## Texas Tech University

The Faculty Senate 3-G Holden Hall Lubbock, Texas 79409/(806) 742-3656 April 27, 1988

| TO: | Members of | the Faculty Senate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FROM: | Georgette | ettel, President gg |
| RE: | Agenda for 3:30 p.m., | heeting \#98, May 4, 1988 \$enate Room, University Center |
| AGENDA |  |  |
| I. | Recognition | of Guests |
| II. | Approval of | the minutes of the April 13, 1988 meeting |
| III. | Recognition | of Newly Elected Faculty Senators |
| IV. | Report by B Counc | 11 Gustafson, Senate Representative, on Administrati 1 Activities |
| V. | Report by M Counc | ryanne Reid, Senate Representative, on Academic 1 Activities |
| VI. | Remarks by | ice President Haragan, Academic Affairs and Research |
| VII. | Committee R | eports |
|  | - Com <br> - Ope <br> - Bud <br> - Fact <br> - Stud <br> - Res | ittee on Committees, David Payne, Chair nations Advisory Council, Ernest Fish, Representative get Study Committee, Ernest Fish, Chair 1ty Status \& Welfare Committee, Uzi Mann, Chair (see attachment) <br> Committee "A" (Library Monitoring), Neale Pearson, farch Support Study Special Committee, Ken Ketner, Cha |
| VIII. | Exit Speech | by Faculty Senate President |
| IX. | Announcemen $\begin{array}{r}\text { A }\end{array}$ | ts and Other Business <br> dintment of ad hoc Senate Elections Study Committee |
| X. | Adjournment |  |




[^0]Thanks to all of you for your service. What a year of productive committee work it has been, especially for those of you who served on multiple committees! Welcome to new members of the Faculty Senate; farewell and thanks to colleagues completing terms on the Senate.
David Payne, Chair
Committee on Committees, 1987-1988

# Haculty Status and Welfare Committee's Report on 

Intellectual Property Document
(Presented to the Faculty Senate on May 4, 1988)

## INTRODUCTION

1. Background
a. In the November 1987 Senate Meeting, the intellectual property document whigh had been adopted by the Administration was presented to the Senate. After discussion, Senator Brink moved that the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee review the document and report to the Senate. The motion carried unanimously.
b. On January 20, 1988, a revised intellectual property document was presented to the Senate President by the Administration. (The revised version was prepared at the request of the Coordinating Board, prior to TTU participation in the Advanced Research and Technology programs.) This revised document was approved by the Board of Regents in March 1988. A copy of this revised document was sent to all senators with the agenda of the May meeting. Note, this is NOT a revised document prepared by the Committee. In fact, this is the first time that the active University's intellectual property policy is reviewed by the Faculty Senate.
2. Scope of the Committee's Review
a. The Committee decided to review the new, revised document rather than the old version which was referred to it by the Senate.
b. The Committee defined its role as a reviewer of the document. The objectives were to identify and report to the Senate faculty concerns and poteptial problems with the document. We did NOT try 40 revise the document or to prepare a new document.
c. In addition to reviewing the TTU document, the Committee also
feviewed six other documents (from the University of Michigan, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Oregon State University, Case Western Reserve University, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, and TTUHSC) and compared them to the TTU's document.

## REPORT

## 1. General Issues

a. The document is cumbersome and confusing-in many places one or two sentences cover many issues. It is recommended to divide the documents in the proper place into two parts: (i) issues related to inventions and patents, and (ii) issues related to publicatipns and copyright (see RPI's document).
b. The issue of "substantial direct support by TTU" (Sections $4(C)$ ) is confusing and should be defined more clearly. In adidion, it should take into consideration the percentage of the TTU support
out of the total cost of the invention and the publication.
Also, it normally does not count as a substantial support by TTU.
c. Students are treated differently than faculty and staff (see 4(E)). Also, what is considered "funding" of a student by TTt TA considered to be funded by TTU)?
d. The composition of the University's Intellectual Property (Section sentation physical sciences be established in the document.
e. The issue of liability and indemnity of the inventors, the University and sponsoring bodies is not covered by the document. (See Oregon State University's document Section 6(b)).
f. Expenses of the University on patents and publications (Sectio are not defined. Only direct cost should be considered.
g. The document does not cover cases of joint inventorship (see fTUHSC's document Section (9)).
h. The disbutsement of royalty income to the department and the college is not clear (last sentence of first paragraph on page 11). It should indicate clearly that such funds will be given to the department and college in addition to the budgeted funds.
i. A general policy statement that a prior agreement betreen the University, an individual and a funding agency concerning patent and copyright be reached whenever there is a likelihood that a "substantial support" is provided by the University.
j. A general policy statement that all employees (both present and new) will be given a copy of the intellectual property document (one which has been approved by the Faculty Senate), and each employee will sign that he/she has read it and will comply by it.
2. Specific Points

