

**Academic Affairs Council
March 30, 2010**

minutes of the meeting

The Academic Affairs Council met at NSU on Tuesday, March 30, 2010 with the following persons participating: BHSU, Dean Myers; DSU, Cecelia Wittmayer; NSU, Tom Hawley; SDSMT, Duane Hrcir; SDSU, Laurie Nichols & Mary Helling; USD, Lynn Rognstad; BOR, Sam Gingerich, Paul Turman, Jodi Gabriel, and Trudy Zalud via conference phone.

Item 1 Agenda

The following items were added to the discussions for AAC.

- MyMathLab – (will be part of Item 6.M Pearson’s e-college)
- Rank & Promotion, BOR 4:11
- Implementing the IDEA Survey (will be added to May AAC meeting)

Lynn reported that the general studies proposal is on hold currently but may possibly be fast tracked a little later.

Item 2 Minutes

M/S by Dean and Laurie to approve the February 2010 minutes as submitted. Motion carries.

Consent Agenda Items

Item 3.A.1 Program Modifications - USD

USD has submitted a program modification to change the program name for the MS in Administrative Studies program. The proposal will move forward to the May BOR meeting for consideration.

Item 3.A.2 Program Modifications – SDSMT

SDSMT has submitted a program modification to change the program name for the MS in Technology Management program. The proposal will move forward to the May BOR meeting for consideration.

Item 3.A.3 Program Modifications – NSU

NSU has submitted a program modification to change the program name for the Administrative Systems-MIS program. The proposal will move forward to the May BOR meeting for consideration.

NSU has also submitted a request to inactivate/terminate the E-Business Education (BSEd) program. The proposal will move forward to the May BOR meeting for consideration.

Item 3.B.1 Course Modifications – USD

USD has submitted the following course modification requests. These will move forward to the Executive Director for consideration and be reported on the Interim Actions report for the May BOR meeting.

New Course Requests

- ADS 730 Addiction Studies Research
- ARTH 313 History of Photography
- ARTH 314 History of Design
- ARTH 410/510 Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century European Art
- ARTH 416/516 Art Theory and Criticism
- HSC 110 The Multicultural Health Team
- HSC 305 Human Relations
- HSC 310 Health Care Delivery
- HSC 350 Principles of Health Care
- HSC 360 Technology in Care Delivery
- HSC 380 Health Literacy and Culture Care
- HSC 440 Major Issues in Health and Human Services
- HSC 460 Leading Change
- HSC 485 Healthcare Field Experience

Item 3.B.2 Course Modifications - SDSMT

SDSMT has submitted the following course modification requests. These will move forward to the Executive Director for consideration and be reported on the Interim Actions report for the May BOR meeting.

New Course Requests

- CBE 424/524 Molecular Modeling and Simulation
- CEE 325 Introduction to Sustainable Design
- CEE 753 Stability of Metal Structures
- ENVE 316 Fundamentals of Mass Transfer
- GEOE/MEM 110/110L Introduction to Geological and Mining Engineering
- MEM 410/510 Advanced Mineral Economics for Managers
- MEM 415/515 Advanced Mining Geotechnical Engineering

- MEM 420/520 Advanced Tunneling and Underground Excavation
- MEM 425/525 Advanced Rock Mechanics
- MEM 440/540 Advanced Mine Ventilation and Environmental Engineering
- MEM 455/555 Rock Slope Engineering II
- MEM 480/580 Advanced Explosives and Blasting

Item 3.B.3 Course Modifications – NSU

NSU has submitted the following course modification requests. These will move forward to the Executive Director for consideration and be reported on the Interim Actions report for the May BOR meeting.

New Course Requests

- MATH 101, Intermediate Algebra Lab
- BADM 479, International Human Resource Management

Authority to Offering Existing Common Course

- ANTH 270, Museum Techniques
- ANTH 431, Archaeological Field Techniques
- MATH 102L, College Algebra Lab

Sam has a few questions for MATH 101 and will talk to Tom about that prior to moving forward.

Item 3.B.4 Course Modifications – BHSU

BHSU has submitted the following course modification requests. These will move forward to the Executive Director for consideration and be reported on the Interim Actions report for the May BOR meeting.

New Course Requests

- HLTH 430 Human Nutrition
- MCOM 464 Advanced Studio & Commercial Photography
- MUS 185 Recital Attendance
- PE 216L Fitness Assessment Lab

BHSU agreed to offer HLTH 430 as experimental again if necessary but Sam will review the proposal again before it moves forward to the Executive Director.

