Members Present: Ricardo Alfaro (Chair), Darryl Baird, Connie Creech, Blair Davis, Aviva Dorfman, Jan Furman, Doug Knerr, and Greg Laurence

Ricardo called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes – November 5, 2015 ► The Minutes of November 5 were approved as written.

Proposed New Program: BSE in Industrial and Operations Engineering (CAS) ► Ricardo reported that the BSE in IOE has been put on hold by the Department; therefore, the item will be removed from AAAC’s agenda until it may be re-submitted sometime in the future.

Report from Provost ► Doug thanked everyone for their participation in the search activities; he hopes to bring both searches to a thoughtful conclusion soon following recommendations to the Chancellor.

Doug indicated that he gave his first presentation to CAC/BSP regarding academic strategic planning. He had eight bulleted items providing the reason and the strategic actions for each. He said that they map to the University Strategic Plan. He has also been meeting numerous times with both of the new Vice Chancellors, Kristen Lindsey and Barbara Avery, in an effort to make sure that they are all on the same page and working towards similar strategic goals of the Chancellor. He explained that Kristen is meeting with each dean to make sure that our case statement is clear and that the University has a definite understanding of wishes. He said that ultimately our unified university role is to make sure that our priorities are mapping to our mission.

Doug indicated that the Joint Meeting with AAAC and Deans will be rescheduled. He added that the Deans have been required to put forth their space requests. The Deans took a tour of the Merit Building and he said that it was quite amazing, with quality furnishings that will remain.

Action: A portion of a future AAAC Meeting will be set aside for the purpose of the Committee touring the Merit Building. Sue will work with Vice Chancellor Tewksbury in arranging that tour.

Doug said that since he has arrived he has poured over all kinds of survey results and he has learned a lot in a short period of time. He indicated that the role of AA is huge and that a clear faculty voice is important. The bottom line is that we need to know, “What does the faculty want out of the next era of growth?” We need to claim the role that we are a first choice institution as well as a regional proud ‘M’ university.
Discussion ensued regarding AAAC’s recent Resolution regarding future chair appointments.

**Action:** Doug will seek feedback from the Deans regarding the Resolution.

**Report from Faculty Council** Greg reported that Faculty Council is reviewing the suggestions submitted to them by AAAC regarding efforts to improve the response rates for student evaluations. Discussion took place. Blair reiterated that for younger students, social media is still the way to go in messaging students. Ricardo noted that for messages that need to be documented, email is the only format that is recognized as a legal means of contacting students, not to say that both could not be used. He also mentioned that there are a few things that units/faculty can do now until FC has had a chance to complete their review, but do not encourage incentivizing.

Greg also reported that there is concern with recent searches where there was not a majority of faculty on the search committee(s). Specifically, they are concerned with the newest search of the Director of Research and Sponsored Programs. In addition, they would like to create a model for future administrative searches and has asked AAAC to develop a model to recommend to the Provost. Much discussion took place that included:

- Are there best practices for searches?
- A suggestion was made to use the Research and Creative Activities Committee as the core Search Committee for the Research Director search. There was not a consensus to do that.
- Conversation took place on what constitutes “administrative” and should it be limited to only academic affairs.
- One suggestion was to include searches for “administrators impacting the campus at large.”
- Doug suggested that instead of titles, we may want to refer to the “reporting structure.”
- Sue was asked to bring copies of the University’s Org Chart to the next meeting.

**Action:** Because there were so many questions, options, and interpretations, Ricardo asked Greg to seek clarification from Faculty Council regarding what they consider “administrative” and/or their intent. Also, Greg was to ask for draft language for a policy to be discussed at AAAC for recommendation to the Provost.

Greg indicated that the third item from Faculty Council was their concern that when the Winegarden Visiting Professor was announced, the Nominator was noted, but no acknowledgement was given to the committee (members) who reviewed the application and made the recommendation. Questions arose regarding the procedures for the selection process of a Winegarden Visiting Professor. Much discussion took place.

**Action:** The Provost Office will provide the committee with a draft of the procedures and timeline for the selection of a Winegarden Visiting Professor.
Discussion of Document “Assumed Practices”  

Doug explained in reference to the HLC Assumed Practices that he has asked Tom Wrobel do the leg work in identifying current policies and procedures on an institutional level that map to each of the Assumed Practices listed in the document. Tom will be laying the ground-work for us. Doug said that AAAC will be reviewing each of the components to make sure that we do have practices in place that cover each of them and/or to propose policies/standards that need to be adopted. He said that the easiest means of tracking and keeping everything mapped correctly is to create a website; however, we cannot begin until Tom gets something to us.

Doug indicated that he would like our university to get to a place where we have a voice in the adoption of the next HLC revision. He said that once we get well into the project, he would like to bring in someone from HLC to provide a preliminary review of what we have done. He said that the faculty voice needs to be consistent with this.

**Action:** Doug said that he would like the Committee to review the criteria and come up with a list of items that are considered “urgent” and/or top priority.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.