

Academic Assembly
March 14, 2011
1:30-3:30pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Karen Feldt, John Strait, Paul Fontana, Mary Graham, Francisco Guerrero, Kristen Shuyler, Allison Henrich, Mark Maddox, Rob Rutherford, Mary Graham, Chips Chipalkatti, Maryann Bozzette, Mary Rose Bumpus, Chuck Lawrence, William Kangas, Isaiah Crawford, Jacquelyn Miller, John Weaver.

Excused Absence: Katherine Raichle

- 1. Welcome**
- 2. International Studies Update (Chuck Lawrence)**
 - a. Program review was well done and recommendations are noted with concerns as well as what is working.
 - b. Opened up to questions. No Questions
 - c. Vote for the report to go on to Provost Crawford. First, seconded and passed.
- 3. Core Revision Survey (Chuck Lawrence)**

Faculty encouraged to participate and encourage colleagues to participate. Importance of campus wide responses was stressed. Reminder emails will continue to go out to faculty who have not yet participated.

fellowships for summer 2012. Dollars are set aside for the core curriculum for launching core Fall 2012.

- h. **Promotion Increments:** Budget increases have been allotted for promotions, from

- b. **Questions and Comments: (Paul Fontana):** Needed some clarification in the text of proposal regarding faculty vs. student printing. Intent was from a student perspective. **(Karen Feldt):** What % of faculty allow for all electronic submission. Mark has not gathered that information as part of this study. Angel is not always reliable. **(Karen Feldt):** Question to assembly – any concerns about the policy? **(John Strait):** In the Law School, all class docs are submitted electronically. **(John Weaver)** added, unless there is draft work, all coursework is paperless.
- c. **(College of Nursing):** Commented that students want ppts for taking notes and do not know how to get around that. Criticism from students who feel obligated to have materials in print. There may be a disconnect between expectations for the faculty and students in college of nursing.
- d. **(Karen Feldt):** – what is the next step? Discussion ensued. **(Mark Maddox)** Would like to take it to the Dean’ s council. Would like your colleagues to have input and would like to enact changes, but not until more buy-in from around the university. The plan is to distribute this and send feedback to Mark and Merlin.

6. Faculty Technology Committee (Randy Horton)

- a. Proposed changes were incorporated. Doesn’ t say what to do if committee doesn’ t want to re-invite the vice chair. Discussion ensued. Language is redundant and needs to be clarified.
- b. **(Paul Fontana):** May want representation on the committee, from each college not required, but recommended. Should the college determine representation? Insert “ optional” might shore that up. Do not state “ Zero” as an option as institutionally the reasons might get lost in the shuffle.
- c. **(Provost Crawford):** Why are terms tied to university convocation? **(Randy Horton)** answered that it started with the beginning of Fall term was the rationale. **(John Strait)** Fall is a problem as people do not show up until last minute and they have to prep for classes. Would suggest that appointments be made at the end of the regular academic year for the following. **(Jacqueline Miller)** - Make sure that it is clear that positions begin July 1.
- d. **(Chips Chipalkatti):** Will there be any teaching load/release time for faculty? **(Randy Horton)** – hopefully it will never require that level of commitment. There will be low intensity – faculty interface with OIT.
- e. **(Karen Feldt):** With those changes, can we vote on it today? **(John Weaver)** 1st, and **(John Strait)** 2nd, unanimously passed.

7. Minutes from 2-28-11