Item 3.C.1 Reports

None submitted.

M/S by Cecelia and Lynn to approve the consent agenda. Motion carries.

Item 4.A.1 New Program Requests

No report.

Item 4.B.1 New Certificate Requests

No report.

Item 4.C.1 New Site Request – DSU, BS in Computer Science, Internet

DSU has submitted a new site request to offer the BS in Computer Science online. No comments were received at DSU. Cecelia clarified that the proposal still needs to go to the EUC committee. Sam added that online programs will move to the EUC for quality assurance review, not review of the program itself.

Sam added that Dr. Warner has different views about online programs and has a hard time understanding why we do so much to control competition. As online offerings have matured, most states have gone away from this proscriptive approach. The EUC will be focusing more on the programs and meeting the HOEA requirements.

Sam continued that the councils will need to have discussions on the EUC and future direction of the EUC. Accreditation through the HLC must be talked about. At the inception of the EUC, a small amount of marketing was done. Does the state need a storefront that provides an overview of programs/courses offered? Does this have value for the campuses? These kinds of discussions will have to take place within system councils.

In addition, there are some unresolved policy issues that will need to be talked about. In the blended environment for courses ~ face to face, online, etc. ~ does the system need a group to help move us to a common place?

Lynn was concerned about some of these issues since USD is in the middle of their self study for the HLC. Sam replied that USD should just move forward based on the framework that is in place. Any changes between the self study and site visit will be communicated to the HLC. We would collectively need to approach the HLC since the EUC is referenced by all of the campuses' statement of affiliation status.

Item 4.D.1 Intent to Plan Requests

No report.

Item 5.A Electronic University Consortium

No report.

Item 6.A.1 BOR Policy Revision

No report.

Item 6.B.1 MOCC Issues

No report.

Item 6.C Program Productivity Review Follow Up

Sam remarked that campuses have received calls from the media and the Argus will probably come out with a story about the program productivity review yet this week. Tom added that there was a Bob Mercer article about programs being cut. The Aberdeen American News has also contacted him about doing an article after the BOR has acted on the item. Sam added that we are just one of many systems doing this type of program clean-up.

Cecelia cautioned the institutions that the Argus kept asking her about how much money this will save the institutions. Sam agreed that this is one of the questions you may get from the Regents. Since this has been moved to the full board agenda, there will not be formal presentations by each institution.

Sam added that for the BOR meeting, he will talk through the process that the institutions followed. He will talk about what is going on nationally and then move to the recommended action of the item. The next steps that we will take are included in the agenda item. The expectation is that information will come forward with a teach-out process for the programs being eliminated. Sam felt that these processes will move forward as a group. Institutions should list the course deletions.

What is the timeline? Sam has suggested that the programs being inactivated would be finalized during the June BOR meeting. We will need to have teach-out and communication plans in place. For elimination of specializations, the institution could send a memo showing all specializations being eliminated and outlining the strategy to teach-out those students enrolled in these programs. We need to have a paper trail and need to communicate that this process is being taken seriously.

For programs that require further review, a timeline for these must be established and reported to the BOR. They must be within the next 3 years. For example, the French

program was identified as a program for further review. We would get the arts and sciences deans involved. The physical sciences programs are another group that is typically low-enrolled.

Sam commented that the intent is that as he finishes up the presentation to the BOR, the next steps being suggested are part of the recommendation and approval by the BOR. The strategy is to make sure the campuses have flexibility. We cannot save large amounts of money immediately; the institutions must teach-out the programs being terminated.

Tom suggested that the talking points that Sam will be using should be shared with the VPAAAs so that everyone is on the same page and shows the same vision. The BOR and AAC talked about this last fall, long before there was talk about significant cuts in budget. The system did not do this type of review for years and it needed to be cleaned up. We add programs all the time and at some point we needed to look at how efficient the system is so this review was begun. We needed to ask the questions. Lynn agreed that this was a good process to go through. Sam added that given the timeframe that the institutions had to do this review, the institutions did a good job.

Sam added that the goal is to keep the requirements for majors as simple as possible to give the students flexibility. The active program review is still going on and ties into this too. There are some differences in the BA and BS requirements. We need to review these differences. What does it mean? What should they be? What are the reasons for these differences? Do these make sense and should they be aligned? Sam felt that AAC should discuss these issues. Tom agreed and thought it would be very helpful.

