET time-sharing network.

In a message to SUPA members dated November 7, 1979, President Bremer noted President Jimmy Carter's support of the Dole-Bayh bill in a White House Fact Sheet which states: "The President also supports the retention of patent ownership by small businesses and universities, the prime thrust of legislation now in the Congress, in recognition of their special place in our society." Howard suggested members might utilize the President's endorsement in helping their own representatives in congress in supporting the bill.

In early February of 1980, there was an exchange of letters between Howard Bremer and staff people at the White House, where Howard urged the President to specially show support for the Dole-Bayh bill. In response, Al Stern on the Domestic Policy Staff of the White House concluded: "Once the Administration bill has been introduced, we intend to work with the Congress and other interested parties to enact the best possible legislation. I hope and expect that you and your Society will be active participants in this process."

There were parties strongly opposed to the Dole-Bayh bill, lead, it seems, by Senator Russell Long, who wrote a letter dated February 20, 1980 giving his reasons why Dole-Bayh was a bad thing. He stated: "I am convinced that this bill is one of the most radical and far-reaching giveaways I have seen in the many years I have served in the United States Senate. S. 414 would allow a single company to monopolize a product invented with public funds. I adamantly oppose this concept and am convinced that the American public shares my belief - that title to publicly-financed inventions should belong to the public." Senator Long made a number of other arguments why Dole-Bayh would be a bad thing, and also enclosed a statement by Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, Father of the Nuclear Navy, giving his reason for opposition to S. 414.

However such opposition was in the minority, as S. 414 passed in the Senate quite comfortably. Senator Bob Dole, in a letter dated April 28, 1980 addressed to

Ms. Mary Spores, noted: "I am particularly pleased to inform you that S. 414, the University and Small Business Patent Procedures Act of 1980, passed the Senate on April 23<sup>rd</sup> by a vote of 91 to 4." Senator Dole went on to say: "In view of the problems that have arisen over the past 30 years from the lack of a uniform patent policy and from the arbitrary decision making by individual federal agencies, I feel that the passage of S. 414 signifies a major step in the right direction towards easing the transfer of technology from the research stage to that of development, thus increasing American productivity from the decline it has entered."

In June, Secretary-Treasurer Mary Spores sent to all SUPA members a legislative report from Howard Bremer, the minutes of the annual meeting, the minutes of the Trustee's meetings of 2/27/80 and 4/14/80, an updated membership list, "and some articles which may be of some interest to you."

The minutes from the April and September Board of Trustees meetings were presented in the September edition of the SUPA Newsletter, as well as a review of the pending legislation affecting university patenting and licensing.

In October 1980, Eugene Whelan, Chairman of Product Resources International, Inc. contacted SUPA President McCartney suggesting SUPA members would benefit from "getting to know us." PRI generates a "sourcebook" of inventions, primarily in the medical area, in search of licensees to develop into products. McCartney forwarded Whelan's letter (with several attachments promoting PRI) to Ray Snyder, Chair of the Resources Committee, for the committee to review Whelan's proposal, which included "introducing" PRI in the SUPA Newsletter.

In a letter to the SUPA membership dated December 9, 1980, President McCartney informed the membership of the passage by Congress of the Patent Law Act of 1980 (PL 96-517), to become widely known as the Bayh/Dole Act. Per McCartney, next step (following signing of the law by President Jimmy Carter, which occurred on December 14) is drafting of implementing regulations by the Executive Branch. McCartney urged SUPA members to actively participate in the review and comment stages of the process.

The area of university patenting and licensing was now rising to the attention of senior university administrators, leading to a joint Association of American Universities (AAU) and American Council on Education (ACE) Seminar on Patents and Licensure to be held in conjunction with the 1981 SUPA Annual Meeting in Atlanta (the SUPA Meeting ended at noon, to be followed immediately by this joint seminar). Howard Bremer, Theodore Brown, Clark McCartney, and Richard Zdanis would constitute a panel "to discuss policy problems emanating from recent developments in the areas of patent law and



licensure. The SUPA meeting will provide a foundation for the afternoon's discussion of general university policy issues."

In a letter to Mrs. Karen H. Williams dated January 27, 1981, Howard Bremer, following up on a prior telephone conversation, wrote: "This will confirm our telephone request that the university community as represented by SUPA and other organizations have the opportunity to participate in the drafting of the regulations pertaining to H. R. 6933, now Public Law 96-517." And "We do not wish to be placed in a position of reading the proposed regulations in the Federal Register and then submitting comments on them after the fact, when we believe strongly that early input to the regulation drafting from the university community would be advantageous to all parties and preserve the thrust and spirit of the legislation." A copy of the letter was sent to all SUPA Officers and Trustees.

On February 1, 1981, Secretary-Treasurer Mary Spores sent a letter to all SUPA members with an official invitation to attend the March 9 - 10, 1981 Annual Meeting in Atlanta, and reminding the membership of the invitation from Dr. Dvorkovitz of free admission of all SUPA members to the TechEx'81. As it turns out, this would be the last SUPA Annual Meeting to be held in conjunction with Dr. Dvokovitz's annual event.

In May of 1981, Larry Gilbert sent a proposal to SUPA Officers and Trustees for educational seminars to be held in conjunction with the 1982 Annual Meeting. The seminars would be held the day before the Annual Meeting, with a morning seminar on patent fundamentals to be presented by Peter Rosenberg with an added fee of \$75. Larry proposed offering Rosenberg the greater of \$900 or 60% of the amount collected plus \$100 per diem expenses (with the right to cancel if less than 10 people sign up). The afternoon seminar would be given by SUPA members on a variety of topics. There would not be a separate fee for the afternoon seminar, but \$15 would be added to the general registration fee and each speaker would receive the greater of \$375 or 25% of the \$15 surcharge, plus \$75 per diem expenses. The SUPA members giving the seminars would develop materials for the courses which would be combined and offered for sale, with net profits split 50/50 between SUPA and the individuals. The concept of educational seminars was adopted, but at the actual Meeting (held February 7/9, 1982), Rosenberg's patent seminar with the added fee was given the day before (Sunday) and the SUPA member educational seminars were held on Monday morning, with the regular Meeting beginning Monday afternoon.

In a letter dated May 15, 1981 to Senator Charles Mathias, President McCartney stated "the express support of SUPA for your bill S.255, Patent Term Restoration Act." It seems clear SUPA would continue to monitor and comment on patent

related legislation even following the successful implementation of the Bayh/Dole act. Apparently McCartney also sent a support letter to the U.S. President, as Mathias, in a response, wrote "I also appreciate reading your persuasive letter to the President on this subject."

On July 6, 1981, Howard Bremer sent to SUPA Officers and Trustees and to the COGR Subcommittee a copy of the interim regulations for P.L. 96-517. The interim regulations contained a provision for forfeiture of rights when an invention is not reported to the agency at least three months before "a manuscript describing the invention is submitted for publication without assurances of confidentiality", which Howard referred to as "a provision with which universities will have a great deal of trouble." Fortunately, this provision was deleted from the final regulations.

President McCartney received a letter dated October 26, 1981 from William Lovell, the newly hired (July 1981) Patent Manager for Oregon State University; He proposed the various disclosure and license agreements originated at each SUPA member university be pooled together in a standard form book. The idea was indeed a very early precursor for the AUTM Technology Transfer Practice Manual, which does provide sample forms. In a letter dated November 18, 1981, President McCartney thanked Mr. Lovell for his suggestion, which would be discussed at the next Board of Trustees meeting.

