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1. Administrative Reports
2. President Curtis

Good afternoon. The sun is shining and it is finally spring. We are still engaged in some budget activity while we are awaiting the final state Senate language about budget recommendations. I just want to keep you informed.

There will be a Presidential Advisory Council meeting in the near future. The meeting will be held in a Zoom environment. During this meeting, we will engaging with different people about the strategic plan. There will be breakout sessions. It will be nice to get the view point of people that aren’t in the everyday planning.

1. Provost Olsen

I have received numerous emails about teaching in the fall. I have stated this in my last two Friday newsletters. Unless you were hired to teach only online classes most of your workload will be on campus. We will be keeping track of all changes made in regards to recommendations from the government but at this time plan on being on campus.

1. Chair Report Liz Brown- No Report
2. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
3. COVID Vaccines

L. Brown: I have received emails from parents wondering if there will be a vaccine clinic available for students.

D. Curtis: We are close to having announcement about that. I will say for faculty to keep taking advantage of the community options. I have heard that Kroger North has the Johnson and Johnson shot available.

K. Yousif: I hope that we consider the continued use of masks after social distancing is reduced after the availability of the vaccine. One thing that helped me feel safe was the use of social distancing and masks.

D. Curtis: There will be so many more vaccinations available between now and then and any reporting on how well they are working will be more readily available. At this time getting the vaccine is an option. We absolutely want to keep everyone safe.

R. Guell: This might be more of a question for Katie than anyone else. I was wondering since the state requires records for some vaccinations will this be the case for the COVID vaccine?

D. Curtis: Since these vaccines were created under emergency circumstances that is likely not going to be the case.

B. Butwin: We are a long way from that. It could be possibility in the future but not at this current time.

D. Curtis: I will share this. I had a student in my office and they shared that they will not be getting the vaccine due to safety concerns. I think we need to work on ways to encourage students and fellow employees to get vaccinated.

L. Eberman: Yes, we need to talk with students and their willingness to get the vaccine. We need to educate ourselves on the vaccine in order to help those that question the safety. It also a good time to talk structural equities historically when there have been emergency vaccinations. We need to teach people that the vaccine is not a transmission point. When I try to talk to people I let them know the vaccine is here to protect me, the mask is to protect you, and quarantine is to help not expose others after I have been exposed. The more we can teach about the vaccine the better chances we have decreasing the spread of COVID.

1. American Rescue Funds

R. Guell: At what point will we hear a University communication regarding the disbursement of the American Rescue Funds to students and the uses that university might use?

D. Curtis: We are still very early in the process of getting these dollars. I will tell that some of the funds meant for students have been pushed out. There are three tranches of this coming through. We have pushed out that first one that everyone was aware of. We have updated the board of what we used the other half for. We have two in the works that are currently evolving. We are waiting on guidance on what we can use the funds for that aren’t meant for students. We are trying to push the envelope here with as many ideas that we can since we will be audited on the use of these funds. We are wanting to make these work for as many possibilities as we can. It is all in the advisement stage right know. Diann and Greg stay on top of that as well as all of the government regulation people at other institutions. As soon as we have definitive advice on that we will use that money in as many ways as possible. Chris Olsen is working closely with Diann on ideas about how we could do that and making sure it okay. The last thing we want to do is spend 3 million dollars and then have to pay it back.

1. Race in the United State Proposal

J. Gustafson: I just wanted to ask those involved in the revision of the Social Justice Race in the U.S. proposal. Should we expect to see this again this semester in terms of a revised proposal?

L. Brown: I don’t know if we will see something this semester. The discussions are still ongoing. The University College Council (UCC) meets again this Thursday and that will be topic of discussion.

C. Olsen: It is with the UCC right now.

1. SAC Items
2. 210 Changes Files #2-4

Motion to approve C. MacDonald, L. Eberman:

Motion to Table: R. Guell, C. MacDonald 8-0-0

L. Brown: Chris MacDonald and Mike Chambers found a few grammatical errors but they aren’t any thing that will change File #2.

A. French: Thank you for having us today. As you can tell, SAC has been very busy this semester. We have been working through some policy and have other discussions. I am going to turn it over to April and Jason regarding policy 210.