There are many minor corrections (definitions, English, structure
etc.) to the document. A copy with these corrections is submitted to th to be forwarled to the Office of Academic Affairs. We also submit Senate of the six itell can be helpful to the Administration.

## PROPOSED MOTION

The Committee recpmmends to the Faculty Senate to adopt the following
notion:
The Faculty Senate requests that the Administration review the comnents of the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee on the intellectual document and fevise the document accordingly. The Faculty Senate that a revised intellectual property document be completed by september 1988 and submitted to the Senate for review.


FACULTY HIRING FATTEFNS: FEERUAFY 1987 - FEEFUAFY


COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES:
2 ASSOC. PROFS.
3 ASST. FROFS.
1 VISITING PROF.
1 UISIT.ASST.PROF.
COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE:
1 FROFESSOR
1 ASST. FROF.
2 VISITING ASSOC.FROF. 1 VISITING ASST. FROF.

1 FROF
2 ASSOC. PROTS.
4 ASST. PROF要.
1 VISIT.ASST. FROF.

S ASST. PFOAS.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { ASST. FROF. } \\ & 2 \text { VISITING ASSOC. FROF. } \\ & 1 \text { VISITING ASST. FROF. } \end{aligned}$ |  | ASST. PROOS. VISITING ASSOC. PROF. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COLLEGE OF | ARTS and SCIENCES: |  |  |
|  | 1 PROFESSDR | 8 | PROFESSOR ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
|  |  | 2 | ASSOC. FRGFS. |
|  | 16 ASST. PROFS. | 17 | ASST. PROfS. |
|  | 2 VISITING PROFESSORS | 1 | VISITING \#ROF. |
|  | 2 VISIT. ASSOC. PROFS. |  |  |
|  | 18 VISIT.ASST. FROFS. | 2 | VISIT.AS\$T.PROFS. |
|  | 1 ADJUNCT FROF. |  | - |
| COLLEGE OF | GUSINESS ADMINISTRATION: |  |  |
|  |  | 3 | PROFESSOR |
|  |  | 2 | ASSOC. FRQFESSOFS |
|  | 1 UISIT. ASSOC. PROF. | 3 | ASST. FROPS. |
| college of | EDUCATION: |  |  |
|  |  |  | FRDFESSORG |
|  | 1 ASST. FROF. <br> 1 VISIT. ASSDC. FROF. | $\Xi$ | ASST. FROPS. |
| COLLEGE OF | ENGINEERING: |  |  |
|  | 1 FFOFESSOR | 4 | PROFESSOR: |
|  | 1 ASSDC. FROF. | 3 | ASSOC. PROFS. |
|  | 3 ASST. FROFS. | 3 | ASST. PROPS. |
|  | 1 VISIT. ASSOC.FROFS. <br> 3 VISIT. ASST. FROFS. | 1 | VISIT ASAT PRDF |
| COLLEGE OF | HOME ECONOMICS: |  |  |
|  | 1 PROFESSOR |  |  |
|  | 1 ASSOC. PRDF. | 3 | ASSOC. FROFS. |
|  | 5 ASST. FROFS. |  | ASST. FFOOR. |


[^0]:    This spring, two committee members conclude three years of service: Marvin Platten and George Tereshkovich. Over the past seven years, four senators have served on the Committee on Committees throughout their term on the Faculty Senate; eight others have served for two years. The committee is appointed by the Senate President, with each college or school of the University having one representative.
    The By-laws of the Faculty Senate suggest that the chair of the committee serve both before and after she or he heads the committee. This virtually requires that some senators represent their college on the committee for all of their senate term. Newly-electedsenators are urged to consider such a commitment; Senators completing their first year are also urged to consider a two-year stint on the committee.

