2018 Conference Survey Results

Madison, WI conference

Compiled by Bethany Nelson of the University of Wisconsin-Madison

75 surveys were returned from Universities, Scientific Institutions and 1 from another entity.

1 school answered twice. Only 1 set of answers was counted.

1 result was not from a University or Scientific Institution and was not counted.

This gave a total of 73 discrete surveys answered.

This is an increase from 67 from 2017 and the same from 2016.

**Broad Observations:**

Screening is increasing in all areas across the board with very few decreases. Some of these increases are quite large and show that there are some areas where almost all schools screen.

There were decreases in some areas in the “screen some of the time” column, but they were mostly off-set by an increases in the “screen all the time” column, indicating that more schools are developing more comprehensive screening procedures, rather than specific focuses.

Of note, a fair amount of schools allow interactions with restricted parties, though some schools did mention that they had not run into the issue yet.

Note on numbers:

1 school only answered the front page of the survey, and one, only the back page meaning that all answers will use 72 as 100% response even though there were 73 discrete responses.

Some schools did not indicate if they screen an activity some or part of the time. Their responses were counted as some of the time overall, but are given their own column in tables for comparison. The amount that did not indicate is down significantly from last year.

Here are the total screenings and percentages (rounded to the nearest whole number).

**Visas**

72 responses

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type | # of Universities who screen | Percentage | Change from 2017 | Change from 2016 |
| H-1B  | 68 | 94% | +9% | +5% |
| O-1  | 37 | 51% | +9% | +6% |
| J  | 58 | 81% | +12% | +19% |
| F | 27 | 38% | -7% | +16% |
| Other | 12 | 14% | +2% | +4% |

Other specified as: B1, B2, TN, J-2, F-2, O, P, T

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type | # of Universities who screen all the time | Percentage of all the time screening | Change from 2017 | # of Universities who screen some of the time | No indication of how many screened | Percentage of some and no indication | Change from 2017 |
| H-1B | 55 | 76% | +9% | 12 | 1 | 18% | No change |
| O-1 | 30 | 42% | +17% | 6 | 1 | 10% | -8% |
| J | 37 | 51% | +9% | 19 | 2 | 29% | +2% |
| F | 14 | 19% | +10% | 12 | 1 | 18% | -18% |

Additional Information:

2 schools indicated that they screen anyone on any visa from an embargoed country

2 schools indicated that they screen if someone is working on an “export restricted project”

1 school specified that anyone who needs an invitation letter gets screened

1 school stated that they do not screen undergrad or summer students on visas

1 school said the International Office sends Js that are from sanctioned or embargoed countries to the Export Control Office

**Student Screenings**

72 responses

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type | # who screen | percentage | Change from 2017 | Change from 2016 |
| Undergrad US | 18 | 25% | +3% | +21% |
| Graduate US | 23 | 32% | +5% | +25% |
| Post-doc US | 22 | 31% | +9% | +24% |
| Undergrad International | 33 | 46% | +12% | +34% |
| Graduate International | 48 | 67% | No change | +31% |
| Post-doc International | 50 | 67% | +6% | +16% |

All schools indicated that they screened some or all of the time on this question so the “no indication” column is not used.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type | # of Universities who screen all the time | Percentage of all the time screening | Change from 2017 | # of Universities who screen some of the time | Percentage of some screening | Change from 2017 |
| Undergrad US | 4 | 6% | No change | 14 | 19% | +3% |
| Graduate US | 7 | 10% | +4% | 16 | 22% | +1% |
| Post-doc US | 6 | 8% | +4% | 16 | 22% | +4% |
| Undergrad International | 9 | 13% | +3% | 24 | 33% | +9% |
| Graduate International | 18 | 25% | +7% | 30 | 42% | +3% |
| Post-doc International | 21 | 29% | +5% | 29 | 40% | +3% |

Additional Information:

3 schools indicated that they screen U.S. students if they are working with a TCP

2 schools indicated that they screen international students only when involved in research that could be export controlled

1 school screens only when a student is party to an “NDA, MTA etc.”