J. Trainer: So policy 210 was really an outcome of the AACRAO recommendations in terms of some of the things they had recommended us to look at. In policy 210, you are going to find out it rolls into a lot different areas. As we started to look at policy 210, it meant we had to address inconsistencies across the policy and really look at taking process out of the policy to more clearly focus on what the real meaning of what it is. This will clear up the purpose and intention and hopefully just add some general clarity. I do want to highlight two areas I know that we have mentioned a couple of revisions have already come across. There are two other ones that are small tweaks in the works. These. I just wanted to let that they did come up. One of those is in terms of the non-discrimination policy, so Katie and I will be working to make sure that that language is in there in a proper way. The second item is does change the purpose just how it is laid out and its language revolving around a freshman applicant and a transfer applicant. The primary difference is a transfer student with fewer than X number of credits will require the freshman application criteria. How universities typically display that language varies so we have had it one way. We have proposed to match the IU and Purdue layout. We got push back on that. I believe we found a nice compromise, but it doesn’t change anything in there in terms how those terms are defined. If you are a transfer student with fewer than X number of credits, we aren’t going to make an admissions decision based on those credits and they will need to go back and apply with the freshman application.

A. Hay: Right now the way we have our admissions policy is that for a student with less than 24 hours, we make our admission standards based on their high school qualifications and this changes it to where 12 earned hours will be used for admissions standards. This is one of the recommendations that AACRAO put forward, especially when you are dealing with adult learners, because they have been out of high school for however many years and sometimes that high school record is not indicative of what they are going to do today. So then for anyone that has fewer than 12 earned hours from another institution after high school, we would still be make an admission decision not only on how they did at the other institution but also based on their high school record. Ppolic 210 really includes three different policies. It has our admissions policy, part of what would consider transfer and its part of the course equivalency piece, and then it has academic renewal. What we have done here is we have broken out this one policy into three different policies. So you have admissions policy being 210, then you have all of the things about course to course equivalency or any other award of credit that’s not by registering and taking a course here, and academic renewal a policy as well. We made changes to take process out of the policy. A lot of the stuff that you see under the transfer and the award of academic credit is stuff that is currently the policy itself, except the course by course. The transfer piece is that currently we that you have to earn a C or better. This proposal puts forward a C- or better for it to still count. The other language that was tweaked in the policy, and it came directly from the AACRAO consultants, is that our catalog language is it makes it look like when students come in, those courses are being evaluated one way based on the program, and when they switch programs, those course by course equivalencies are being changed. That really isn’t how that should work. The course by course equivalency should come in so that an English 101 comes in as an English 101 course then it is up to the individual college and the program they are in to decide how they have that count towards their program. A change of major shouldn’t change that English 101. One of the conversations was about a high school transcript. I know from Foundational Studies and non-native language there are still some concern that we will need high school transcripts but the conversation about why we wanted to take that out as requirement was because that high school transcript isn’t required to make that transfer decision.

L. Brown: Is there a way to indicate this to transfer students. I know this wouldn’t be in the policy but be in the procedures so that they would know they need to provide that.

A. Hay: Correct. But it’s not for every transfer student.

K. Yousif: I have had several faculty contact me with four concerns that I have agreed to raise. I think some of them you just answered. I think the obvious one is that there is a feeling that the non-native languages is being singled out and targeted from the very first page as causing problems. It’s under structure impact of Foundational Studies non-native language on student transcript as a problem. If some of that wording could be softened. It’s the only category and department singled out.

There are some language issues that are repeated. The first place this in is 210.2.1 Freshman Applicant part f. In this section you have “English language scores”. My colleagues say this is vague. It should read something like “acceptable scores on accepted English proficiency exams”. There has to be a way there is some sort of threshold score and that it’s a proficiency exam. This is in three different locations and they are asking for prosiest language. I understand as the liaison to SAC that the goal is not to lock the admission policy down. I know you don’t want a score in there or what exam, but they are asking for more detailed language.

The next question is the question of transcripts. As far as in is for us if student doesn’t submit a transcript that is fine. Say now it’s not required for admission; rather it is required for course evaluation. So I understand that important distinction. We have no way of giving them credit for non-native languages, so it is in their best interest to submit a transcript whether they were in high school a long time ago or one year ago. What you are saying is that they are going to have to submit it for non-native languages but they are not going to have to submit it for admissions. I think maybe that wasn’t clear on the reading.

