UCFA
Minutes
Tuesday, April 4, 2000

Members Present: Berz, Bordinat, Crimp, Dorr, Flo, Gliozzo, Gossain, Keith, Li, Millard, Schiffman, Smucker, Tims;
Others: Rubner, Zischke;
Visitors: Fred Poston, Vice President for Finance and Operations and Treasurer; Bruce Benson, MSU Police Chief and Director; Michael Rice Deputy Chief Parking and Safety Bureau; and Paul Hunt, Vice Provost for Libraries, Computing and Technology

Meeting was called to order at 1 p.m.; the agenda was approved.

Minutes for March 21 were approved.

The draft of the letter to the Provost regarding recommendations for salary increases was distributed for review prior to the next UCFA meeting.

Two core issues were the central focus of the agenda: 1) Campus planning and parking and 2) intellectual property rights related to multimedia.

Campus planning and parking

The UCFA and guests discussed the parking and traffic related issues for the first hour and 20 minutes. Major discussion points included the following: 1) the long term planning related to campus traffic and parking; 2) the immediate shortage of parking spaces and traffic patterns; and 3) the All-University Traffic Committee

1) Long term Planning:

• Fred Poston gave an overview of the 2020 Vision for campus planning process; this plan is a systematic long term planning process. The focus of the proposal is based upon a district plan and there is an ongoing open forum for input from faculty staff and students. The full report of the process is available for review and has been approved as a planning document by the Board of Trustees.

• Human safety is paramount. Need to separate cars, bikes and pedestrians. There is too much traffic in the central area of campus. Plans call for new peripheral parking to be implemented. Plans call for dramatic reduction in the central campus traffic with a transportation plan to have regular and frequent circulating transportation system for faculty and staff.

2) Immediate shortage of parking spaces and traffic patterns: Poston and Michael Rice elaborated on the following issues:

• the immediate need for 1000 parking spaces. Some places have been temporarily "lost" due to the construction of the Communication Arts Ramp. Other parking spaces will be needed as the Shaw Ramp is renovated.

• The need to increase the cost for faculty, staff and student parking. The Board of Trustees has mandated that parking be self-sufficient and rates have not been raised significantly in recent years. There are significant increased costs associated with the building of new ramps.

• The costs of parking at MSU ranks lowest of the Big Ten Schools with a range of $960 at the University of MN to a low of $132 at MSU. A proposal has been developed which gradually increases the costs of parking over the next 20 years. The increases are projected at 3% per year; attaching the costs of the ramp construction to another project has kept the interest rate lower for borrowing the money. Furthermore the direct costs to faculty and staff will be reduced by implementing the provision that parking fees can be treated as pre-tax dollars earned by an individual.
• Parking violations and fees paid by students subsidize faculty/staff parking. The majority of traffic violations occur near a limited number of buildings, in specific areas of campus.

3) All University Traffic Committee: Poston reviewed that the committee is advisory to his office and that he had met with them for the first time within the past month. According to Poston, policies developed by this committee need revamping. Numerous issues related to this were discussed including:

• Parking by students in the visitor lots subsidizes staff and faculty parking. Current policy is that graduate students can park south of the river.

• With the movement southward for the center of campus, what adjustments are needed in policies? Many of the policies were put in place years ago when the campus traffic was far less.

In response to all three areas of discussion, members of the UCFA raised the following issues:

1. UCFA definitely wants opportunities to be involved as the development of the 2020 vision continues to unfold. We want to make sure that faculty members have opportunity for input related to their job related needs.

2. The 3% annual increase in parking rates over the next 20 years appears reasonable, especially given the increased rates will be taken from pretax dollars.

3. We are very concerned with the current parking accessibility, not in terms of convenience, but in terms of diminishing our ability to carry out our jobs. The ability to get to classroom and meeting sites in a timely manner with availability of parking is seriously impacting on faculty productivity. Although this has been a long standing problem, it has not been dealt with and seems to be increasing in intensity.

4. We are concerned that the faculty representation on the All University Traffic Committee is insufficient in number and that the voices of faculty are not being heard, given the way this committee is structured and carried out.

5. One of the unintended consequences with the serious parking shortage in reasonable proximity to where faculty work is that faculty are choosing to come to campus less and work from home; this trend could reduce opportunity for student contact.

6. Has consideration been given to re-evaluating existing parking strategies: could more parallel parking be expanded along places like Wilson; could student traffic be limited through gated entry into certain areas of campus; should graduate parking areas be reassessed and redefined?

**Intellectual Property Rights**

Paul Hunt met with the committee for the final 40 minutes of the meeting. Martin Berz introduced the question in general as who owns the right to the web-based teaching materials?

Hunt outlined the current policy at MSU: Intellectual property is governed by two policies:

1) patent policy and 2)copyright policy including non instructional materials.

Electronic Materials currently fall into the latter category. In terms of patent policy, based on recent federal developments, software may be patentable, and methods of business may be patentable. Copyright applies not to the idea, but the process of creation, and is tied to a requirement of registration. There are reciprocal difficulties related to the rights of revision, rights of withdrawal of copyrights etc. It is highly likely that governance will be asked to examine the existing policies in copyright and patent and perhaps the policy in working outside the university for pay.

The University doesn't claim to own copyrighted work unless a wire is tripped, which will cause the university will assert ownership: 1) if you are assigned to write something as a part of your job; 2) if university resources are
used [staff members, grant funds, specialized equipment] or 3) if you are given release time or part of summer employment. However, the common scholarly practice that faculty own textbooks they write is upheld. If none of these conditions apply, the amount of revenue for the outside work is irrelevant; however, it is not possible to compete with the primary employer in the product you develop.

Do multimedia and other materials developed in the Virtual University and similar settings fall under these policies? The answer to this question is yes, but many related questions and observations arise for which there are no simple answers:

1) Who can decide something needs to be revised or withdrawn when unit A creates, and unit B wants to use?

2) What happens to the materials if a faculty member leaves the university?

3) Who gets the royalties?

4) Students own their class work. You can get students' permission to use their class work but the faculty and University cannot claim ownership of students' work.

5) Students supported by university or grant funds do not have rights to what they develop, especially if the material is not related to their dissertation project.

6) Competitions with for profit organizations. Is there a duty of loyalty to the primary institution and not to the competing institution?

This discussion was terminated due to shortage of time, but raised questions concerning patent, copyright and outside work for pay that will need to be addressed by governance in the coming months. The suggestion was made that UCFA may want to develop a list of issues for discussion.

Submitted by: Joanne Keith