The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair Dan Lair.

Provost Report ► Provost Knerr disseminated the Internal Audit Grade Management Report noting that page one provides the overall variances that have gone on. He indicated that that item will be revisited in a future meeting to discuss thoughts and/or endorsements to tighten up the process.

Provost Knerr provided an overview of slight personnel changes regarding University Outreach and the Thompson Center for Learning and Teaching. Recently, a posting was launched to hire a permanent Director for University Outreach with one internal candidate. He asked for volunteers to review applications. One of the changes between the two units is that the Boyer Scholar program will now be part of TCLT. He sees the two directors as peers and indicated that they both have important and big jobs to handle.

He also provided an update regarding the Qualtrics survey in terms of a dean for the School of Nursing.

Doug reminded members that, if they have not already done so, to complete the Strategic Planning Survey and encourage others to do the same. He reported that recently a joint swat analysis between the Steering Committee and the Strategic Planning Committee occurred.

Doug indicated that much work is being done in terms of enrollment management, with the major goal, of course, being yield. He indicated that international recruitment continues to be a challenge and emphasized the need and desire to continue the emphasis of developing more online programs where appropriate. He also reported that merit aid for transfer has been enhanced and that package information is being sent to key institutions. Also, many new events such as GEC/DEEP reception, invites to leaders from places such as Henry Ford College have been extended, and a reception for alums and prospective students is scheduled in April in Chicago, to name a few. In addition, we have partnered with Keypath, an online marking organization with noted success, to target out of region and state prospects.
Provost Knerr concluded by indicated that he will be attending the tri-campus Academic Affairs Honors Convocation at Hill Auditorium in Ann Arbor on March 19 followed by a reception for students.

**Graduate Program Guidelines Proposal** ➤ As a follow-up to previous discussions, Senior Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Programs Lotfi indicated that as a result of the Graduate Board (GB) reviewing its New Graduate Program Approval Process, they decided to propose a more streamlined process which would eliminate AAAC from reviewing new programs going directly to the Provost for approval. He noted the following reasons for wanting to streamline the process:

- Of the many committees and review processes a new program must go through, GB felt that it sometime hinders them from the ability to develop new programs in a timely fashion.
- Sometimes programs have taken as long as two years to develop and get through the approval processes, thus, preventing us from sometimes being competitive.
- As new programs go through committee reviews, many of the same questions are raised and answered; thus, streamlining the process would eliminate redundancy.
- The new streamlined process is similar to the ones of both Ann Arbor and Dearborn.

He explained that GB does a thorough and complete job of vetting each proposed program both with an eye at the curriculum and financial aspects. Chair of GB Mary Jo Finney added that the GB is also made up of a diverse and broad base of faculty with a number of perspectives. Each proposal is given a very robust review. She indicated that the new process would not prevent the Provost from seeking AAAC’s input as needed. Much discussion took place.

AAAC’s response was that they did not approve of the New Graduate Program Approval Process for the following reasons:

- AAAC is an advisory committee to the Provost and they want to maintain that status especially as it renders with curricular matters.
- Members view AAAC’s input as a check and balance process that is set in place by Faculty Code.
- AAAC members felt that their role in reviewing programs was more holistic in terms of vetting them from a university perspective.

**Syllabi Availability Proposal** ➤ President of Student Government Arumugam disseminated a Syllabus Availability proposal on behalf of Student Government. This stemmed from previous discussions with AAAC and was a revised proposal for the purpose of having syllabi posted on Blackboard for student access two weeks in advance of the first day of class for each semester/term rather than the evening before. She indicated that this practice is in place at both Ann Arbor and Dearborn campuses. Vice President Khobeir added that Student Governing has been working on this for the last two years and has culminated from data collection and surveys of the student body.

Following their presentation, much discussion took place. A decision was made that before AAAC takes a stand, that members would seek faculty input from their respective unit and report back at the next meeting. If members cannot attend the next meeting, they should email Chair Lair.

**Approval of Minutes – February 16, 2017** ➤ A motion was made and supported to approve the Minutes of February 16 as written.
Faculty Council Report ► AAAC Faculty Council Representative Furman reported that Faculty Council is continuing to refine the process of updating the Code. At the Governing Faculty Meeting of March 30, the next round of Code revisions will be discussed. She indicated that the Chancellor and Provost Knerr attended the last Faculty Council Meeting and provided personnel updates.

Jan also reported that Faculty Council received a proposal from the College of Arts and Sciences to consider a campus-wide grievance procedure for faculty. Ann Arbor and Dearborn have processes that are coordinated across their campuses. Their processes include the concept that once a grievance leaves the unit (college/school), it goes to SACUA or Faculty Senate and then comes back to their respective Office of Human Resource to be facilitated.

Proposed Changes to Undergraduate Program Review Process ► Dan said that Special Advisor to the Provost Gilia Smith was not able to attend the meeting; however, the proposed changes to the Guidelines for Undergraduate Academic Program Review and Improvement are merely to clean up the language and to offer flexibility to the departments to review their programs all at one time, rather than on a set scheduled, if they would like.

Brief discussion ensued. AAAC approved the proposed changes but encouraged that better follow-up be provided to departments following their reviews as indicated in Section VI of the Guidelines.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.