There is one other place that is absolutely key. This is in 215.2 Advanced and Prior Learning Credit Requirements Non-Native (foreign) Language Placement Exam. This is not a test-out for placement credit or prior learning exam. You take the exam to figure out what level you are in but you still have to pass the course. I think that this is misleading to students as if they are going to get credit just for taking the placement exam and that’s not how it works. I don’t know if there is a better place for it. I don’t know if it need to be in there. I am just pointing out that there is that issue. There is miscommunication across campus with advisors.

A. Hay: Do you want us to put that maybe 215.3 and bump the rest up one or does that need to be separate?

K. Yousif: Let me think about it. I know that doesn’t help you. What does anyone else think? I don’t like the idea of rewriting policy on the floor but it’s not that kind of exam.

L. Brown: We also have advanced placement exams and you have to earn a score of three or better to receive college credit. Those aren’t in here and that is something that would go into the procedures rather than the policy. If we are trying draw the distinction between those. Maybe those specific things would go there.

L. Eberman: I think the issue that Keri is bringing up in that section is it very clear that this section is saying that students can be awarded credit and that is in conflict with what Keri just read.

K. Yousif: We give credit up to 12 hours for a 3 credit class but you have to take the class and you have to pass it with a C+ or better. It just doesn’t work that way. I am sorry I didn’t not come up with the solution.

R. Guell: I have a number of objections, that I will wait until the end to say, that would involve the thoughtfully doing some revisions. If this went to an up or down vote at the moment I would vote no because of my many objections. I could certainly imagine at the end of this conversation coming to a vague conclusion about the areas that need revision and tasking one or more of us incorporate those.

L. Brown: April, I do think that doing a separate section where that is laid out would be better.

J. Gustafson: I think Lindsey said most of what I was going to say. This is about 215.2. It wasn’t clear from the way that this is written is if this is a comprehensive list or examples. Other places where there are bulleted lists it makes it clear if these and only these examples are the types of categories that will be accepted or are examples. Non-native language exams stuck out to me as well since I work with a lot of international studies students and that is constant area of misunderstanding. I don’t think we need to write a new section but certainly those categories where you can test into and retroactively receive credit for things after a class. That should be clarified.

M. Chambers: Under AACRAO’s concerns it identifies how under structure there are “too many areas involved in the articulation process, causing inconsistencies and delays”. How has that been addressed? Is this taking things from the departmental level?

A. Hay: The policy itself still states the college has the oversight of how things apply to their program. Right now it is with the understanding that it is discipline specific so it goes to that. There is nothing written in the actual policy about how that is done, because that is more of a process. Right now we are working with the college to define how that might work. I will say that the AACRAO’s recommendation was to allow 100 and 200 level courses to be articulated and done through the registrar’s office. 300 and 400 level courses are to be done at the actual disciplinary department. We weren’t putting that in the policy itself because it is actually more of a process.

J. Trainer: In general, the two things that ACCRAO stated were the inconsistency of timeline and review. They had some examples of that. The second was the need for us to be much more efficient with official or unofficial evaluations moving into the future and that we are somewhat behind in our ability to be able to do that. Even in these conversations about what does an official and unofficial evaluation look like and who does that. The idea is a more centralized approach for lower-division courses is the way in which many universities perform this. I want to start or finish the conversation with the intention of those decisions not to be any different in which any faculty would make. To me it is as much of a way to allow us to make those decisions much greater bandwidth and much faster pace.

A. Hay: We streamlined the language a little bit and underneath the different types of credit it does say in the general policy that the academic deans have the approval on the applicability of academic credits within their college.

M. Chambers: I see that and hopefully that will help streamline some. To what extent are we using our articulation agreements here? I have often been consulted in whether credits will transfer in coming to ISU. Usually it’s not an issue, but there are a couple universities in Indiana that use a similar name for different courses. I don’t want to see faculty lose the availability to weigh in, as they are the disciplinary experts. I understand the desire for making this more efficient. It might be good to find ways to consult with the colleges on the lower-level courses in some sort of streamlined way.

A Hay: We should be using more than just the title to make the equivalencies as well. We are working with the associate deans on trying to figure out a way and a timeline. We need to know who in the college wants the authority review these and make those decisions.