1 school screens when students have restricted technology access

1 school indicated they may drop the student screenings

Additional information not reflected in the above numbers:

1 school indicated that they will screen students only when contractually obligated

**Restricted Party Interactions**

71 responses

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Type | # of schools who allow | Percentage |
| Travel to Restricted Parties | 22 | 31% |
| Visitors from Restricted Parties | 29 | 40% |
| Contracts with Restricted Parties | 7 | 10% |
| Students from Restricted Parties | 32 | 44% |

There are 71 responses because one school specifically indicated that they were not providing an answer.

Additional information

4 schools stated they had not had this situation

3 schools said it was on a case-by-case basis

2 schools said it was a case-by case basis but they had not had any yet

1 school indicated it has not come up but would allow it as long as there was compliance with the law

1 school that indicated they allow visitors, but said it is very rare and closely monitored

1 school indicated that some of the categories never came up, but added that may be because the school’s procedures are not designed to identify them

1 school said that for travel, they counsel the traveler, for visitors they restrict closely and for students that monitor and counsel faculty

1 school said they would chat with the traveler

1 allows students if there is no current connection with a restricted university and the restricted university was simply one they had attended previously

1 allows with provisos

1 school stated that travel and visitors is decentralized and they have no way of knowing if interactions are occurring

1 school said that the Computer Science department will not allow visitors from restricted parties to come, but other departments will

1 advises against travel to restricted entities but will advise on not sharing confidential or proprietary information and limits students based on the fiduciary relationship

1 indicated that they will allow visitors for fundamental research only

1 seldom allows travel and if there is a student will have a meeting with the PI and possibly the FBI

Not reflected in numbers:

1 school indicated that they will sometimes allow these things under limited circumstances with controls, but they did not mark anything

**MTAs**

72 responses

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type | # of schools who screen | Percentage | Change from 2017 | Change from 2016 |
| Incoming Domestic MTAs | 28 | 39% | +3% | +7% |
| Outgoing Domestic MTAs | 30 | 42% | +3% | +9% |
| Incoming Foreign MTAs | 50 | 69% | +3% | +5% |
| Outgoing Foreign MTAs | 63 | 88% | +12% | +7% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type | # of Universities who screen all the time | Percentage of all the time screening | Change from 2017 | # of Universities who screen some of the time | No indication of how many screened | Percentage of some and no indication | Change from 2017 |
| Incoming domestic | 13 | 18% | +2% | 13 | 2 | 21% | +2% |
| Outgoing domestic | 16 | 22% | +3% | 13 | 1 | 19% | -6% |
| Incoming foreign | 33 | 46% | +3% | 14 | 2 | 22% | No change |
| Outgoing foreign | 51 | 71% | +15% | 9 | 3 | 17% | -2% |

Additional information:

1 school indicated that their sponsored programs office will forward when they think it might have an export issue

1 school screens domestic MTAs when it involves export controlled material

1 school screens MTAs that involved controlled materials or ones that have export language

1 school’s MTA screenings are handled by the Office of Technology Licensing

**Travel**

72 responses

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type | # of schools who screen | percentage | Change from 2017 | Change from 2016 |
| Domestic Travel | 3 | 4% | +1% | +4% |
| Foreign Travel | 70 | 97% | +4% | +16% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type | # of Universities who screen all the time | Percentage of all the time screening | Change from 2017 | # of Universities who screen some of the time | No indication of how many screened | Percentage of some and no indication | Change from 2017 |
| Domestic Travel | 1 | 1% | +1% | 2 | 0 | 3% | No change |
| Foreign Travel | 26 | 36% | +15% | 41 | 3 | 61% | -11% |

Additional information:

1 school screens foreign travel if bringing school-owned equipment or traveling to sanctioned countries

1 school screens some travel to sanctioned countries

1 school screens anyone who registered with their internal system

1 school screens in departments that do restricted work

1 school screens travel to embargoed/sanctioned countries

1 school sends an e-mail when foreign travel is indicated in a budget and has a website that asks students to indicate foreign travel

1 school screens travel when there is a foreign sponsor or if there is export control language in the contract

