

Meeting Minutes
University Senate Rules Committee
November 8, 2016, 4:00 PM
119 Independence Hall (SCR)

Present: Tom Wells, Prosper Boyaka, Tim Gerber, Kari Hoyt, Jose Diaz, Brian Winer, Stefan Niewiesk

Ex officio: Kay Wolf, Brandon Lester

Guests: Mario Belfiglio (USG Representative)

Absent: Tom Wells, Jenna Gravalis, Maria Salvador, Masallay Kanu

1. Minutes

The minutes from the October 11, 2016 meeting had been approved unanimously by email.

2. Amendment to Rule 3335-13-06 Rights to and interests in intellectual property, patents, and copyrights (by Dr. Ulrich Heinz)

During discussion of rule 3335-13-06 in faculty council there was strong support for structuring rule 3335-13-06 similar to rule 3335-13-08 rule (research misconduct). Based on discussions at faculty council, Dr. Ulrich Heinz submitted an amendment to rule 3335-13-06 which included this intent as well as stating the principle that faculty owned copyrighted works with certain exceptions.

The discussion centered around three points: comparison of rule 3335-13-08 with rule 3335-13-06, the phrasing of paragraph C, and the flow of rule 3335-13-06.

Rule 3335-13-08 speaks to shared governance by stating that the respective policy is issued and maintained by the research misconduct committee and administered by the vice president of research. In the amendment to rule 3335-13-06 it is proposed that the policy is issued and maintained by IPPC committee but how which administrator has to assist in the administration of the policy is not stated. This point might require clarification.

The amendment adds that (C) The university recognizes the traditional principle held by academic institutions throughout the nation that faculty members, staff and students own all rights, title, and interests in copyrightable works that they create, regardless of their form of expression, except in a number of specific situations described in the policy. The technical meaning of "copyrightable works" is defined in the policy. The majority of the committee viewed this paragraph as an important addition but discussed whether it should be rephrased.

The current paragraph D would more logically follow paragraph A.

The committee decided to ask Stefan Niewiesk and Brandon Lester to revise the proposed amendment accordingly, and present it for further evaluation at the next committee meeting.