Trudy will generate a list of courses that have not been taught in the last three years and include the date when it was last taught. The data will be separated by institution, then by common and unique courses. This will be distributed in the next couple weeks.

Item 6.D Course Prefixes

Sam commented that he occasionally receives curricular requests asking that new prefixes be approved. The new course request form asks if the prefix is approved for the institution. There is a list in the AAC guidelines of prefixes that were approved. As this has evolved, what was the initial discussion behind this? How does it tie into the common courses? Should it tie into anything? Should we control these?

BHSU requested a writing program and wanted to teach courses with the WRTG prefix. Most of the courses are English courses but the proposals came forwarded with WRTG prefixes. Dean explained that BHSU wanted a writing minor and wanted it marketed with a writing prefix. They felt that with the English prefix, the courses and writing minor program may get lost on the transcript.

Lynn felt that if the request was an already approved prefix, it was less of an issue than if the prefix is new to the system. She thought that the list of prefixes probably came out of the common course review, BAD vs BADM, etc. The RIS prefix list is a lot bigger than the approved list on the AAC guidelines. New prefixes have been approved and have not been added to the AAC guidelines list. Should we establish guidelines to control prefixes?

Sam clarified that the WRTG issue is a prime example. Dean added that they want to offer writing courses at BHSU. Lynn agreed that the courses submitted are writing courses. Dean felt that by cross-listing the WRTG with ENGL, the courses may transfer easier for students. Sam added that the BHSU courses in writing will be approved as submitted. The issue is the prefix, does this group want to control prefixes?

AAC felt there should be guidelines to state what it takes to create a new prefix. Lynn agreed and volunteered to draft system guidelines for requesting new course prefixes.

The new course requests for BHSU in Writing will move forward but may be revisited.

Item 6.E Implementing D2L's Grade Export Function

Sam reported that when the system contracted with D2L, there was the expectation that there would be full integration between Colleague and this course management system. Specifically, it was thought that complete course registration information would be exported from Colleague to D2L and grades would be exported from D2L to Colleague. However, the ability to export grades from D2L to Colleague was not in place when the system came on line. It is not possible to do this interface in D2L and have the same edits that are used when faculty submit grades in Colleague. We have attempted to do the grade export feature but it just doesn't work.

Cecelia felt that there were other holes in the D2L program that are a lot more troublesome. If we walk away from the grading feature, are there other things in D2L that we can get done? Is the overall D2L structure working?

Sam commented that we are in Year 3 of a five year contract with D2L. There are some who want to start looking now for a new learning management system. As we consider options, we need to consider the perspective of students, especially those taking courses from multiple institutions.

What are the options? Cecelia commented that with budgets as tight as they are and looking at the price tag for D2L, is it really a value? Could we get as much out of a cheaper program than we are getting out of D2L?

Cecelia continued that the option for grade integration we currently have now does not work. There is a cost to ensure the protection of the faculty member and so that someone could not enter a grade that they were not supposed to enter, i.e. entering the SU grade

when a letter grade is required. Laurie did not feel that the cost is much to get something in place that would benefit the faculty member. Currently this is a source of irritation for faculty members; they have to enter the grades twice. Think of the faculty member who has 400 students in their class; they enter grades in D2L and then they are also forced to enter grades into WebAdvisor. Historically the checks and balances fell to the registrars and if there was a question, they had to go to the source and with only a small amount of time to enter all grades anyway.

After a short discussion, AAC decided not to pursue the grade validation portion for D2L. The current system is not working and AAC did not feel the grade function without the checks and balances to help validate the grades that are submitted would not be beneficial.

Item 6.F UExcel Exams

Sam commented that UExcel is developing another set of exams similar to CLEP that could be used to award credit. ACE said these should be worthy of credit just as CLEP exams are. Staff is recommending that the exams be forwarded to the discipline council for review and a recommendation.

AAC agreed that the discipline council should review the set of exams being developed to see if they could be recognized for credit. Sam will handle.

Item 6.G Residual ACT Scores

Sam commented that this issue keeps resurfacing. We have accepted residual ACT scores in the past for admissions but this gets wrapped up in both SDOS and athletic eligibility. Even though policy is clear, students still want the residual ACT score to count for SDOS and they are rather insistent when told it does not. Current records show only 236 students used residual scores this past term.