In December, 1981, Roger Ditzel sent a letter of alarm to McCartney, suggesting the provisions of a "radically revised" patent policy for the Muscular Dystrophy Association (MDA) should be on the agenda on the next SUPA Meeting. Roger was concerned that the disagreeable provisions of the new patent policy might spread to "other similar sponsors of research." The disagreeable provisions included: (1) a nonexclusive license to MDA, with the right of MDA to sublicense; (2) pay back to MDA of the grant funding from royalty income; (3) MDA retains march-in provisions; and (4) the sharing of royalty income (after the pay back) with MDA or MDA have the right to direct the disposition of royalty income. Roger suggested: "It may be appropriate for SUPA to notify MDA of the view of educational institutions with respect to the revised MDA patent policy."

Secretary-Treasurer Mary Spores sent, on December 15, 1981, a cordial invitation to all SUPA members to attend the 1982 Annual Meeting. She noted the new PRIM'R course on Patent Law and Procedure - "for the person new to the patent and technology field" - offered on the Sunday before the regular meeting.

As the 1982 Annual Meeting would be held in Washington D.C., plans were made to invite key D.C. people to participate in the program or attend the

evening reception. The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Gerald Mossinghoff, agreed to be an invited speaker at the Meeting. Howard Bremer suggested a number of people to be invited to the reception, including Bruce Lehman (counsel for the subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties, and the Administration of Justice, Joe Allen who played a key role in the passage of the Bayh/Dole Act, and other key congressional aids. Senator Harrison "Jack" Schmitt accepted an invitation to address the Meeting with regard to his proposed legislation for extending the Bayh/Dole provisions to large business as well.

In March of 1982, Bill Trease proposed to new President Roger Ditzel several changes to the by-laws that had been suggested by SUPA Board members. These included: (1) extending the definition of regular membership to include teaching hospitals; (2) extending affiliate membership to not for profit firms that are not associated with a university; (3) expanding the U.S. regions from three to five; (4) changing voting procedures to a mail ballot sent prior to the Annual Meeting; and (5) amending the name to the Society of Intellectual Property Administrators.

Following the 1983 Annual Meeting, President Ditzel sent a letter to Derek Bok, President of Harvard University, commending Steve Atkinson's, the General Meeting and Program Chairman, for "a particularly excellent meeting." Roger went on to say "I believe it is highly significant that 236 out of a total 262 members of the Society attended this year's meeting, which at once indicates both the national interest in technology transfer as well as the broad responsiveness of universities." This continued a prior tradition of sending both a letter of thanks to the Meeting Chairperson (such a letter was sent to Steve) and that person's boss noting the excellent job done. (Note: Derek Bok sent a nice note in response on March 8, 1983, noting "It was very thoughtful of you to take the time to write.").

On March 10, 1983, Howard Bremer sent a memo to SUPA Officers and Trustees and members of his Legislative Affairs Committee, summarizing recent activities and new assignments to subcommittees in Congress noting: "It is apparent from these assignments that continued recognition of the technology transfer issue and matters ancillary to that issue is still of major and perhaps growing concern in Congress. In view of these developments it is suggested that the Legislative Committee be particularly alert to proposed legislation in the 98<sup>th</sup> Congress which would have a bearing on the technology transfer issue."

Also in March, Treasurer Ed Lefner announced he was leaving his post at Texas A&M for private industry, and would thus resign from SUPA at the end of April. President Ditzel requested nominations to fill the vacancy, and from six

proposed candidates, the Board elected James Brown (Assistant VP for Research at Colorado State University - and Chair of the SUPA Membership Committee).

In this vain of perpetual diligence, President Ditzel sent an IMPORTANT NOTICE on June 9, 1983 to all SUPA members on proposed changes to the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) in which "it appears that substantial limitations on university faculty's rights to publish are proposed." Roger informed people as to where to get relevant information and that providing comments (due July 20, 1983) was encouraged.

In the December 1983 SUPA Newsletter, President Roger Ditzel's report to the membership was titled "Important Issues Emerging". He noted that the final stages of creating OMB Circular A-124, the implementation of the Bayh/Dole Act, was in final stage of completion two years ago. He thus anticipated "a relatively quiet two-year term as your President. I was dead wrong." The attention on university-industry relations was becoming part of the larger issue of the U.S. national industry policy, with numerous bills relating to patent policy being introduced in Congress. The membership in SUPA "has grown dramatically and is now at the 300 level." New forms of funding, such as R&D limited partnerships, and new tax laws, were all under discussion. Per Roger: "The next two years will continue to offer opportunity for change. SUPA members must continue their active role in responding to that opportunity."

### The SUPA Annual Meetings

**The First Annual Meeting** was held at the Holiday Inn O'Hare in Chicago on February 5, 1976. Program Chairman was Larry Gilbert. The registration fee was \$15 for SUPA members and \$20 for non-members. Registrants could attend the Dvorkovitz World Trade Fair at no charge, and Dr. Dvorkovitz hosted lunch for the SUPA meeting attendees at the nearby Hyatt Regency, O'Hare Hotel, which was the site of his World Trade Fair. The cost of a single room at the Holiday Inn was \$28.

The program began with an address by Norman Latker, DHEW Patent Counsel, on "Current Government-University Patent Policy. Larry Gilbert then presented "LES and SUPA - Where Does SUPA Go From Here". Niels Reimers, Manager of Technology Licensing at Stanford University then closed the morning sessions with "Preparation for a Licensing Negotiation - Case History". The luncheon speaker was Howard Forman, Patent Attorney, Rohm & Haas. Larry membership application form to the four members of the Membership Committee for comment. The proposed Gilbert opened the afternoon sessions with "How to Establish a University Patent Program". This was followed by a panel presentation on "Questions and Answers on Patent Administration &

Technology Transfer" with Roger Ditzel (Iowa State Research Foundation), Tom Martin (University of Utah), Art Smith (MIT), and Marvin Woerpel (WARF).

The Business Meeting and Election of Officers was scheduled from 4:30 to 5 pm. As the term of the Officers was two years, there were no candidates for election, however George Picker was replaced as President by Ray Woodrow, Princeton University. This was triggered by a letter prior to the Meeting from Edward MacCordy, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research at Washington University to Larry Gilbert, suggesting the Officers should all resign prior to the First Annual Meeting, to open up the election of Officers. Edward was especially critical of Picker as President, suggesting that many SUPA members were not comfortable with him in this role.

**The Second Annual Meeting** was held at the Hyatt-Regency O'Hare in Chicago on February 8 & 9, 1977. Program Chairman was again Larry Gilbert and Dr. Dvokovitz again offered free admittance to his World Trade Fair (also located at the Hyatt-Regency O'Hare) to SUPA meeting attendees and hosted lunch on both the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup>. Registration fee had doubled, to \$30 for SUPA members and \$40 for non-members.

The program was spread over two days (Tuesday and Wednesday), with sessions in the morning followed by lunch. The attendees were then free in the afternoon to attend the Trade Fair. There was a reception from 6 to 7 p.m. on February 8, followed by a dinner banquet from 7 to 10. The annual business meeting was held during the dinner. The Officers remained unchanged, but with the addition of the Past President position, which was held by George Picker. However five Trustees were elected to the Board. Serving during the time period 1977 - 1978 were: Howard Bremer (WARF - Howard was also listed as Chairman of the Blanket Agreement Committee); Edward MacCordy (Washington University); and Donald Costello (Director of Academic Computing Services at the University of Nebraska and Chairman of the Computer Software Protection Committee). Serving for the time period 1977 - 1979 were: Ray Synder (now in private practice, and Chairman of the By-Laws Committee); and Ms. Cynthia Hanson (Assistant Patent Officer, Colorado State University).

