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Minutes of the Faculty Assembly
April 28, 2010

The meeting was called to order at 2:34 p.m.

The minutes of the Faculty Assembly Meeting of March 3 were accepted as distributed.

Reports: Tim Neary distributed copies of the Annual Financial Report. Because dues are now only $20, the Social Committee must work with finding a place for dinner for only $30 per person. Precise details on the dinner will be distributed through email soon; the location for this year’s dinner is the Officers’ Club at the Navy Base. The date of the dinner is Thursday, May 20. The cocktail hour begins at 6 p.m., and the dinner at 7.

New Business:

1. Election Results. The Faculty thank Tim Neary, Jim Chace, and Carol Gibbons for their service on the Executive Committee.
   a. New Executive Committee members will be: Chad Raymond, Steve Symington, and Martha Rose.
   b. Rank and Tenure: New members will be Clark Merrill and Tina Wray.
   c. Standing Grievance: Clark Merrill will serve again.
   d. Sabbaticals: Sally Gomaa, Sandor Kadar, and John Quinn have been elected.
   e. Nominations and Elections: James Mitchell and Chad Raymond have been elected.
   f. Core Curriculum Committee: for the Professional Studies, Mary Montminy-Danna, For Natural Sciences, Sarah Matarese. For Social Sciences, Luigi Bradizza
   g. Evaluation Process Committee—Sally Gomaa and Barbara Sylvia have been elected

2. Michael Budd spoke about Relational Governance Structure. The administration has recently extended the governance process; the idea is not to supplant strategic planning, but rather to enhance it. The faculty could tie the discussions of rigor and academic quality, along with an elected faculty curriculum committee, into a common framework. This way, we’d be more of a proactive body instead of a reactive one. Our discussions should be oriented to what makes us distinctive, what to improve/preserve, and what we aspire to be.
   a. Tentative process:
      i. Working in groups and developing a range of options
      ii. Discuss results in full assembly
      iii. Align ongoing work and solicit proposals
      iv. Assess and report progress (the last evaluation of the Faculty Assembly was completed in 2005)

No consensus was reached; the Curriculum Committee will try to present several models to Faculty in September. A motion to approve the idea of a Curriculum Committee did not pass; 15 faculty members voted in favor, 25 against, and 11 abstained.

There was a motion to adjourn at 3:40

Respectfully submitted,
Linda Crawford