

1988

February 23, 1989

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "February 23, 1989" (1988). *Minutes*. 1002.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/1002](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1002)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

**B. Copyrights/Patents amendments consideration**

Chair Foster did note that he had made inquiry of the other Faculty Senates as to their thoughts on the amendments proposed and to date had not received any responses. James Tidwell did contact Foster and noted that the work for hire was the only way the board would actually hold a copyright. That only specifically assigned duties or activities would be subject to revenue or revenue sharing with the Board. That general research of faculty would not constitute work for hire and would not fall under the copyright amendments. The problem seemed to center around the area of assigned duties and activities, what do they mean explicitly by those terms. Those terms need to be written out so faculty know where they stand in respect to sabbatical leaves and release time. There is a need to know exactly what is meant by work for hire. Another concern was half of cost of production. What is meant by half of cost of production?

Kipp Kruse had called a couple of institutions in regard to their Copyright/Patent regulations. In talking with faculty members the institutions do have a policy, but it is administered at the university level rather than the Board level.

Ken Hadwiger's comments to Chair Foster noted that he (Hadwiger) felt that the BOG Board should be taken out of the policy and that the policies should be in terms of the universities involved. Also, that the universities should be the level where negotiation should take place between the faculty author and the President, where currently it is at the Board level and the faculty member is not afforded an opportunity to negotiate. Hadwiger also noted that he would like to see the benefits of this policy solely marked for research and creative activity at the university level, the proposed amendments are relatively vague on that aspect.

Tony Schaeffer then presented suggestions for changes in four areas in the amendments, and submitted to Chair Foster the recommended changes.

Motion was made that the BOG Board include an appeal process at the university level as part of the policy within the copyright/patent amendments.(Schaeffer/Sutliff)

Motion was made to table this motion until exact language of this motion and other motions that may be generated can be written and shared with the complete Faculty Senate before a vote be taken. Motion carried.

After further discussion, it was noted that the following terms do need additional clarification and/or defining: a) work for hire; b) cost of production; and c) assigned duties and responsibilities.

After further discussion a motion was made that one or all of the following people be invited to speak to the Faculty Senate to address the Copyright/Patent amendments at the discretion of Chair Foster: Dean Larry Williams, Bud May and Vice President Kindrick. Motion carried.

**C. The State of the University Address will be Tuesday, March 14, in Coleman 120 at 3:00 p.m.**

**IV. New Business:**

No new business.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m. The next Senate meeting will be February 28, 1989, 2:00 p.m., in the Martinsville Room.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Patricia J. Fewell