The luncheon speakers were Bruce Dahlbo of Dr. Dvokovitz and Associates (on February 8), and Norman Latker (on February 9). The sessions on February 8 covered "Omnibus Patent Legislation", "What Industry is Finding on the Campuses in Technology Transfer", and Tax Aspects of University Patent Policy". The sessions on February 9 began with a presentation by Roger Ditzel on "Case Western Reserve Revisited: What Hath CWRU Wrought?" Roger considered what was transpired since the launch of SUPA at the Case Western meeting, and posed some questions as to why SUPA should exist and what role

should it play. His paper is attached as Attachment 3. Robert Goldscheider, President of the International Licensing Network, followed Roger with a session on "Basics in the Art of Licensing" and then Roger and Robert conducted a "Panel Discussion, Question and Answers".

**The Third Annual Meeting** was held at the Hyatt-Regency Atlanta Peachtree Center on Monday February 6, 1978. As in prior years, the SUPA Meeting was held during the week of the Dvorkovitz Annual World Forum on Technology Transfer. The registration fee was \$40 for members and \$50 for nonmembers, and the cost of a hotel room was \$31 - \$45 for a single room. The December 1977 SUPA Newsletter announced that elections for officers and trustees would be held at the Annual Business Meeting the evening of February 6. Positions to be filled were: President; Secretary-Treasurer; Vice President Eastern and Western regions, and two trustees.

Those elected at the February 6 Business Meeting were: President Howard Bremer (WARF); Vice President Eastern Region William Burke (Chairman University Patent Committee, University of Georgia); Vice President Western Region Clark McCartney (Patent Administrator University of Southern California); Secretary-Treasurer Mary Spores (Assistant to Director, Research Services Administration, Northwestern University); Trustees for the term 1978 - 1980: Theodore Wildi (Assistant to the Vice-Rector of Laval University, Quebec, Canada) and Clarence Martin (Director, Patent and Product Development, University of Utah).

The Program Committee had Larry Gilbert and William Burke as Co-Chairs. The program began with a session by Dr. John King, Director of Research at American Cyanamid Co., on "How Industry Evaluates University Technology". Ray Synder followed with a session on "Patent Fundamentals". The luncheon speaker was Norman Latker. In the afternoon, three concurrent workshops were held (75 minutes in length, and then repeated after a 20 minute break). The workshop topics: "Understanding Basic Clauses Used in Patent Licensing Agreements" by Kenneth Payne (Partner with Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, and Garrett); "From Conception to the Marketplace: A Case Study of an Invention" by Howard Bremer; and "An Overview of the New Copyright Act" by Larry Gilbert.

**The Fourth Annual Meeting** was again held at the Hyatt-Regency Atlanta Peachtree Center, site of the Dvorkowitz World Forum. The Meeting date was Monday February 26, 1979. Program Committee Co-Chairs were G. Willard Fornell (University of Minnesota) and William Burke. There was a reception on Sunday from 4 to 7 p.m. and a Board of Trustees Dinner Meeting was then held from 7 to 9 p.m.

The Monday program began with the Annual Business Meeting (8:15 to 9:15 a.m.) and, interestingly, there was no change in the "management team". All Officers and Trustees remained unchanged, with Ray Snyder and Cynthia Hanson (with the new title of President, CSU Research Foundation) elected to two more years as Trustees. The first general session was conducted by the first international speaker at a SUPA Meeting. Mr. Ulrich Shatz of the European Patent Office described "The European Patent Office and How It can be of Benefit to American Universities". This was followed by "Technology Transfer Through Technotec" and "Technology Transfer Through Dr. Dvorkovitz and Associates". There was then a session on "Small Business Nonprofit Organization Patent Procedures Act". The luncheon speaker was Mr. Donald Banner, Commissioner of the USPTO. In the afternoon, there were two concurrent workshops of 90 minutes, which were repeated after a 15 minute break. The workshop topics: "The 1976 Copyright Act - Guidance for Universities" by Larry Gilbert and Ms. Harriet Oler of the U.S. Copyright Office; and "When and How to File Patent Applications on University Discoveries" by Ray Snyder, Ralph Davis, and Arthur Smith (General Counsel, Office of Sponsored Programs, MIT).

**The Fifth Annual Meeting** was held at the OMNI International Hotel in Atlanta on Monday February 18, 1980. Program Committee Co-Chairs were Larry Gilbert and William Burke. There was a reception on Sunday from 5 to 7 p.m., followed by the Trustee Dinner Meeting. Registration fee was \$45 for members and \$55 for nonmembers.

As in the prior year, the program began with the Annual Business Meeting (8:30 to 9:30 a.m.). Ralph Davis, the then Vice President Central Region, was elected President. However Ralph resigned before taking office due to a change in his job responsibilities at Purdue. The Trustees then selected Clark McCartney to be President. Clark had just finished his term as Vice President Western Region, and Roger Ditzel had been elected at the Business Meeting to replace him as Vice President Western Region. William Burke was reelected to another term as Vice President Eastern Region, Mary Spores was reelected to another term as Secretary-Treasurer, and two new Trustees were elected: F. Philip Dufour (Director, Sponsor Project Programs, University of Maine) and William Honstead (Executive Vice President, Kansas State University Research Foundation).

The first special Award created by SUPA, the Birch Award, in honor of Senator Birch Bayh, was presented at this Meeting to Howard Bremer. Joe Allen, then a member of Senator Bayh's staff, presented the Award to Howard.

**The Sixth Annual Meeting** was held at the Colony Square Hotel in Atlanta on Monday and Tuesday, March 9 and 10, 1981. All members of SUPA were again given free admission to Dr. Dvorkovitz's Annual World Fair for Technology Exchange, which was held March 10 - 13 in Atlanta. Program Chairman was Martin Rachmeler, with Spencer Blaylock, Ralph Ely, Clive Liston, William Burke, and Mary Spores serving on the Program Committee. The registration fee was \$75 for members and \$85 for non-members, or \$85 for anyone registering on-site.

The Annual Business Meeting was held during lunch on March 9, where By-Laws changes to clarify criteria for affiliate and emeritus membership were approved. Edward MacCordoy (Washington University) and Arthur Smith (MIT) were elected as Trustees, replacing Ray Synder and Cynthia Hanson whose terms were expiring. There were no other changes to the Board of Trustees. Per President McCartney's comments in the March/June 1981 SUPA Newsletter "The highlight of the meeting and a fitting conclusion to a great program was the humorous and yet sincere keynote address by the Honorable Judge Markey of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, who delivered a moving tribute to the patent system. Judge Markey once again proved himself to be an engaging and sympathetic speaker. He came out strongly in support of university patent programs, encouraging us all to aggressively pursue our efforts in technology transfer. In this regard he castigated those who would attempt to discourage research in recombinant DNA, emphasizing that no expansion in knowledge could possibly be harmful over the long term."

The general program provided sessions on: "SUPA Activities and Highlights: Legislative Affairs, Education, & Resources"; "Patent Agreements with Federal Agencies: Problems and Responses"; "Industry-University Interface: Research Agreements"; "Patenting of Living Material"; Current Developments in Intellectual Property Protection: Copyrights; Computer Software" and "Licensing by the University".

**The Seventh Annual Meeting** was held February 7 - 9, 1982 at the Washington Marriott Hotel in Washington D.C. For the first time, a theme was established for the meeting: "University Technology Transfer as a Connecting Link to Industry". The Program Chairman was Carl Wooten, with assistance from William Burke, William Trease, and Roger Ditzel.