**Grants and other contracts**

72 responses

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type | # of schools who screen | percentage | Change from 2017 | Change from 2016 |
| Grants | 68 | 94% | +7% | +10% |
| Fee For Service(FFS) | 41 | 57% | +3% | +12% |
| NDAs | 64 | 89% | +11% | +16% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type | # of Universities who screen all the time | Percentage of all the time screening | Change from 2017 | # of Universities who screen some of the time | No indication of how many screened | Percentage of some and no indication | Change from 2017 |
| Grants | 33 | 46% | +10% | 34 | 1 | 49% | -2% |
| Fee For Service(FFS) | 17 | 24% | +6% | 24 | 0 | 33% | -3% |
| NDAs | 26 | 36% | +8% | 37 | 1 | 53% | +4% |

Additional information:

1 school indicated that they screen grants that are DOD or DOE funded and screen NDAs if they have export control language

1 school screens NDAs with foreign parties

1 school screens grants with export control red flags

1 schools screens all international awards

**Purchases**

72 responses

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type | # of schools who screen | percentage | Change from 2017 | Change from 2016 |
| By the University from domestic sources | 34 | 47% | +7% | +13% |
| By the University from foreign sources | 55 | 76% | +15% | +17% |
| From the University by domestic sources | 19 | 26% | -4% | +4% |
| From the University by foreign sources | 38 | 53% | +4% | +19% |
| other | 3 |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type | # of Universities who screen all the time | Percentage of all the time screening | Change from 2017 | # of Universities who screen some of the time | No indication of how many screened | Percentage of some and no indication | Change from 2017 |
| By the University from domestic sources | 14 | 19% | +5% | 20 | 0 | 28% | No change |
| By the University from foreign sources | 23 | 32% | +10% | 31 | 1 | 44% | +5% |
| From the University by domestic sources | 10 | 14% | +4% | 9 | 0 | 13% | -6% |
| From the University by foreign sources | 17 | 24% | +5% | 20 | 1 | 29% | -1% |

Additional Information:

1 school indicated that they screen purchase card transactions when made for specific items like cameras, software etc.

1 school indicated that they do not sell anything

1 school screens based on a list of high risk items

Time Screened

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Type | # who screen |
| Screen purchases before | 20 |
| Screen purchases after | 2 |
| Mixture of both | 33 |

**Shipments**

72 responses

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type | # of schools who screen | percentage | Change from 2017 | Change from 2016 |
| Domestic shipments | 6 | 8% | -2% | +5% |
| Foreign shipments | 59 | 82% | +7% | +31% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type | # of Universities who screen all the time | Percentage of all the time screening | Change from 2017 | # of Universities who screen some of the time | No indication of how many screened | Percentage of some and no indication | Change from 2017 |
| Domestic shipments | 2 | 3% | +2% | 4 | 0 | 6% | -3% |
| Foreign shipments | 16 | 22% | +10% | 42 | 1 | 60% | -3% |

Additional information:

1 school indicated that they are in the process of moving from screening some foreign shipments to all foreign shipments

1 school indicated that they were confident they were catching over 90% of international shipments and had checked the all foreign shipments screened

1 school stated that they send an automated e-mail to departments to contact the export control office regarding shipping when an award is funded

**Visitors**

72 responses

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type | # of schools who screen | percentage | Change from 2017 | Change from 2016 |
| Conference visitors | 33 | 46% | +9% | +26% |
| Regular campus visitors | 46 | 64% | +12% | +32% |

All schools indicated that they screened some or all of the time on this question so the “no indication” column is not used.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type | # of Universities who screen all the time | Percentage of all the time screening | Change from 2017 | # of Universities who screen some of the time | Percentage of some  | Change from 2017 |
| Conference Visitors | 6 | 8% | +1% | 27 | 38% | +8% |
| Regular Visitors | 8 | 11% | +2% | 38 | 53% | +10% |

Additional information:

6 schools indicated that they only screen international visitors

1 school screens visitors if they know they are coming

1 school is rolling out a centralized visitor process that will not require faculty to send visitor names, but will direct them to do so

**Mandatory Training**

72 responses

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type | # of Universities | Percentage | Change from 2017 |
| Mandatory Training | 45 | 63% | +2% |
| No Mandatory Training | 24 | 33% | -6% |
| No indication | 1 | 1% | N/A |