Possibly, all the 236 students could have been admitted anyway. Sam suggested that we eliminate this option. Tom replied that his enrollment people wanted to keep this for the last minute students. Paul remarked that if they are taking it for placement, we have the placement exams. Tom replied that the NSU minority rep felt that this would be an obstacle for minority students.

Sam remarked that of the 30,000 students in the system, there were 236 students with residual ACT scores. More students are taking the ACT in their high school years. SDSU accepts the residual ACT for the Jackrabbit guarantee scholarship.

Paul will gather data from RIS on the students who were accepted with residual ACT scores and will forward the information to the VPAA for review.

Item 6.H CLEP Guidelines – English Composition

Paul remarked that these requests are sent to the assessment committee and they in turn talk to the faculty member about the issue. However, in this case a faculty member said that this should be handled by the discipline council.

CLEP has added an optional essay portion to the exam which, if completed, would permit students to earn six credits rather than three. He added that ACE recommended that it be accepted and we have traditionally gone with what ACE recommends. In addition we do allow 6+ credits to some other courses /disciplines. Cecelia clarified that students can only receive the 6 credits if they take the essay portion and meet the scores. Paul agreed.

Sam remarked that this initially came up last fall and we agreed that we would talk further. More communications did not happen. When issues like this come up, what are the expectations of these discussions? Sam said that the English DC occasionally includes him on the email discussions so he has seen the communications.

Sam felt it would have been different if the EDC would have said that this exam did not reflect the learning outcomes established for the system's common courses. The credits are awarded because the student shows the competency of the course. In this case, the English Council simply said no exam should be allowed to award six credit hours.

Tom agreed with Sam that we do need to close the loop on communications. He agreed that we fell apart by not going back to the English discipline council and report why it was discussed. Sam commented that we need to make this a formality and have some response from our office, in addition to some communications on campus.

In the future, what are the questions that we would ask the discipline councils? Does this exam align with the course? Should the issue of how much credit should be awarded be asked? Paul replied that we are asking if the course meets the expectations of the exams, does it align with our curriculum. If the answer is yes, then what does ACE award for credit? What the EDC responded was that no one should get 6 credits for any test.

Sam will take this back to the English Discipline Council for further review. In addition, each member of AAC should have follow up discussions on campus.

Item 6.I Ready Adult Academic Policy Review

Paul commented that the academic affairs group for the ready adult project met and noted a few policy issues that AAC needs to review before they go forward to the BOR.

BOR Policy 2:29 Definition of Credits

Paul commented that we have a stringent number of credits that are required by the institution granting the degree. The conversation went into an overall definition of

academic credit a student receives at the institution granting the degree. AAC should talk about the threshold or the rationale that is behind the residency requirements. Paul felt that there would be flexibility as long as it's within our system rather than from a particular institution. This discussion is relating to these students but it opens the issue to other students that universities are trying to recruit back into the system too. One issue identified was that if students are at inactive status, then they had to come in under the new catalog.

Laurie clarified that the student can petition back to an old catalog however a lot depended on the discipline. Lynn agreed and suggested that the general studies degree possibly have an exception because we are looking for a different result. Tom added that NSU looks at the currency of the credits to be earned too.

Sam remarked that in some systems, policies are in place where certain courses are only good for 5 years and if they haven't been used within that time, then the course cannot be used to fulfill a degree requirement. Paul added that we do have policies in place that allow for certain exceptions. He felt that the members of these committees do not feel there are exceptions. The VPAA has a broader range of authority to allow for exceptions in many cases. If there are exceptions made, there is a paper trail to show that university staff have validated that the student has completed the degree.

Cecelia clarified that our policy is that the student can only sit out for two semesters and then has to come back in under the new catalog. We don't really have a policy on how long the course is good for. In many cases there is a time limit on applicability of the course. Lynn commented that through advising, the student should be advised to take the more current course.

BOR Policy 2:10 Academic Amnesty

Paul commented that students can petition to have the credit hours from a previous semester waived by the VPAA. This team is looking at particular courses rather than the full semester.

Cecelia commented that this policy was put into place to reconcile the differences across the campuses. DSU at the time was more liberal than what is in current policy. It is amnesty by the semester rather than just specific courses. Sam felt that this policy also relates to financial aid.

Should this policy show that there are exceptions? There are cases where the student just needs to start over. Sam added that there are considerations given in each case but these are not necessarily an amnesty issue.