Highlighted speakers were Betsy Ancher-Johnson, whose presentation at the 1973 NCURA meeting triggered the 1974 meeting at Case Western Reserve, where SUPA was born; and Senator Harrison Schmitt (R, New Mexico) Chairman of the Science, Technology and Space Sub-Committee.



A three hour session lead by Peter Rosenberg, Senior Claims Examiner USPTO, on "Primer on Patent Law and Procedures" was held on Sunday. This was followed by the 6 to 7:30 p.m. reception and then the 7:30 to 10 p.m. Trustee Dinner.

Monday morning was devoted to two Educational Seminars, which ran simultaneously. The "Basic Technology Transfer and Licensing" included sessions given by Ralph Pinto (University of Virginia), Katharine Ku (Stanford University), Arthur Smith (MIT), and Ray Snyder (Northwestern University and University of Missouri). The "Advanced Licensing Considerations" included sessions given by Michael Petit (University of California, Berkeley), William Trease (University of Iowa Research Foundation), Marvin Guthrie (now in private law practice), Clive Liston (Stanford University) and William Burke (University of Georgia Research Foundation). The afternoon had workshops on: "Trade Secret and Know-how Licensing"; "New Ventures to Commercialize University Technology"; "Forming Ventures to Commercialize University Technology"; and "Joint Ventures with the University and the Inventor as Equity Participants".

Tuesday morning sessions were: "PL96-517: "Final Status and Procedure Changes Required"; "Proposed Fee Schedules Under PL96-517"; and "Intellectual Property Organization: Advantages for the University". The Annual Business Meeting was held from 11 a.m. to Noon, where the various SUPA Committee Chairpersons gave reports. The following Officers and Trustees were elected: Roger Ditzel President; Philip Dufour Vice President Eastern Region; Cynthia Hanson Vice President Western Region; Ed Lefner Secretary/Treasurer; Robert Custard Trustee; Ralph Pinto Trustee.

**The Eighth Annual Meeting** was held at the Capitol Holiday Inn in Washington D.C. on January 30 - February 1, 1983. Meeting chairman was Stephen Atkinson (Harvard University). However in the announcement of the meeting in the December 1982 SUPA Newsletter, and in the report on the meeting in the March 1983 SUPA Newsletter, it became known as the Ninth Annual SUPA Meeting. The registration fees were \$50 for a SUPA member and \$90 for a non-member. The Sunday afternoon PRIM'R course on University Patent Operations and Procedures was free to members and an added fee of \$30 for non-members.

As in the prior year, there was a Sunday afternoon three hour PRIMR Course, "to provide the new or relatively inexperienced University Patent Administrators with basic patent law, technology licensing and university patent policy concepts that will be relevant to the day to day problems they encounter."

Monday was devoted to a mock negotiation of an industry sponsored university research program. Negotiators were pre-selected from major research universities and from industry. The meeting registrants were provided the facts sheet and were then invited to meet with one of the negotiating teams to participate in the team's strategy. Tuesday was devoted to workshops, where meeting attendees could select to attend three of the six workshops on: "Publication and Confidentiality"; "Technical Direction of Research at Academic Institutions"; "Equity and Conflict of Interest: Individuals and Institutions"; "Rights to Intellectual Property: Exclusive vs. Nonexclusive licensing and Disposition of Income"; "University Trademark Licensing"; and "Licensing Tangible Research Property: Biological materials and Computer Software".

At the Annual Business Meeting, the Birch Award was granted for the second time (the first to Howard Bremer) to Norman Latker. A newly created Meritorious Service Award was given to Mary Spores. A Bylaws amendment to split the Secretary/Treasurer position was approved, with Ed Lefner remaining as Treasurer and Lamar Washington becoming Secretary. Martin Rachmeler was elected Vice President Central Region and Earl Friese and Bill Trease were elected Trustees, replacing Ed McCordy and Arthur Smith on the Board.

#### SUPA Finances:

The founding capital of \$900 came from pledges of \$100 from the following nine founding members:

WARF	Marvin Woerpel
California Institute of Technology	T. Lee Stam
Purdue University	Ralph L. Davis
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Larry Gilbert
University of Miami	George Picker
Northwestern	Earl Friese
University of Utah	C. W. (Tom) Martin
University of Missouri	Ray Snyder
University of California	Mark Owens"

However this founding capital was returned, as these nine members were exempt from the membership fee of \$10 and the \$30 annual dues for the first three years of their membership. One of the nine did not get their \$100 payment into the SUPA accounts in 1975. The fiscal year for SUPA was based on the calendar year January 1 to December 31. Income for 1975 was \$2520, with \$800 in charter member fees and \$1720 from the \$40 (\$10 initiation fee and \$30 annual dues) from 43 new members. Expenses were: incorporation fee of \$38;

stationary of \$104.25 and miscellaneous of \$2.25, leaving a year end cash reserve of \$2,375.50. Membership at year end was 51 (the 43 new members and the 8 paid-up charter members).

**1976:** In 1976, income totaled \$2800, \$1440 from 36 new members initiation fees and annual dues (\$40) and \$1360 from Annual Meeting registration fees (28 members at \$15 each and 47 nonmembers at \$20 each). As Annual Meeting attendance was reported as 85, it appears 10 of the attendees did not pay the registration fee. Other than \$110 for stationary and postage, the rest of the \$979 in expenses were related to the Annual Meeting. The year end reserve was \$4,196, with membership at year end now at 87.

**1977:** Income in 1977 increased to \$3410, with \$560 from 14 new members, \$2810 from Annual Meeting registration fees (55 members at \$30 each and 29 nonmembers at \$40 each) with \$40 in misc. income. Essentially all of the \$2,542 in expenses were related to the Annual Meeting. This Annual Meeting introduced the dinner banquet (Dr. Dvorkovitz & Associates were covering luncheon costs) so the dinner costs of \$1,647 were the major Meeting expense. Speaker gifts were also introduced, at a cost of \$155. Year end reserves were \$5,064 and membership was at 101. Oddly, there was only one \$30 membership renewal fee collected, suggesting no attempt was made to remind members of this and to encourage payment of the annual dues. This probably was caused by the positive financial status of SUPA and that funding was not an issue for the organization.

**1978:** The first annual financial deficit, of about \$200, occurred in 1978. Income was \$6,064, with \$400 from initiation fees and annual dues from 10 new members, \$2,350 from the \$30 annual dues from 75 existing members, and \$3,410 from Annual Meeting registrations (44 members at \$40 each and 32 nonmembers at @50 each). The Annual Meeting dinner banquet must have been quite a meal, as meal costs were a fraction under \$3,000. Total expenses were \$6,261, with travel costs of Officers and Trustees showing up for the first time, as well as costs related to the first Board of Trustees meeting held outside of the Annual Meeting. There was also \$335 for "Mailograms" related to the Dole-Bayh bill. Year end reserves declined slightly to \$4,867 and year end membership also declined to 94, as some members did not pay their annual dues and were dropped from membership.

**1979:** An annual operating surplus returned in 1979, where income exceeded expenses by \$1,556. Income totaled \$7,190, with \$1,160 from the initiations fees and annual dues from 29 new members, \$2,730 from the \$30 dues renewals from 91 members, and \$3,300 from Annual Meeting registrations (44 members at \$50 each and 19 nonmembers at \$60 each). The Annual Meeting dinner apparently

was toned down a notch from the prior year, as meal costs were \$1966. Costs not related to the Annual Meeting of significance were \$500 as a retainer to Norman Latker and \$1200 for travel, lodging and meals for a Trustee meeting. Year end reserves increased to \$6,423 and membership climbed to 121.