**Classified Research Acceptance**

72 responses

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Accepts classified | 25 | 35% |
| Does not accept classified | 42 | 58% |
| Unclear/did not indicate | 5 | 7% |

Notes on unclear category:

2 schools did not indicate

1 school circled both yes and no

1 school put a question mark

1 school said sort of

**Developing Processes**

35 Schools indicated that they were developing processes in a variety of areas. Some schools listed more than one process in development

The following processes are listed as in development:

8 Shipping

4 visitors

4 purchases

3 J visas

2 mandatory training

2 international visitors

2 looking for an integrated system

2 foreign travel

2 All items listed in survey

2 F-1 visas

1 travel

1 expand screening to more visa types

1 screening international grad students and post do-docs

1 B visas

1 vendors and sub-contractors

1 consignees and end-users

1 use visual compliance

1 university Policy

1 looking at the risk and benefit of a lot of different areas in favor of focusing on areas of restricted work

1 broad program development

1 revising and updating processes

1 MTAs

1 annual question/disclosure as part of COI

1 all visas

1 all new hires

1 foreign military students

1 purchases from the University by domestic and foreign sources

1 FFS

1 evaluating RPS process and system for automatic screening of employees and grad students

1 TCPs

1 University-wide program

1 improve screening

Breaking down the numbers as Universities who accept classified research vs. those that don’t

Percentages were based on that category total only(i.e classified was based on 25 total etc.).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Accepts classified-25 total | Does not accept classified-45 total | Unclear/did not indicate-5 total |
| H-1B | 24 (96%) | 40 (89%) | 4 |
| O-1 | 13 (52%) | 23 (51%) | 1 |
| J | 22 (88%) | 32 (71%) | 4 |
| F | 12 (48%) | 14 (315) | 1 |
| Other | 5 (20%) | 6 (13%) | 1 |
| Undergrad US | 9 (36%) | 7 (16%) | 2 |
| Grad US | 11 (44%) | 10 (22%) | 2 |
| Post-doc US | 11 (44%) | 9 (20%) | 2 |
| Undergrad International | 15 (60%) | 16 (36%) | 2 |
| Grad International | 19 (76%) | 26 (58%) | 3 |
| Post-doc International | 21 (84%) | 26 (58%) | 3 |
| Allow travel to Restricted Parties | 9 (36%) | 13 (29%) | 0 |
| Allow Visitors from Restricted Parties | 10 (40%) | 17 (38%) | 2 |
| Allow contracts with restricted parties | 2 (8%) | 5 (11%) | 0 |
| Allow students from restricted parties | 12 (48%) | 18 (40%) | 2 |
| Incoming Domestic MTAs | 15 (60%) | 12 (27%) | 1 |
| Outgoing Domestic MTAs | 14 (56%) | 15 (33%) | 1 |
| Incoming Foreign MTAs | 20 (80%) | 27 (60%) | 3 |
| Outgoing Foreign MTAs | 23 (92%) | 35 (78%) | 5 |
| Domestic Travel | 2 (8%) | 1 (2%) | 0 |
| Foreign Travel | 25 (100%) | 40 (88%) | 5 |
| Grants | 23 (92%) | 40 (88%) | 5 |
| FFS | 18 (72%) | 20 (44%) | 3 |
| NDA | 24 (96%) | 35 (78%) | 5 |
| Purchases by the University from Domestic sources | 13 (52%) | 18 (40%) | 3 |
| Purchases by the University from Foreign sources | 21 (84%) | 29 (64%) | 5 |
| Purchases from the University by Domestic sources | 9 (36%) | 8 (18%) | 2 |
| Purchases from the University by Foreign sources | 18 (72%) | 15 (33%) | 5 |
| Domestic shipments | 3 (12%) | 3 (7%) | 0 |
| Foreign shipments | 20 (80%) | 34 (76%) | 5 |
| Conference visitors | 13 (52%) | 19 (42%) | 1 |
| Regular visitors | 20 (80%) | 24 (53%) | 2 |
| Mandatory Training | 22 (88%) | 21 (47%) | 2 |