Academic Assembly
September 30, 2013
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Jeffrey Anderson, David Arnesen, Brady Carlson, Carol Wolfe Clay, Brooke Coleman, Karen Cowgill, Isiaah Crawford, Tito Cruz, Lynn Deeken, Bill Ehmann, Terry Foster, Charles Lawrence, Kristi Lee, Michael Matriotti, Sean McDowell, Erik Olsen, Katherine Raichle, Roshanak Roshandel, Rob Rutherford, Heath Spencer, John Strait, Toni Vezeau

I. Welcome, Introductions, Overview of AcA
   A. President Rob Rutherford, Vice Presidents Karen Cowgill (chairing Program Review Committee - PRC) and Sean McDowell (chairing Faculty Handbook Revision Committee - FHRC)
   B. AcA is official body of faculty governance and plays a majorly advisory role to Provost, which may shift this year as we reexamine the faculty governance structure
   C. During Executive Session only voting members stay
II. Review of 6-3-13 and 6-10-13 Minutes
   A. Both approved with no changes
III. Announcements
   A. NWCCU acreditors were widely impressed with SU, recommendations included: develop intellectual property policy, increase shared governance
   B. Retirement benefits update
      1. AcA appointed five faculty members to discuss changes with HR over the summer
      2. Jerry Huffman will visit AcA next week to update
   C. Faculty Ombudsperson
      1. Three faculty were on the search committee with Connie Kanter, CFO
      2. New ombudsperson McKenna Lang will visit AcA next week
   D. Faculty Handbook Revision Committee
      1. The FHRC worked all summer and made good progress on revisions
      2. FHRC is seeking AcA imput on the faculty governance section of the handbook
      3. Hopeful to take a complete draft of the new handbook to the Board of Trustees in late February
   E. Provost Faculty Convocation
      1. October 2 at 3pm in Pigott Auditorium, reception following
      2. Features announcement of new faculty, promoted and tenured faculty, and endowed chairs and professorships
IV. Intellectual Property Policy (*Guests: Nalini Iyer, David Lance*)
   A. Context
      1. Current policy is out of date, the deadline for the new policy is October 15
      2. The Office of Research Services and Sponsored Projects (ORSSP) has been working on the new policy and related materials for at least a year, using policies from peer and aspirational institutions for guidance
      3. New policy is pro-faculty, pro-staff, pro-student wherever possible, and is fully endorsed by Deans' Council
   B. Open source software issue

1. Some graduate students have an implementation project, such as computer engineering students who develop an app, and the property rights for these are not clearly defined when faculty are closely involved in development
2. The university hopes to not move in the direction of patenting research, and software that comes out of a classroom experience is owned by the creator (in the same way as printed material)
3. Normal purview of faculty member is to develop online and hybrid courses
4. Some current arrangements don't clearly fit under the "umbrellas" provided
   C. University's rights
   1. Protected under a work for hire contract or volunteer contract
   2. Certain sponsored projects, negotiated through ORSSP, will have contractual details that trump the IP ownership general policy
   3. Project center contracts will be moved under ORSSP, there will be a growth period to figure out exactly how these will be handled with an annual review of contracts to keep the process up to date
   D. Definition of "any use of facilities" seems very broad for volunteers
   1. The university owns this intellectual property because of the access to faculty, facilities, resources provided
   2. Under extraordinary circumstances, MOU would be negotiated
   3. Volunteers must apply to be on campus and sign research agreement
   4. Suggested edit: "Exceptional contribution of university resources, which may include…"
   E. Finished IP policy will appear in new Faculty Handbook
   1. New handbook includes a section on amendment process whereby small changes can be approved by FHRC and larger changes must go to all faculty
   2. Existing handbook says that all faculty must see any proposed revisions and then FHRC reviews feedback before proceeding with revision
   F. Next steps
   1. Send specific edits and suggestions to Rob Rutherford, Nalini Iyer and Bill Ehmann by Wednesday (October 2) afternoon
   2. Vote on new policy draft at next meeting
V. Executive Session