**1980:** The financial statement for 1980 shows a modest loss of \$745. Income totaled \$7,235 with 27 new members paying the \$40 initiation fee and annual dues and 102 existing members paying their \$30 annual dues (\$4140). The Annual Meeting registration fees totaled \$3095, with 48 members paying \$45 and 17 non-members paying \$55. Expenses for the year were \$7,980, with \$4089 related to the Annual Meeting (a loss of almost \$1000 for this meeting), \$1626 for Trustee Meetings, and \$2265 in association operating costs. Year end reserves declined to \$5,678 and membership increased to 133.

**1981:** Income in 1981 of \$18,303 was more than double that of 1980, with 56 new members (\$2,240), 129 renewing members (\$3,870) and 150 attendees at the Annual Meeting (vs. 80 at the 1980 Meeting) bring in \$12,155. \$9000 of the \$13,266 in expenses were related to the Annual Meeting and \$1,630 was spent on Trustee meetings. Association operating costs were \$2596. Year end reserves were \$10,756 and membership jumped to 189.

**1982:** This was another profitable year, with income of \$21,897 and expenses of \$14,943, adding \$6,954 to reserves bringing the year end position to \$18,438. Annual Meeting registrations (165 meeting attendees) totaled \$13,476 vs. Meeting costs of \$12,009. Annual dues provided \$6,870. Also, for the first time, the reserves were invested in a money market certificate bearing 15% interest, which added \$1550 to income. Trustee meeting costs were \$1,792 and association operating costs were \$1,142, which included \$325 to pay for the first audit of the SUPA financial statements. Membership at year end was 216.

**1983:** SUPA continued its growth in 1983 adding a net 53 new members to end the year with 269 members. Total income was \$26,203, with \$7,640 from dues, \$17,010 from Annual Meeting registrations, and \$1553 from interest income. Expenses totaled \$22,163, with \$17,500 related to the Annual Meeting, \$2,739 for the SUPA Newsletter, \$672 for the Trustee meeting, and \$1,924 for association operating costs. A net gain for the year of \$4,040 increased SUPA reserves to \$22,478.

**Highlights from SUPA Board of Trustees Meetings:**

**1976:** For 1976 and 1977, the Annual Business Meeting and the Board of Meeting were one and the same. At the 1976 Meeting (February 5 with order at 4:40 p.m.), the following key actions occurred:

1. Election of Officers: President G. Will Fornell; VP Eastern Larry Gilbert, Secretary/Treasurer Earl Freise; At-Large Members W. D. Woerpel, W. Marcy, and Mark Owens. However Mr. Fornell was not present, so Ray Woodward (who received second greatest number of votes) agreed to serve if Fornell could not.

2. It was then pointed out that the by-laws only allowed six members to the Board, and At-Large positions were not permitted. The By-Laws Committee was then charged with considering amending the by-laws to add four At-Large representatives. The President then appointed the three "elected" At-Large Members plus V. Dvorkovitz to serve on a special four person committee to advise the President on matters concerning the Society.

3. The Board was asked to review the possibility of reimbursing Board members for travel on Society business at times other than the annual meeting. The Meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

**1977:** The meeting was called to order by President Ray Woodrow on February 8 at 8:50 p.m. Larry Gilbert presented gifts to speakers at the Annual Meeting (held earlier the same day) and the Secretary/Treasurer explained the purpose of the SUPA Newsletter and asked for contributions. Other key actions:

1. President Woodrow reviewed the five actions taken during the prior year (written statements or testimony) related to issues or legislation affecting member patent programs.

2. Ray Snyder, as Chair of the By-Laws Committee, proposed an amendment that would create four At-Large Members to the Board, with two to serve two year terms and two to serve one year terms, and two Members to be elected at each of the future Business Meetings (which was approved). From a seven person slate, the two receiving the most votes (Ray Snyder and Cynthia Hanson) were elected to the two year terms and the two receiving the next most votes (Howard Bremer and Ed MacCordy) were elected to the one year terms. Vladimir Dvorkovitz, Will March, and Albert Gold were the others on the slate of candidates. Ralph Davis was then reelected to a two year term as VP Central.

3. Ray Snyder was asked to investigate the issue of SUPA incorporation in Florida, and a possible change to Illinois; and Larry Gilbert was asked to again serve as Program Chair for the 1978 annual meeting to be held in conjunction with the Dvorkovitz World Fair.

4. SUPA members were encouraged to return questionnaires on University patent policy that had been recently sent to them.

5. The President then asked for endorsement of a letter to NIH supporting the concept that patent costs be included under indirect costs. This was approved (28 to 3) but only after it was agreed that the President would only forward

letters on behalf of SUPA after the content had been approved by the Board of Trustees.

6. Two new committees were formed: one on how to obtain protection for computer software; and the second on developing a general agreement form for use between universities and industry. Meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

**1978:** From 1978 onward, a new pattern was established. The annual Business Meeting was conducted at the Annual Meeting of SUPA, and one or more separate Board of Trustee meetings were held during the year.

A. The SUPA Business Meeting: President Ray Woodrow called the meeting to order on February 6 at 8:30 p.m., and reported that the Society is now incorporated in the State of Illinois. Because of the new incorporation, changes to the by-laws were required to define who can vote, that 50% of the membership must be present, and a majority of the members of the Board of Trustees must be present to change the by-laws and to elect Board members. This was approved, and election of Trustees was then held. There were four candidates for President (*Will Fornell, Howard Bremer, Ralph Davis, and Clarence Martin*), Three for VP Eastern (*Albert Gold, William Burke, and Ralph Ely*), three for VP Western (*Clark McCartney, Clive Liston, and Clarence Martin*), three for Secretary-Treasurer (*Mary Spores, Cynthia Hanson, and Henry Bredeck*) and seven for Trustees (*George Stadler, William Trease, Will Marcy, Ed MacCordy, Clarence Martin, Ted Wildi, and Will Fornell*). Those names in italics were the winners. There was then a discussion on whether the Society should develop position papers on the various issues and policies of the Government regarding university patenting and licensing. The consensus was that SUPA should develop such papers, but for the use of the member institutions. Meeting adjourned at 10 p.m.

B. Board of Trustees Meeting: President Howard Bremer called the meeting to order on June 26 at 9:30 a.m. at the O'Hare Hilton in Chicago. The results from a questionnaire sent to the membership in April were: (1) the members voted for the 1979 annual meeting to be held in conjunction with the Dvorkovitz Technology Fair in Atlanta; and (2) votes were evenly divided as to SUPA affiliating with another organization, so another vote will be taken in the future.

Other key actions:

1. A by-laws amendment was proposed to establish an "emeritus member" category for SUPA members who retire. An emeritus member would have voting power but no dues.
2. The nine charter members of SUPA would begin paying dues again beginning in 1979, thus receiving a credit for the original \$100 contributed to form the organization.
3. The expenses for non-government speakers at the 1979 Annual Meeting would be covered and gold pens given as speaker gifts, but no honoraria.
4. Larry Gilbert agreed to be the new Newsletter editor and Ray Snyder will obtain and submit the forms for SUPA to be tax exempt.

