Academic Assembly
January 7, 2013
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: David Arnesen, Brenda Broussard, Mason Bryan, Carol Wolfe Clay, Karen Cowgill, Isiaah Crawford, Tito Cruz, Lynn Deeken, Bill Ehmann, Terry Foster, Christian Halliburton, Sonora Jha, William Kangas, Chuck Lawrence, Kristi Lee, Michael Matriotti, Erik Olsen, Roshanak Roshandel, Rob Rutherford, Chris Stipe, John Strait, Jeremy Stringer, Carmela Villa

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

I. Review of 11-26-12 Minutes
   A. Correction: V. C. 1. "The university leadership has asked all divisions of the university to put forward a five percent reduction scenario; no area of the university is exempt from engaging in this process."

Policy draft

1. NIH implemented new regulations and requires compliance
2. Written for externally sponsored programs awarded to the institution (does not apply to a Fulbright because it is awarded to faculty member, not the institution)
3. More than $5,000 of funding (set by Public Health Services) requires automatic review of the form and mitigation, if necessary

Intellectual property

1. SU does not have a policy governing intellectual property
2. A faculty member who develops their own product and looks to profit from it financially is not a concern at this time, but if it does become an issue then we will form a committee to review the situtation
3. Intellectual property policy should reflect changes in first-to file-instead of first-to-discover laws

Conflict of interest

1. No process for handling a complaint within the compliance policy
   a. Don't expect significant conflict of interest mitigation, these are mostly for large medical research universities
   b. If faculty is doing consulting work for private business in their capacity as a citizen and not a faculty member of SU, there is no conflict of interest
2. Need to establish a conflict of interest committee to handle more complicated cases
   a. Keep the process for the committee development separate from the policy
   b. Issues would be handled on a case-by-case basis by the committee
   c. The financial conflict of interest policy and process should be defined in the new version of the faculty handbook following established faculty based governance review process (e.g. Faculty Grievance Committee)

B. The year three report is very straightforward and follows the recommendations without adding anything extra
C. Main areas that we are not fully compliant have to do with the non-codification of processes and procedures in a way that is consistent with the new NWCCU standards
D. AcA is listed in the governance area of the report a significant number of times, although not as policy generators
E. Although we were originally expecting an in-person visit from accreditors this spring, the visit will now be remote/virtual; without an in-person visit, our roadmaps of complex