Present: Dr. Kyle Christensen, Chair
       Dr. Kimberly Gill
       Mr. Jay Knape
       Mr. David Mitchell
       Dr. Rodrigo Obando
       Ms. Jackie Radebaugh
       Dr. Sri Sitharaman

Absent: Dr. Kirk Heriot
       Dr. Elizabeth Parker

1. Dr. Christensen called the meeting to order and began by reviewing the agenda which included:
   a. Any old business (there was none)
   b. Accepting the Minutes from the November 22, 2011 meeting
   c. Review of current IP activity by the Research and Service Foundation
   d. Discussion of IP Policy Disclosure Form
   e. Discussion of IP Policy website content

2. Acceptance of the Nov. 22, 2011 minutes were voted on and unanimously approved:

3. Mr. Mitchell reviewed the IP that the Research and Service Foundation is aware of and working on:
   a. Dr. Summers Cognitive Mapping project as a result of a Government earmark – work is being done on filing the university’s first patent in relation to the IP developed by Dr. Summer’s work.
   b. Dr. Seuss full dome planetarium film – work is under way to secure a producer for the film which will be followed by efforts to find a sponsor.
      i. Dr. Obando asked if there might be intern opportunities for appropriate students with the production company, which Mr. Mitchell said was, one, a very good idea, and, two, they would pursue if and when the project got under way in earnest.
   c. UITS Mobile Apps – Mr. Mitchell reported that he is working with OmegaFi on their development of a new payment system for universities which would include CSU apps when they go to market.
   d. Plagiarism tutorial – Mr. Mitchell reported that the University had recently received a call from West GA University about CSU’s web-based plagiarism tutorial and that they are considering licensing the tutorial.
   e. CSU Wind Ensemble on iTunes – Mr. Mitchell reported that he had spoken with former CSU Professor Rob Rumbelow, who had initiated the recordings and their appearance on iTunes. Apparently placement on iTunes is the right of the recording company, Summit Records, who Mr. Mitchell is in the process of contacting.
4. The discussion then focused on the scenarios committee members were supposed to have written for placement on the IP Policy website.
   a. Dr. Christensen reviewed the reasons for the scenarios and asked that everyone get them done within the next two weeks.
   b. The list includes:
      i. College of the Arts (E. Parker – University-assisted – DONE)
      ii. Computer Science (R. Obando – sponsored grant/program)
      iii. Political Science (K. Gill)
      iv. Education (S. Sitharaman)
      v. Staff (D. Mitchell)

5. Discussion was then directed to the IP Policy Disclosure Form.
   a. Mr. Mitchell began by describing the form and its function and purpose, noting that he had revised somewhat the first draft Dr. Gill had written.
   b. Mr. Knape suggested putting the form online as an interactive PDF file that one could complete on one’s computer.
      i. The committee felt that an actual signature would be most advisable, so those filling out the form will need to print a copy and sign it by hand.
   c. The question was raised whether the form would fall under the Open Records Act because the form could contain confidential information about the IP that could hurt its protectability if released to the public at the wrong time.
      i. Mr. Mitchell said he would check with Jaimie DeLoach, our in-house Risk Manager and attorney.
   d. Ms. Radebaugh raised the issue of the top of the form including “Articles” and “Books” as categories to check, feeling that these would be part of the scholarly work expected of faculty and therefore exempt from the IP Policy.
      i. Upon discussion, the committee concluded that there could be times, albeit rare, when articles and books might be assigned by the university or otherwise not part of the scholarly work concept, and decided to leave the two categories in the form.
      ii. To help clarify it was proposed that language be drafted at the top of the form that makes it clear scholarly works are exempted. Dr. Gill offered to create the language.
   e. Dr. Obando raised a question about the appropriateness of Question 6 on the form, which deals with Individual Efforts. The feeling was that if a faculty or staff member produced IP that was totally outside their field of endeavor at CSU, then they should not have to complete a Disclosure Form.
      i. It was indicated that the reason for its inclusion was more for protection of both parties than an attempt to be onerous or intrusive and that it was similar to the university policies requiring faculty to report all consulting and outside teaching assignments they take on.
      ii. The committee agreed conceptually with Dr. Obando, it felt the question should remain but that additional language be included to the effect that IP created outside one’s field need not be reported. Dr. Gill volunteered to draft language to that effect.
   f. Mr. Knape pointed out that if the form is to be an interactive PDF, then more space will need to be given to Section 8 (Commercial Potential) and that the section should include a note about adding additional sheets if necessary, with which the committee agreed.
6. The next item of business was the website and its contents. It was determined that for now the site should contain sections for:
   
   a. An introduction, which Mr. Mitchell volunteered to draft;
   b. The IP Policy, itself;
   c. The Disclosure Form;
   d. A list of members and their contact information;
   e. A section for all IP Committee meeting minutes;
   f. The scenarios being created; and
   g. A FAQ section to help guide anyone with questions (Mr. Knape volunteered to start the FAQ process by setting up a Google Document that all could share.

7. The last item dealt with meeting with the Colleges at their “back to school” meetings this August during which members of the Committee would present the policy, the Disclosure Form and answer any questions.
   
   a. Dr. Christensen will discuss being included with the Provost.

8. There being no further business, Dr. Christensen said he would send a Doodle to all for a next meeting to be held in early May. He asked if there was a motion to adjourn, which was so moved, seconded and voted unanimously.