5. The Annual Business Meeting will become a breakfast meeting with only a reception in the evening. The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

**1979:** The schedule for 1979 was a Trustees meeting on the Sunday evening before the Annual Conference, the Business Meeting the next morning to start the Annual Conference and another Trustees meeting during the Summer. The Sunday Trustees Meeting was called to order on February 25 at 8:40 p.m. at the Hyatt Regency Atlanta. Norman Latker was an invited guest and there was a lengthy discussion on how best to support sponsorship for the Dole-Bayh (S. 414) proposed legislation. Other items:

1. Ray Snyder was authorized to submit the forms to give SUPA 501 (C) (3) tax exempt status.
2. The Board passed a resolution to pay Norman Latker a \$500 retainer to serve as a consultant to SUPA.
3. The By-Laws Committee was asked to prepare an amendment to create two new classes of membership: (a) Non-university individuals working with patents; and (b) Emeritus member for retiring SUPA members with voting privileges but no dues.
4. Cynthia Hansen reported no response as yet from NSF on the Olson letter suggesting matching funds to Universities using royalty income for research support.
5. William Burke was authorized to book the Annual Meeting Hotel more than one year in advance. Meeting adjourned at 11 p.m.

**Annual Business Meeting:** Called to order at 8:15 a.m. after breakfast for 39 members and 6 Officers. The following Committee reports were given:

- A. Membership Committee report the membership is 107 representing 83 universities (5 Canadian) and 9 affiliated organizations.
- B. Resources Committee reported Northwestern University is holding a Patent Awareness Symposium to educate students and faculty. There is also an effort with LES for cross-indexing industry contacts.
- C. By-Laws Committee proposed a vote be taken to: (a) add an Associate membership category for non-university people; and (b) add a Member-Emeritus category for retiring SUPA members.
- D. Blanket Agreement Committee reported on feedback for model agreements and plans to submit models at the next annual meeting.
- E. Computer Program Committee has sent proposals regarding computer patenting, etc. and is awaiting comments.

President Bremer then discussed the Dole-Bayh Bill and gave credit to Ralph Davis for associating Senator Bayh with the Bill.

For elections, Ralph Davis was reelected as VP Central and Cynthia Hanson and Ray Snyder were reelected to another term as Trustees. Meeting adjourned at 9:15 a.m.

Summer Trustees Meeting: Was called to order at 8:50 a.m. on July 17 at the Sheraton O'Hare Hotel in Chicago. President Bremer led a discussion on several bills in congress, including S. 414 - The University and Small Business Patent Procedure Act. Other items:

1. In perhaps SUPA's first proactive marketing effort, Theodore Wildi, the Board member from Canada, was commissioned to write letters to Canadian universities to introduce them to SUPA.
2. It was proposed that geographical lines be drawn that show clearly what states reside in each Region (West, Central, East), that this be circulated to the membership, and that this be part of SUPA letterhead in the future.
3. Ray Snyder suggested an organization of industry members be formed as companion society to SUPA. He was asked to draw up the ground rules for such an organization.
4. Allan Moore of Case Western Reserve University (organizer of the October 1974 conference where SUPA was initiated) would like SUPA support for a national meeting on "Improving the University/Industry Interface". SUPA favors the idea. Meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.

**1980:** This was a busy year for the Trustees, with three Board meetings scheduled. The first was the Sunday evening before the Annual Conference. It was called to order at 8:25 p.m. on February 17 by President Bremer at the OMNI Hotel in Atlanta. Joseph Allen of Senator Birch Bayh's staff was an invited guest. Ray Snyder was appointed Resources and Education Chair for 1980 and then given the assignments of summarizing rules and regulations of Foundations (as there is a movement to put limitations/restrictions on their funding), and collecting workable ideas to be incorporated into a handbook. Ray also presented a draft set of by-laws for "Industry Interface, Inc." as a companion organization with SUPA with industry members. There was discussion about opposition to the Dole/Bayh S. 414 Bill (e.g. Senator Long) and the need to find more co-sponsors of the Bill (49 have signed on with 15 more needed). There was also discussion about holding regional meetings in addition to the Annual Conference.

Annual Business Meeting: Was called to order at 8:30 a.m. with 53 members and 9 Officers/Trustees present. Ray Snyder presented his plan for "Industry Interface, Inc." and Clark McCartney proposed a task force be appointed to work with LES on a program to present to the Small Business Administration. Other items:

A. The issue of holding the Annual Conference exclusive of Dvorovitz was raised and the majority present was favorable to the idea.

B. Elections: President Ralph Davis (Purdue); VP Eastern William Burke (University of Georgia); VP Western Roger Ditzel (University of



California); Secretary/Treasurer Mary Spores (Northwestern); Trustees Philip Dufour (University of Maine) and Clark McCartney (University of Southern California).

C. A discussion was held on holding regional meetings, and on the involvement of regional VPs in the nomination process to gain greater diversification.

D. The Birch Award was presented to Howard Bremer.  
The Meeting was adjourned at 10:15 a.m.

Trustee Meeting April 14: The primary purpose of this meeting was to elect a President, due to the resignation of President-Elect Ralph Davis. The meeting was called to order at 9:25 a.m. by Past President Howard Bremer. Clark McCartney was nominated and elected President, and then assumed the Chair of the meeting. William Trease (University of Iowa) was appointed VP Central to complete the one year term remaining for the resigned Ralph Davis. William Honstead (Kansas State) was appointed a Trustee to complete the two year term of Clark McCartney. New president McCartney then announced his primary goal is to involve more SUPA members in committee work. He then listed nine committees with the Chairs: By-Laws Philip Defour; Copyrights Donald Costello; Education Larry Gilbert; Legislative Affairs Howard Bremer; Membership Cynthia Hanson; Newsletter Diane Thilly; Nominations C. W. Martin; Program Martin Rachmeler; Resources Ray Snyder. The Borad then discussed each committees charter and proposed activities, and President McCartney then charged each regional VP to supply at least one member to each committee. It was proposed to form a task force to work with LES on industry interface, and the proposal to form an affiliated association for this purpose was tabled, pending the results of the task force. The meeting was adjourned at 1:34 p.m.

Trustee Meeting September 8: The meeting was called to order by President McCartney at 9:40 a.m. in the WARF conference room. First order of business were committee reports:

1. By-Laws Committee: Chair Phil Dufour (University of Maine); Members Thomas McGlasson (Indiana University), Richard Spratley (University of British Columbia), John Wilson (Georgia Institute of Technology). Current activity is to define the criteria for affiliated members.

2. Copyright Committee: Chair Donald Costello (University of Nebraska); Members James Dennehey (State University of New York), Clive Liston (Stanford University), Dillon Mapother (University of Illinois), Vincent Carney (University of Nebraska). The primary focus of the committee will be to develop copyright policies and administrative procedures to implement policies as guidelines for SUPA members.

3. Education Committee: Chair Larry Gilbert; Members Albert Broseghini (Children's Hospital Boston), Phil Thompson (University of Minnesota), Ed Kasner (University of New Mexico). This committee will consider regional meetings/events between Annual Meetings and present a plan for member continuing education at the next Annual Meeting.

4. Legislative Affairs Committee: Chair Howard Bremer (WARF); Members Niels Reimers (Stanford), Milton Goldberg (COGR), Paul Keenan. Problems have been encountered with S.414 in the House by the Administration Bill, 6933 that must be addressed. Howard will prepare a brief report to be distributed to the membership.

5. Membership Committee: Chair Cynthia Hanson (Colorado State University); Members Ed Lefner (Texas A&M), Victor Medina (University of Maryland), Stephen Atkinson (Harvard University). With the proposed by-laws change on affiliated members, the committee will review membership policies and report on recommendations at the Annual Meeting.