C. Olsen: The faculty are still going to be reviewing courses the first time they come through. In fact, as we go through the massive list that exists already, we are going to make sure that is accurate. I don’t want people to think that is getting lost somehow. The point of this is to make it consistent across the university. This way when courses come in it’s the same course no matter what college you are in. The second thing is that we maintain that. I think at the upper-level most of those are idiosyncratic anyway. Those will still have to go out, hopefully in an expedited way. The point is mainly consistency, not to change the people involved in this. Things will change over time. Maybe there is a three year mark or something were we have rolling reviews of what is in our database.

M. Chambers: That sounds fine by me.

A Hay: Right now we have these online transfer equivalency tools available for students. I think our process has been to just let them fall through in the transfer equivalency table as electives and then going into the degree audit and doing exceptions.

R. Guell: How many institutions in Indiana have lowered the threshold to a C-? We agreed that a C- was less than the lowest allowed level at a C. If we are going to accept a C-, then should we not change the grading scale from 1.67 to a 2.00?

A. Hay: There are number of institutions that have started accepting the C-. Just a reminder with the statewide gen ed transfer core which is transitioning to the Indiana College Core. This is where we get those 30 hours posted. We are taking D- and above for those hours. So we are already treating students differently with that college core.

L. Brown: That is only with block transfers. Like with the T-SAP items.

A Hay: T-SAP is a little bit different. The transfer core we are still bringing them in as transfer equivalencies. If we accept something as a C- and we bring it in but the program requires a C or better. The transfer for course for course will be there but it won’t count towards that course requirement. The T-SAP is that you actually get an Associate’s degree.

R. Guell: On the block transfer of credit where all of it is struck out except a paragraph: We have been treating AAS different then we have been treating AS. It seems as though striking out the table we are making the decision to treat an AAS the same as an AS or AA. Is that the case?

A. Hay: No. That is not part of the policy but a part of the procedures. That will be in the catalog that shows all of these things. If we make a change to Foundational Studies courses and how it applies. If we don’t make it more generic, not only will we have to make Foundational Studies changes go through the Board, but will have to redo the policy and have it go through as well. That list that we have was something we just created that wasn’t part of the policy to begin with.

R. Guell: Part of this change is not a change to treating an AAS as equal to an AA or AS?

A. Hay: No.

R. Guell: Ok. The 12 hour standard versus the 24 hours. I have a hard time believing that when we admit a transfer student with just 13 hours of college credit that they are not going to need or value the services of the University College. That intensive professional advising is a significant portion of the services that we provide students on that end. I don’t think that I could be talked out the change from 24 to 12.

A. Hay: This is an admission policy. It doesn’t say that they won’t provide those services.

R. Guell: My understanding is that a transfer student goes straight to their college.

A. Hay: Not all of them.

C. Olsen: I think it is the difference between requiring the high school transcript or not. It not about where they get routed.

L. Brown: It is just for admission.

R. Guell: That’s all. It doesn’t direct them where they are going to go?

A. Hay: No. that logic isn’t going to change

K. Yousif: On Bob’s comment that a C- sometimes isn’t sufficient for specific program or a pre-requirement. I know that you don’t want to put that in the policy. Are those kind of conversations being had as the student is being admitted and getting their official information on what will change?

A. Hay: A lot of time is will this course transfer in as this course. So then the conversation will go to I want to major in X and that is a different conversation. There is another tool that will run a degree audit towards those course that will say whether that will apply to that degree. The intent with these changes is that prospective student can get any of those things. My pie in the sky dream is that when students are admitted, not only do they get a degree audit but they also get their own personalized degree map of how long it is going to take.

R. Guell: The next example is statistics. This is off of the top of my head. Stats taught in the math department is Math 241, stats taught in business is the combination of Math 205 and 305, stats taught by the Psychology department is PSY 370, stats taught by AHS is 240, stats taught by EPSY is 302. We have this line between two and three were it goes to the department instead of staying at a college level decision but it is largely the same thing. How do we square that particular circle? Not all stat class are the same. What is taught in business is different then what is taught in the nursing school.

A. Hay: What you are explaining is the issue we currently have?

R. Guell: No. what I am saying is that when a student changes majors the re-evaluation should take place and that is not a university level decision and should not be. Call a biology class one thing and then when the student changes majors and need it called another thing. Biology for premed is not the biology for nurses.

