The Faculty Senate Research Committee has addressed several topics this year. These topics were reported to the University Research Council on 3-10-11 and there was some feedback from Dr. Gerald Sonnenfeld on a few of these issues. The topics are listed below.

1. Ownership of **Intellectual Property**.

   Section 5 Determination of ownership rights in Intellectual Property. Specifically parts 5.a.v.1. under university ownership and 5.b.iv.1. under creator ownership which seem to potentially overlap (See below). The committee requests clarification and possible review by the policy committee.

   5.a.v.1. *For clarification purposes, the University shall retain rights to:*

   *Classes and/or Courseware developed for teaching at the University whether fixed in tangible or electronic media. For illustration purposes only, a Class includes the syllabus and any Class notes, if provided, but would not include teaching notes. Courseware includes any and all software and digital material (in any media).*

   5. b.iv.1. *iv. For clarification purposes, Creators shall retain rights to:*

   *Creative or scholarly works including artworks, musical compositions, and literary works directly related to their professional endeavors, credentials, and/or activities. This includes any personal material created, developed, or used solely by Authors in connection with their delivery of University Classes.*

2. Reviewing suggested changes to **Part VII of the Faculty Manual** dealing with the description for the IP committee.

   The Intellectual Property Committee was only defined as”representatives from the faculty and administration.” The Faculty Research committee has several recommendations to be considered by the Faculty Senate.

   a. The Research committee recommends using the IPC return the previous description in the faculty manual except for having a graduate and undergraduate student on the committee. The committee was not sure why the committee make-up was changed to the vague description in the revised section of the manual. The Research committee recommends the Manual read:

   *The IPC consists of a chair appointed by the VP of Research, the Associate Director of Research Operations who serves as secretary, the general counsel or his/her designee, a representative from administration and advancement, an associate dean from each college, a faculty representative from each college and the person from Cooper Library identified as patent coordinator.*
b. The Research Committee recommends that any appeals to the decisions by the IPC be reviewed by an Appeal committee comprised of equal number of faculty and administrators from the university.

c. The Research Committee recommends that when a faculty submits an appeal, the faculty will have the option to present written input from person(s) with expertise specific to the IP being considered.

   Dr. Sonnenfeld stated that filing for patents through the IPC would become more stringent since the number of successful filings was low and cost was high. He also stated he did not see a need for an appeals process since if the university decided not to pursue the IP, the inventor was free to take ownership and pursue a patent themselves.

3. **Internal Grant Submission Process**: the internal selection of single submission proposals, i.e. proposals whose number per institution is limited by the funding agencies? Knowing the process and the people reviewing the proposals may allow faculty to improve the clarity and quality of their submission. The committee wondered if expertise of faculty could be placed into FAS and this could be used to identify potential reviewers of internal grants. This was determined to be too cumbersome and require additional faculty time. The suggestion has been made to include keywords with internal submissions and this could be used to identify potential reviewers. Senator Temesvera will contact Wickes Westcott to see if a keywords option for research can be added to the FAS.

4. Developing a way to document and account for **non-traditional awards**. Can FAS be changed to address this?

   There is currently a non-traditional award form.

5. Revision of the consulting policy has been discussed also. The committee concluded that some timeline for response was needed since some research opportunities are time sensitive and examples of lost research funding were mentioned due to the faculty not being able to get an expedited approval for consulting. An expedited form for short term consulting was discussed. A possible sign off at the Dean level was also discussed for cases that fell under certain guidelines approved by the VP of Research ahead of time as “rubber stamp” types.

   Dr. Sonnenfeld felt that a timeline for consulting forms was reasonable but that there could not be a “rubber stamp” for streamlined cases due to legal implications.