6. Newsletter Committee: Chair Linda Burley (MIT); Members Bill Trease and Clark McCartney. Linda was appointed Newsletter Editor upon the resignation of Diane Thilly. The Board approved a policy allowing universities to place job ads in the Newsletter, and to provide use of the mailing list for the same purpose. It disapproved of any other form of advertisements.

7. Nominations Committee: Chair C, W, martin (University of Utah); Members Katherine Chapman (University of Texas), Lamar Washington (State University of New York), Earl Pye (Californai State Polytechnic University). The election procedure will be: a) at least two candidates for each office will be identified; b) a ballot will be printed and distributed at the Annual Meeting; c) votes will be tallied by the Election Committee and the results announced at the Annual Banquet.

8. Resources Committee: Chair Ray Snyder (University of Missouri/Northwestern); Members Donald Walsh (University of Mississippi), Phil Thompson (University of Minnesota), Kent Henderson (Utah State). This committee will develop recommendations to the membership on how to improve communications with Industry, and will approach LES on using their membership list to identify industry people who seek technologies from universities.

9. Program Committee: Chair Martin Rachmeler (Northwestern); Members Spencer Blaylock (Iowa Sate University), Clive Liston (Stanford), Ralph Ely (Research Triangle Institute). For the 1981 Annual Meeting: a) the OMNI is too expensive so the site will be the Colony Square, Atlanta; b) Two free drinks will be provided at the evening reception; c) hired personnel will assist with the registration; d) travel expenses and lodging for speakers will be paid, but only if tendered. The 19982 will be held in Washington D.C. immediately following the COGR Winter Meeting.

Other items: Board members will be reimbursed for travel to Trustee meetings other than those held at the Annual Meeting. Special bulletins to members may be needed if the information is time critical. The formation of a committee of trademarks will be considered. Meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

**1981:** This year was the start of the tradition of having a Trustee meeting just before, and just after, the Annual Meeting. The Annual Business Meeting was held at the Annual Meeting during the lunch period.

Trustee Meeting March 8: The meeting was called to order at 9 p.m. by President McCartney at the Colony Square Hotel, Atlanta. Proposed changes to the by-laws were discussed and the recommended changes relating to definition of members was accepted. However there was still an issue as to whether non-university affiliated teaching hospitals would be classified as Institutions of Higher Learning. The Membership Committee recommended that membership be denied for individuals whose sole purpose in joining is to generate business for themselves. Howard Bremer presented the "danger zones" related to the implementation of the Stevenson-Wydler Act. Larry Gilbert suggested SUPA conduct a follow up survey to the one done in 1977, and he was then asked to create a draft survey for presentation at the next Board Meeting. And since SUPA would not be meeting in 1982 at the location of the Dvorkovitz Technology Fair, the President will write to Dr. Dvorkowitz thanking him for past favors. Meeting adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

Annual Business Meeting March 9: Called to order by President McCartney at 12:45 p.m. in the Crown Room of the Colony Square Hotel. Membership Chair reported that SUPA has 137 members representing 93 universities, 9 hospitals, and 8 attorneys. By-Laws Chair asked for approval of the by-laws amendments that had been distributed to the Meeting attendees, which was then approved. President McCartney encouraged members to submit items for the Newsletter, and Program Chair Rachmeler presented gifts to speakers. Meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Trustee Meeting March 10: Called to order at 12 noon. Marty Rachmeler gave a summary report on the Meeting: a) people wanted copies of speeches or outlines for reference; b) attendees want more discipline from the Meeting Chair to reduce ramblings and keep to the subject; c) some felt the schedule was too tight, and suggested expansion to two full days; d) advertise the Meeting through other organizations; e) consider a one day training workshop just prior to the Annual Meeting. Meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Trustee Meeting September 11: Called to order at 9:15 a.m. at the Alameda Plaza Hotel in Kansas City. The VP Eastern Region suggested a division of the Eastern

Region, and a motion was made to divide the current Eastern Region into the following three parts: Southern Region, Eastern Region, and New England Region. This was approved. The new breakdown will be presented to the membership for approval, and if approved, the by-laws will be amended to provide for one Vice President for each region and the change will go into effect on January 1, 1983. Carl Wooten, Program Chair for the 1982 Annual Meeting, then presented the proposed agenda for the 1982 Annual Meeting. The Meeting will begin Sunday evening with a reception and end Tuesday afternoon following the luncheon speaker. The President was authorized to appoint Marvin Guthrie as Newsletter Editor. There were then committee reports:

A. Legislative: The regulations for implementing PL96-517 (Dole/Bayh) were discussed at length. One issue is a limitation on the inventor's share of royalties, which Roger Ditzel will contact universities and encourage them to submit comments that are due by October 21, 1981.

B. Nominations: The election ballot will now be printed with a write-in section.

C. Resources: A "Congress of Organizations" was proposed to permit continuing communication and coordination of programs. A suggestion to have SUPA members listed in the LES Directory was tabled for further discussion at the next Board meeting.

There was concern over the inappropriate use of the SUPA mailing list, so the list will now carry the copyright notice, and it will be provided to a non-member only at the discretion of the President. Meeting adjourned at 3 p.m.

**1982:** There were four Trustee Meetings in 1982, one just before and just after the Annual Meeting, one in June, and one in September.

Trustee Meeting February 7: Called to order by President McCartney at 9:10 p.m. and then his suggesting that SUPA take the lead with respect to Industry and Foundation Agreements with Universities, relating to research funding. This could extend to developing regulations to be adhered to, and standardizing Foundation regulations. The By-Laws Committee summarized proposed areas of amendment, which will be passed to the new committee formed after the Annual Meeting, as follows:

1. Membership clarification: SUPA is a unique organization with "clout" on the Hill, and it would not be to its advantage to "water down" the membership by including other voting organizations and industry. Affiliated members would include organizations and individuals dealing solely for the benefit of the Institutions in the Member category, and be non-voting.

2. Geographic changes: The Eastern Region "must" be divided into three regions. Regional Chairman, each elected by their regional members, could be considered in lieu of five regional Vice presidents.

3. As SUPA is a U.S. chartered organization, it should be checked to see if Foreign nationals can be members.

4. A new name is under consideration so as to cover copyright administrators, such as the Society of University Intellectual Property Administrators (SUIPA).

5. Nominating and voting could be done by mail before the Annual Meeting, so that the new officers could preside at the Meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Annual Business Meeting February 8: Called to order at 11:30 a.m. by President McCartney at the Washington Marriott Hotel. A summary of the February 7 Trustee Meeting minutes was read by Secretary/Treasurer Mary Spores, providing background on the proposed by-laws amendments. Howard Bremer provided a briefing on legislative developments. Membership Chair Cynthia Hanson reported SUPA has 181 members representing 100 universities, 12 hospitals, and 10 Foundations. There are 10 Canadian members and one from Australia. The Copyright Committee Chair Robert Custard has been acting as a clearinghouse providing information, and a handbook will soon be available. Ray Snyder, Chair of the Resources Committee, reported on his two years of working with other organizations, such as LES, in promoting SUPA, and he plans to work on the idea of a book listing universities and their inventions. Meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

At the luncheon the next day, the election results were announced: President Roger Ditzel; VP Eastern Philip Dufour; VP Western Cynthia Hanson; Secretary/Treasurer Ed Lefner; Trustees Robert Custard and Ralph Pinto.

