Commission on Faculty Affairs
Minutes
March 20, 2015

Members Attending: Monty Abbas**,** Rami Dalloul (Chair), Jack Davis, Jack Finney, Velva Groover, Brad Klein, Chad Lavin, Drew Muscente, James Spotila, and Anne Zajac.

Guests: Srinath Ekkad, Associate VP for Research, and Amy Hogan, Assistant Provost for Leadership Initiatives

1. Announcement to approve and post the minutes from the February 20 and March 6 meetings. Those minutes have been posted on the CFA Scholar site.

February 20th and March 6th minutes were approved.

2. Changes to the Intellectual Property Policy (IPC): Srinath Ekkad (Associate VP for Research)

Two changes for the IPC have been made. Ekkad began by explaining the first policy change being proposed is due to President Sands wanting students to have access to entrepreneurial experiences. The current IPC does not include student IP language the proposed language includes two policies. The first policy explains that students enrolled in classes who develop something while in class (as students) and using resources that are available through the college or department administering the course and the student is not being paid for the work in the course, then he/she can assign IP ownership to the University and/or VTIP. However, if the student goes into a lab, he/she will have to sign an agreement stating that if IP is developed he/she must share it with the professor because access to the lab and its special resources was given as a result of being in the class. Instances when a professor and a student are involved in developing IP make the IP part of the institution, but the student would get rewarded as well. However, if the students develop IP while working as employees, the IP is automatically vested in the university. In this instance the "employee" part supersedes the "student" part.

CFA suggested that the policy define the development of IP in relation to how space and what resources are used rather than by the role of students (student vs. employee) while developing IP. The roles of students are not always easy to distinguish. Ekkad explained that he will look into changing the language and make sure it would hold in court.

The second IPC change is occurring because at times VTIP has taken too long to patent developments and faculty would rather take the IP somewhere else to patent it. Currently, there is no policy that addresses this issue. What is being added to the policy is that if no response is given within reasonable time, then the IP can be returned to the faculty member, but VTIP would still have non-exclusive rights to it. A procedural document will be

1

developed along with the policy with more specific steps of how to file for IP ownership. Virginia Tech wants this document to be similar to the University of Minnesota's, which has step-by-step documents for how students, staff, and faculty can file for IP ownership.

3. Academy of Faculty Leadership: Amy Hogan (Assistant Provost for Leadership Initiatives). Supporting materials in the Scholar meeting folder.

Hogan began by describing the development of the Academy of Faculty Leadership, a new initiative. The goal of this academy is to recognize faculty contributions that might not qualify as "university service," but might fall under leadership contributions. There are people who are currently doing work that is not being recognized. This academy would be a means to give recognition for that work.

Hogan walked CFA members through a draft of the nomination process and requirements. She explained that there would be a committee in charge of reviewing the nominations. Members of this committee will include members that serve on committees for the other three academies and in the governance groups. A limit of how many individuals can be inducted has not been established.

CFA members questioned if there was truly a need for another academy to be created for the purpose of recognizing leadership or if instead the Academy of Faculty Service could be extended to include leadership. If combined, the service academy could become "service and leadership." Most CFA members agreed that instead of creating more distinctions between these two academies, we should be looking toward expanding the existing categories. The differences between the leadership and service academies were not clear to CFA members. Hogan concluded that she and her team will discuss the possibility of either expanding the Academy of Faculty Service to include leadership or work on further defining a fourth academy for leadership.

4. Reports from CFA representatives on other commissions and committees

A. Employee Benefits Committee Updates- reported by Klein
   - The university is pursuing a supplemental insurance plan (like JMU's). They are in the final contract stage.
   - The New Employee Dashboard, a new online system is being created for newly hired employees to go online and see if they have fulfilled everything in terms of enrollment plans. This system may not give specific information on the choices that have been made. Employee Benefits Committee members are discussing whether the system should give more specific information and if recommendations on which plans to choose should be provided. The New Employee Dashboard is currently being tested.
   - The tuition relief for employees' family members is no longer being pursued. In order for this to occur, the whole state would need to adopt it.

- The Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity has passed resolutions that more clearly define their role. There has also been discussion about whether the word "ethnicity" should be added to the language of the Principles of Community.

5. Announcements/Updates

No announcements were made.

6. Other business

No other business was discussed.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Recorder, Elsa Camargo