

Meeting of the Villanova University Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee

Wednesday, September 29, 2021, 9:00-10:00 AM, Zoom

Minutes

Present: Paul Bernhardt, Samantha Chapman, Amanda Knecht (chair), James Peyton-Jones, Jennifer Ross, John Sedunov

The committee met via Zoom and conducted the following business:

I. Intellectual Property/Patent Policy

James Peyton-Jones updated the committee on the status of previously requested changes to the university's Intellectual Property Policy. The policy now does not include a section devoted to electronic courses. The examples of traditional academic work now includes digital work and teaching materials that belong to the lecturer now includes videos.

The committee then focused on the changes we still would like to see made and some changes that have been made by the administration recently. In section IV.F.3.a, we discussed using the original language "Villanova has historically" where it has been changed to "Villanova generally does not claim." In section IV.F.3.c, there was wording that was agreed to before that we still would like to see changed. It was also pointed out that while the faculty are now protected by changes made in section F, staff are not, and they should consider looking at the policy.

The next several minutes of the meeting involved section IV.E, the Patent Policy. We are worried what will happen if the inventor leaves the university or the buyer of the patent decides to just sit on it and not let the invention be used. If the university maintains its sole ownership, the committee decided to suggest that our objection should be noted in the history section, VII, of the document.

We ended our discussion of the Patent Policy by noting that the sentence at the end of paragraph IV.E.4 should be removed from the policy. The language used seems to assume a future antagonistic situation, and we would like to avoid such assumptions. We also notice that in the third line of IV.B, the term "his/her" should be replaced with "their."

II. Grievance Policy

The committee briefly discussed the fourth area excluded in the Grievance Policy in the faculty handbook. As currently stated, a decision by any university committee required by law to ensure compliance with government regulations is not subject to the standard grievance policy. We think that this should be changed to assure that any punitive actions taken against a faculty member will always be open to that faculty filing a grievance. The compliance

committee is free to make sure the faculty member is complying but should not be able to punish the faculty member without that faculty member being able to pursue a grievance of type 1.

III. To do list

The meeting adjourned after we decided that we will send an email to all members of the FRRC to vote on our proposed changes to the IP Policy. We also agreed that Amanda should reach out to Tom Way to check on the status of FRCC's 2019 recommendations to the Lindback Committee and talk to Craig Wheeland about the grievance policy.

IV. Ideas for our next meeting

- Review Sabbatical Policies of similar universities.
- What are the healthcare options if one opts for early retirement?
- Should there be a policy that could let emeritus faculty keep their labs?
- Why do faculty have to apply to be named emeritus? Should this be automatic after some number of years of service in good standing?