Trustee Meeting February 9: Called to order by new President Roger Ditzel at about 12:30 p.m., who then confirmed the 1983 Annual Meeting will be held again in Washington D.C. The education course on patent fundamentals offered at this year's Meeting, called PRIMR, was well received and will be repeated in 1983. Robert Custard was commissioned to contact Professor Kayton at George Washington University to request the course be geared more towards universities. A basic licensing course may also be considered. New committee Chairs and Members must be formed and suggestions were sought as to candidates -- and the President will contact the prior committee people for suggested candidates. Marvin Guthrie has agreed to serve as Newsletter Editor for another year. It was suggested that the registration fee for the 1983 Meeting be reduced, with some subsidy from reserves. Meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Trustee Meeting June 8: Called to order by President Ditzel at 10 a.m. at the Capitol Holiday Inn in Washington D.C. He then announced that all Committee Chairs had been appointed except for the Education Committee, for which suggestions were given. He asked each regional VP to provide at least two names of possible committee members for each committee from their region. It was then moved to change the name of the Resource Committee to Resource (Industrial Relations) Committee and the Nominating Committee to Nominating

and Awards Committee, and to split the Education Committee into two separate committees: the Annual Meeting Committee and the Education Committee. Steve Atkinson, Program Chair for the 1983 Annual Meeting suggested a Meeting theme of "Development of Policies and Practices" and to include a case study in the program. I was suggested that there be a refund policy for cancellations made more than 48 hours prior to the meeting, and that the at-the-door registration be \$20 higher than the pre-registration fee. Membership reported that a new application form is needed using the new membership category definitions. Paul Dufour was asked to develop a brochure on SUPA to be given to potential members. Discussion about the by-laws produced the following results:

A. Membership clarification: Full Member will include teaching hospitals and Affiliate Member will add not-for-profit research firms.

B. Geographic changes: The proposal to go from three to five regions was deferred to the next Board meeting, and Membership Chair was asked to propose new region lines to more evenly distribute membership among the three present regions.

C. The proposed new name of SUIPA was turned down, as SUPA has gained strong name recognition and patent administration is perceived to include copyright and trademark matters.

D. Secretary/Treasurer: Due to the increase in the size of SUPA, it was deemed time to split this into two separate Board positions.

The President and Secretary/Treasurer were charged with moving the SUPA funds to a bank in Texas, and the Secretary/Treasurer, auditor, and Ray Snyder were to look into any tax returns that should be filed. Meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.

Trustee Meeting September 28: Called to order by President Ditzel at 9:30 a.m. at the Stapleton Plaza Hotel in Denver. Some highlights from the meeting are:

1. The Secretary/Treasurer was given authority to file IRS Form 990 on behalf of SUPA (the first tax form filed by the association).
2. It was agreed that travel expenses to this Trustee Meeting not fully covered by their respective university would be paid by SUPA.
3. An Audit Committee was formed to make recommendations and to expend funds for future audits.
4. The plans and agenda for the Annual Meeting were reviewed and it was decided to send invitations to the Meeting to all NCURA members. It was also agreed to set the non-member registration fee \$40 higher than member fee.
5. Bill Dufour was asked to prepare a SUPA brochure and the costs to print and distribute the brochure were approved.
6. The proposed increase in Regions from 3 to 5 was discussed. There are 137 Eastern members, 35 Central members, and 32 Western members. However as

there is little activity by regional groups, it was decided not to expand the number of regions.

7. The Secretary/Treasurer to check into bonding of the President and Secretary/Treasurer and to set bonding at \$10,000 or \$20,000 as appropriate.

Note: Attached to the minutes was a listing of SUPA 1982 Committee members, and some names of future leaders appear for the first time, e.g., Joyce Briton (Harvard), Katharine Ku (Stanford), and Marjorie Forster (University of Texas Medical)

Meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

**1983:** There were three Trustee Meetings this year (just before and after the Annual Meeting and in September) plus the Annual Business Meeting (immediately following the February 1 lunch).

Trustee Meeting January 30: Called to order by President Ditzel at 2 p.m. at the Capitol Holiday Inn in Washington, D.C. Steve Atkinson, Chair of the Program Committee, reported on the 1983 Annual Meeting. The growing participation by industry was discussed, and Ralph Pinto was asked to review this and make a recommendation to the Board about participation of industry. Proposed changes to the by-laws have been prepared and distributed to registrants, for a vote at the Annual Business Meeting. Other items:

A. The Copyright Handbook was completed and is available from Penn State University (note: not printed and distributed by SUPA).

B. A survey to determine the educational needs of the Society members would be conducted at the Annual Meeting.

C. Mary Spores will be the new Newsletter Editor.

D. The Nominations and Awards Committee was asked to identify small gifts to be given to retiring officers and trustees.

E. All 1982 committee chairs will be re-appointed, and they will be asked to submit a written report on their activities for publication in the Newsletter.

Meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.

Annual Business Meeting February 1: Called to order at 1:45 p.m. with approximately 180 members in attendance. Ballots had been provided to registrants at registration for election of Board members, as well as copies of the proposed by-laws changes. The by-laws changes were approved by voice vote at the start of the Business Meeting, and the results of the balloting were: VP Central Martin Rachmeler; Secretary Lamar Washington; Trustees Earl Freise and William Trease. Other items:

1. Early review of the questionnaire distributed at this Annual Meeting was considerable interest in a licensing short course to be sponsored by SUPA. Consideration will be given to holding such a short course as early as the summer of 1983.

2. Current membership is 262 as compared to 187 a year ago and 137 two years ago.
3. The Resources Committee sent out a call for information as to forming better relations between industry and universities.
4. Howard Bremer discussed his legislative report and reported that small entity status for universities would not be disqualified due to confirmatory licenses to the government.
5. Steve Atkinson reported paid registration was 226, versus 183 at the 1982 Meeting.
6. The Birch Award was given to Norman Latker and a Distinguished Service Award was given to Mary Spores. Awards were also given to retiring officers and trustees: Ed MacCordy; William Trease and Arthur Smith.  
Meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Trustee Meeting February 2: Called to order by President Ditzel. New officers and trustees were welcomed, and President Ditzel then announced the 1984 Annual Meeting would likely be held again in Washington D. C. in conjunction with the COGR Meeting. Suggestions for next years Annual Meeting Chair were discussed, and President Ditzel indicated he would likely appoint both a program chair and a chair for the overall Meeting. Meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Trustee Meeting September 16: Called to order by President Ditzel at 10:09 a.m. at the Capital Holiday Inn, Washington D. C. First order of business was to confirm James Brown as interim Treasurer, Mr. Brown is also Membership Committee Chair, so he presented a report that there are 297 listed members of SUPA, but 106 have not paid their 1983 dues. Most members pay dues with their Annual Meeting registration, or at about that time if not attending. The plan is to set up a procedure to invoice for dues not paid one month after the Annual Meeting, and to add a notice on the Annual Meeting application form that if they are not attending, this form serves as an invoice for payment of the \$30 dues.

Other items:

1. An IRS form 990 was not filed, as SUPA income was less than \$25,000.
2. The 1984 Annual Meeting will be held February 5-7 in Washington D. C., just after the COGR Meeting. General Chair is Spencer Blaylock and Program Chair is H. Todd Eachus. Concern was expressed regarding the late date for organizing the program, and several suggestions for Meeting topics were given. The registration fee will be \$50 for members and \$60 for non-members (as opposed to the \$90 fee for non-members in 1983).
3. Mary Spores will step down as Newsletter Editor next February, and several names were discussed, and will be passed on to the 1984-85 President when elected.



4. A request by Georgia Tech to use the name SUPA in connection with one of their computer seminar programs was denied since SUPA would be have no control over the teachers or subject matter.

5. A request by Technology Catalysts (a private corporation) for permission to send the SUPA membership list to client companies of the firm was also denied. Meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.