

IP
11/1/04
Faculty Senate Presentation

Why is a new policy being proposed?

- 2 years ago, President Glasser reconvened the Committee
- Charged us with the responsibility to update policy
- The committee examined our benchmark Universities' policies, high performing universities' policies and other institutions in KY

By last Spring, the IPC had concluded its work and sent Pres. Glasser a copy. She asked us to move forward providing abundant opportunities for university community input:

- Disseminated the old policy, new policy and a chart comparing them to the full university community
- Received an outside evaluation of the policy draft from a UK law professor who specializes in IP litigation
- Posted these documents on a website and published its address
- Provided university community with the opportunity to e-mail questions
- Held 2 forums in the Spring
- (these activities were in addition to the on-going input from the faculty obtained through our committee's faculty members.)

Given the small amount of participation and input, President Glasser asked us to solicit more university input this Fall

- Held 2 more faculty forums
- Hosted a seminar on IP and Tech Transfer
- Received an outside evaluation of the policy draft from a Tech Transfer/IP professional

The review of the policy has generated generally favorable comments. However, the IPC thinks it is important to review and update the policy and, at least initially, will do so annually.

How is this policy better?

- It expands the definition of IP to reflect recent changes in the law
- Continues the exemption of traditional academic scholarly works and creates a threshold of SIGNIFICANT USE of University resources in University-assisted projects. (significant use includes research funding, funding allocated for distance learning programs, university-

paid time, assistance of support staff, telecommunication services excluding telephone, central computing resources, instructional design or media production, research equipment and facilities, production equipment and facilities.)

- Provides key operational definitions
- Changes the make-up of the committee to include one rep from each college and the Libraries
- Establishes standardized IP creation and ownership scenarios
- Describes a new administrative process
- Defines the role of the committee
- Vests administration for IP with the Provost
- Establishes grievance procedures
- Specifies time limitations (120 days from disclosure to assess the scientific, technical and economic merit as well as the potential commercial value, grievance appeal 20 days.)

Reviewer:

Dr. Joseph D. Fondacaro

Director of Intellectual Property and Venture Development

Research Professor of Pediatrics

Cincinnati Children's Research Foundation

Division for net revenues:

- 50% to the creator
- 15% to the IP Fund
- 15% to the General Fund
- 15% to the Department
- 5% to the College