Currently, students applying for academic amnesty must fill out a form in the registrar's office, which then goes to the VPAA's office. Mary Kay felt that a lot comes down to the single point of contact to either say no, or advise them to move forward towards an appeal or exception position. Paul concurred and added that the institution accepting the student can waive the amnesty semesters but the suspension, which occurred because of the student's performance, must be dealt with.

BOR 2:5 Transfer of Credit

Paul commented that discussion so far has been focused on transfer of credit for those who may be located in South Dakota but not yet taken courses within the Regental system. Section 3 of the policy notes that life experience is not a transcriptable option yet prior learning assessments are becoming more commonplace for nontraditional student recruitment. Is our policy too restrictive? Sam noted that this needs to be clarified. This credit can be accepted. It simply needs to be reevaluated. Our policy reflects common practices in the academy and the common expectations of accrediting bodies.

Cecelia felt that it was put there because there was no writing in those exams. While the course may be accepted as an elective, it would not meet the general education requirements. No one could ensure that global issues were covered in the course.

Laurie felt it was appropriate to remove the globalization portion of the sentence from policy 2:5.10.B.3 specifying credit received through validation efforts. AAC agreed. Mary Kay added that she sees more exception requests for the globalization requirement than the writing intensive requirement.

AAC agreed to revise BOR 2:5 Transfer of Credit to remove the globalization notation to section 10, credit received through validation methods. The remaining policy issues can be handled through the exception process.

10. Credit Received Through Validation Methods

- A. Credit earned through validation methods other than nationally recognized examinations is limited to a maximum of 32 hours of credit for baccalaureate degrees and 16 hours of credit for associate degrees.
 - 1) Validation of Military credit is limited to an additional 32 hours of credit for baccalaureate degrees and an additional 16 hours of credit for associate degrees.
- B. Credit for college level courses granted through nationally recognized examinations such as CLEP, AP, DANTES, etc., will be evaluated and accepted for transfer if equivalent to Regental courses and the scores are consistent with Regental policies.
 - 1) If credit received through validation is applied as elective credit, it may only be applied at the 100 or 200 level.
 - 2) Credit received through validation may apply to System General Education Requirements and Institutional Graduation Requirements.
 - 3) Credit received through validation may not apply to ~~globalization~~ and writing intensive requirements.

Item 6.J Review of Institutional Program Review Guidelines - Update

Mary Kay has provided a draft for review. She stressed that this proposal is focused more on outcomes rather than inputs. Sam felt that this is on the right track.

Mary Kay offered that we could pilot these new guidelines in the fall and work out any issues identified before finalizing these next year. SDSU would be willing to do this as well as any other institution that wanted to participate.

Sam commented that we as a system just went through a process that is different than what is being outlined here. This review processes is more for program development and enhancement but not necessarily for accountability. It might make sense to consider adding an accountability thread here. For example, as the data tables are being filled out, if the program is graduating minimal students, a program productivity review would immediately be generated that would go to the BOR. Rather than doing a huge program productivity review every 10 years or so, can we embed this and keep looking at the programs that are under-performing?

Mary Kay responded that as the review unfolded, the program would be flagged if it is not performing. This would then lead to a completely different review. This program review leads to program enhancement, strengthening the program. Sam felt that that this needs to be handled carefully. If you tell people that one of the options going into a program review is termination, people will not do the program review.

Mary Kay felt that this is already within the SDSU culture. They know they have to do this and they just do it. Sam agreed that this is a way that we are going to strengthen the system. We allowed some programs to become too non-productive and these should have been dealt with a long time ago. AAC agreed that this proposal will work, especially on the heels of the program productivity review just completed.

Mary Kay clarified that if a program goes through an accreditation process, then they do not have to do this as a separate report. They would submit a small report and simply appended materials from the accreditation review.

The universities maintain the active program review schedule. VPAA's will talk to campus personnel and bring any issues or suggestions on the guidelines to AAC in May. This would move forward to the BOR in June.

Item 6.K Lab Fees for CSS Courses

USD and SDSU are proposing a change to BOR policy 5:5:4:1:D:3 to add the CIPS of 27.0303 to the list of approved for computer science/MIS offerings. This would allow a laboratory fee to be charged to certain CSS courses. AAC concurred with the proposal. The revision in policy will move forward to the COPS and BOR meetings in May.

- D. **Laboratory Fee:** Laboratory fees shall be used to purchase instructional equipment and pay other operating costs, excluding salaries, for the benefit of students enrolled in the course.

