

**Faculty Standards Meeting
Sept. 22, 2014**

A. Announcements

1. Introductions of members present

*Allison Mackay, Chair (Fall 2014), *Keith Barker, *Preston Britner, *Elizabeth Jockusch, *Diane Lillo-Martin, *George McManus, Robert Ricard, *Susanne Yelin, Daniel Byrd,

2. Committee charge

"This [Faculty Standards] committee shall continuously review University policies and practices relating to tenure, academic freedom, work loads, rank and promotion, remuneration, retirement, and other matters affecting the faculty and shall propose any desirable expression of Senate opinion on these matters, including proposals to the Trustees for modifications in their rules and regulations on these matters. The committee shall include two undergraduate students and one graduate student.

3. PTR forum on Fri. Apr. 10, 2015, 3-5 pm in SU Ballroom + breakouts

B. Old Business

1. Intellectual Property and Commercialization Policy (draft appended)

Michael Bailey, Executive Director of AAUP, visited to share the position of the AAUP on the UConn Draft Intellectual Property and Commercialization Policy document. He pointed out that the University policy of 'State Law' setting out that the university owns all inventions is counter to the US Supreme Court decision Stanford v Roche that ruled the inventor to have initial ownership under US patent law. Although the state law is incongruent with the Supreme Court decision, a legal challenge would be required to change university policy. AAUP and UCPEA signed off on the draft IP document in 2011 after the Stanford v Roche ruling had been made so cannot protest now. A better model would have been priority to faculty with University having right of first refusal.

Members of the FSC requested additional information about the Supreme Court decision that was supplied by Mr. Bailey following the meeting:

http://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/files/Freedom%20to%20Innovate%20Bulletin_AcademeJulyAugust14full-5.pdf

Mr. Bailey did not know of other articles (e.g. Law Review) that had written on subsequent institutional responses to this decision. Mr. Bailey requested Attorney General review of UConn policy, by Richard Orr has consulted outside counsel and believes the University policy is in appropriate bounds. Mr. Bailey commented that this assessment may be contingent on employment conditions where invention ownership signed away. Members of the FSC identified that changing the state position through the legislature would require a lot of will and it is not clear that there is.

Members of the FSC expressed concern about two related issues:

(i) Whether the university discloses the Intellectual Property and Commercialization Policy as a condition of employment when faculty sign on. It appears that signing an offer letter is a de facto acceptance of the Intellectual Property and Commercialization Policy and new faculty should be informed of such.

(ii) Removal of the time window to market, which had initially been 6 months. Although the University has shortened the time to undertake review for commercialization and licensing, there should still be a specified window after which commercialization reverts to the inventor. Six months seems a reasonable time.

Members of the FSC did recognize that University support for commercialization and licensing was a beneficial service that could be highlighted as a favorable attribute of the University in future recruitment efforts.

C. Overview of Topics for AY14-15

1. Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness

-faculty development, PTR review and other uses, post-tenure review

-histogram, dean's letter about

-mandatory to get report

2. Criteria for PTR guidance documents at School/College and Department levels

Excerpt from Apr. 2014 FSC Annual Report to Senate: “Resolution: *The Senate Faculty Standards Committee (FSC) has discussed the possibility of a PTR framework that provides greater harmonization and transparency across the university, while remaining cognizant of the unique characteristics of excellence standards within individual schools/colleges/departments. At this point, the committee suggests/recommends that a letter to be sent by the Provost’s Office to Deans, Chairs of Advisory Councils, and Department Heads that requests written rules/documents for schools/colleges/departments concerning their PTR procedures, processes, and practices to be developed by the end of the Spring 2014 semester. The FSC also suggests that each unit provide/investigate PTR rules/documents for peer and aspirant schools/colleges/departments, as well as a synopsis of what their present PTR concerns are and how they have looked to policies elsewhere.”*

Sally Reis will provide an update on this process at the Oct. FSC meeting.