Members Present: Ricardo Alfaro, Darryl Baird (Chair), Connie Creech, Barbara Dixon, Chris Douglas, Jacinda Kitts, Greg Laurence, and Tom Wrobel

Absent: Diamond Wilder

Chair Baird called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m.

Review of Minutes of February 24, 2015 ♦ The Minutes of February 24 were approved as amended.

Provost Update ♦ Barbara reported that the chairs of the dean searches should hear something from the search firm very soon. She added that to date the search firm is pleased with the provost candidates; although not huge, the caliber is very good. They anticipate additional candidates very soon.

Barbara reminded the Committee that the Chancellor’s Inauguration is soon approaching and it is a week-long event. She encouraged members to participate and noted that a symposium was being held the morning of the actual ceremony which should be very good.

Barbara reported that the bathroom problem for our dancing students has been resolved. It is anticipated that it will take about 18 months but the end result will be long-term rather than temporary. She will report more once a walk-through has been completed.

Discussion took place regarding the Capital Projects Report and a question arose regarding who generates that report. Barbara indicated that the list is generated by Facilities based on requests that they receive. She said that some of them are from departments who have money to paint and can pay for that themselves; others are larger requests. Some thought that having the list would be beneficial as Academic Affairs is discussed at each meeting.

The conversation included the thought that if AAAC approves programs, that perhaps we should have more information to verify that there are appropriate resources, space, etc. Barbara indicated that the responsibility of faculty is curriculum and delivery of education to students. She said that to get faculty involved in facilities, there is no process for that. She did think that we need to work on developing a current Academic Planning Process – ongoing – where new programs come through and those type of things are looked at. Not all new programs need additional space.

Curriculum Coordination Committee ♦ Chris indicated that he has no report because the CCC has not met since the last meeting of AAAC.
Faculty Council Update ♦ Tom said that Faculty Council has been busy reviewing all of the materials that the Standing Committees submitted in response to the Faculty Code Questions. (All are in other than AAAC.) He explained that those will be put forth at the Governing Faculty meeting scheduled for next week. They are also looking at committees that don’t meet and see if things can be combined.

Tom also reported that since the Provost Search Committee met on February 5, he just received an email with a list of candidates for members to review and provide feedback. There are about 30 candidates and airport interviews are planned for some time in April.

Faculty Code Edit/Revise ♦ Darryl asked members if they were comfortable to the changes that were made to the AAAC description made at our January 16 Meeting. Discussion took place regarding a phrase that was added, i.e. review of existing programs. Ricardo noted that the Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines, which he clarified as the five-year program reviews, do not say that AAAC reviews the programs, but it does say that the Provost in consultation with appropriate faculty group, will review the programs. The consensus was that the Committee felt that that was adequate.

Much discussion took place regarding whether AAAC should review programs and, if so, how in depth should we be. Some thought that that is the job of the dean and the Provost’s job is to make sure that they are doing that. Barbara indicated that periodically it would useful for a review of all programs maybe every 3-5 years. She also explained that the work is huge; she has five on her desk now. Needs assessment of each program review needs to be taken into account to see if courses are following learning outcomes for programs. Most importantly, what has been done after assessment to improve the program.

**Action:** After much discussion, the phrase, “review of existing programs” will be substituted with “procedures of the five-year program reviews”.

Darryl indicated that the third Faculty Code Question, ‘C’ is: Are there issues that are included in the Faculty Code charge that the committee no longer addresses?

**Action:** In answer to Question C: the consensus of the Committee was that that was “Not Applicable.”

Tom indicated that earlier in the Code it says that students are non-voting members, so that is why Faculty Council is not acting on that request because, by virtue of the Code, it is not necessary.

Jasinda indicated that Student Government has talked about it and are not in agreement. She wanted to know the reason for the decision.

Although this has not been the case with AAAC, it was explained that many times students do not show up for the meetings and because of that, then the Committee lacks a quorum and cannot conduct business.

Tom also reported that Faculty Council received a request from Bob Houbeck requesting that a Library Representative designation be added to each Standing Committee.

The final Faculty Code Question, ‘G’ was, “What are identified obstacles in carrying out your committee’s charge?”
Discussion ensued with the major obstacles being as follows:

**Action:** In answer to Question G: two obstacles surfaced: timing of communications from different units, i.e. academic and administrative; and better scheduling for new programs – late proposals are a problem.

The meeting adjourned at 5:22 p.m.