1. The Laboratory Fee Per Course rate will be consistent across the system.
2. The Laboratory Fee may be assessed on all courses with instructional method type "L" and "K" with CIP codes in the basic and applied sciences, engineering, and technology fields.
3. The Laboratory Fee may be assessed on computer science courses and management information system courses (CIP series 11.0000 to 11.9999, 14.0901, 14.0903, [27.0303](#) and 52.1201) where there is direct use by student of computers and management information system software in a laboratory setting.
4. The Laboratory Fee may be assessed on "J" instructional method type in specific CIP code areas where equipment and material are expended.
5. The Laboratory Fee may be assessed on all courses with instructional method type A in the fields of art (CIP series 50.0701, 50.0702, 50.0705-50.0711, 13.1302), theatre (CIP series 50.0502 and 50.0507), design and applied arts (CIP series 11.0301, 11.0801, 11.0803, 50.0401, 50.0402, 50.0404, 50.0406-50.0408), photography (CIP series 50.0602, 50.0605), landscape architecture (CIP series 4.0601), journalism/mass communication (CIP series 9.0402, 9.0404, 9.0701, 9.0702, 9.0903, 9.0904, 9.9999, 10.0105, 10.0303, 10.0304, 10.0305, 10.0308), apparel merchandizing (CIP series 19.0901) where equipment and material are expended.
6. Approval of additional CIP series will be at the discretion of the Executive Director and Chief Executive Officer.

Paul distributed a spreadsheet on fees charged for PE courses. There is inconsistency among the universities. This will be reviewed again in May.

Item 6.L Institutional Credits – Determination of Academic Status

MOCC met last fall and discussed a discrepancy in institutional credits that has been noted in a student's academic record. RIS staff will address part of this by changing the form so that "institutional credits" in the program status section is renamed to "credits in residence".

However during MOCC's discussion, the focus shifted to the centers and specifically UC since their history has been to offer core credits.

Cecelia and Sharon Sopko at UC code credits at UC as credits in residence. They do not necessarily count as institutional credits (requirements for the major). There is inconsistency among the campuses and although some considered the cooperative agreement to underpin all offerings, the rotation schedule for general education courses at UC is not considered a formal agreement.

This item will come back to AAC in May for further discussion. What happens with the general education courses? How do we classify these courses? Additional thoughts should be sent to the BOR office for inclusion in the May item.

Item 6.M Pearson's E-college – Remediation

The Mathematicians in the system recommend that the system use MyMathLab to support student success in remedial math. This program uses a common e-text and it is recommended that this be paid for through a course fee rather than being sold through the campus bookstores.

Sam remarked that currently materials for MATH 021 and MATH 101 are being sold through the bookstore with a CD and access code for \$125. The new price now that the student will be charged is considerably less, thus saving the student money. Students would get access to MyMathLab and an e-text. Paper text will be available at the bookstore and students must purchase them.

The agreement has not been signed yet. AAC discussed briefly that the bookstore would then be cut out of any profits and felt more discussion is needed. AAC concurred that there are many implications to cutting out the bookstores and direct billing the students. Sam will go back and talk to Pearson about the options we have. This will come back to the May AAC meeting for further discussion.

Item 6.N ADA Accommodations for Syllabi

A query has determined that all system universities have a statement on ADA accommodations for their faculty to use on their syllabi. The statements vary among the campuses. No action required.

Item 6.O CIP Code 2010 Updates

Sam commented that a new set of codes have been published and need to be applied in the next few months. As IPEDS reports are submitted next year, this set of codes must be used.

VPAAAs will review these on campus and make sure that everything is correct. The data administrators should also review the lists.

Formally, Trudy or Carla will provide a list of recommended changes from each campus and identify the institution making the request.

Item 6.P Completion of Pre-Gened Course Holds

This item will come forward to AAC in May.

Item 7.A Faculty Issues

No report.

Additions to the Agenda:BOR 4:11 Rank and Promotion of Term Faculty Members

There are term employees that are interested in promotion but are not on tenure track. Sam clarified that these term faculty could be reappointed at a higher level if a contract is issued for another term. There is no promotion process for term faculty members.

These term faculty would need to meet minimum rank qualifications. Laurie commented that there is some debate that if we look under the minimal promotion eligible criteria, this doesn't apply to term faculty members. Sam replied that each time a term faculty member is renewed, there is a new contract. They have to meet the minimum requirements to be hired at a higher rank.

Sam added that this may be something that we need to talk about further. There are a lot of people in this category and a lot of the employees in clinical programs are classified as term faculty members.