C. Olsen: I think everyone is on the same page there. It is still the question of a course coming in from somewhere else and being classified at ISU. Programs can still have different requirements and they have to decide whether they are willing to accept a different stats course. I would encourage folks in the example to start maybe thinking about accepting other stats classes for transfer students and some other courses as well. If they are close enough to be interchangeable then that is great. As a way to facilitate transfer students. I think it still a question of evaluating a course for the university versus a course as a requirement for a major. We are just looking for consistency at the intake university level. If it is Math 241 then people can decide.

R. Guell: So is it comes in as Math 241 it stays Math 241. So if a student transfers into Health Science and then that department would accept that?

C. Olsen: Yes. They could write that into a curriculum revision.

L. Brown: The nurses already have that written out that way.

R. Guell: We do as well in Econ. April has advised against doing advising through the catalog. You want your students to take the preferred course and you just do the course. Take this one but the other will suffice in a pinch but we are not allowed to write that in in any way into the catalog.

C. Olsen: I think programs have to decide that. If it is okay for you write in alternative then do it. If not then don’t.

S. Powers: We get a lot of alternatives written in. The inconsistency problem is when it is done via an exception. One student gets that exception and the next one doesn’t. We are trying to figure out why the decision was made for one student and not the other. Was it because they saw a different advisor, was it because someone had a bad day, or was it because of race or gender? We don’t know this so we need the consistency of once a course comes in it will always be equal to that. If my major doesn’t accept that course then they have to take the other course.

R. Guell: One of the arguments from changing 24 to 12 was about adult learners. Can you make an age criteria within your admissions policy to that if you are under the age of 25 you are by definition not an adult learner.

L. Brown: Or number of years since high school graduation, then it is not age.

B. Butwin: Jason mentioned a few changes and I have a couple of suggestions. That is one of areas I wanted to talk about. Generally discriminating again young people is not much of a problem. Sometimes we have housing restrictions. We can talk about ways to address that.

R. Guell: I guess on this let me conclude by me saying, we can vote on this and I will vote against it. We can table this barring changes in language by officer and administrators. Or we can vote it down. We can do any number of things.

1. KAO Letter File #5 Motion to Approve C. MacDonald, R. Guell 8-0-0

Forward the memo to Student Affairs regarding Policy 450

Amy French: We realize that FAC has already addressed this issue but we think there are policy issues to address. Policy 450 should be utilized to address entities, in addition to individuals, that violate ISU institutional principles.

1. GC Items

Motion to approve all four certificates at once R. Guell, J. Gustafson: 7-0-0

H. Tu: These four certificates are in place of the four specialized programs. As a result, non-degree students will be able to achieve certification. The changes will bring those that may not want a degree but have the option to add these courses and possibly allow them to become degree seekers.

S. Kopaczewski: We view these certificates as ways to increase our reach and attractiveness to working professionals. You will notice that in the proposal that we have a core of courses because we do anticipate that the people that will be interested in earning these certificates may not have a background in communication but are seeking different credentials within their career path. We do think that those three courses universally support these certifications. Then we have two more specialized courses that give them advanced knowledge that is beneficial to the particular certificate.

L. O’Laughlin: These certificates are not stackable.

R. Guell: Was the College of Health and Human Services involved in the development of the Health communication certificate as many years ago there was a kerfuffle with a Health Communication program proposal?

S. Kopaczewski: I as far as I know the kerfuffle was resolved at the undergraduate level. We don’t anticipate any problems at the graduate level. The certificate is predominantly based in communication. There is one health course in particular and then interpersonal which always closely aligned with communication. I don’t believe we made a formal proclamation to Health Sciences.

H. Tu: According to the recommendation from Graduate Council we are only going to allow these certificates from the most popular ones. Health Communication is not set to roll out yet.

L. O’Laughlin: I think our understanding was that you wanted to roll out and see which certificates were most popular then streamline it down the line.

S. Kopaczewski: My understanding is that we were going to pass all four then launch all four and then take that as a developmental stage to see where the interest is. For example, right now they are not stackable because they have those core courses. If we find out that there is a desire for stackable certificates then we may look at building curriculum so that there is not as much overlap across the certificates. At this point we would like to see the curriculum run and then see where opportunities for development might be.

H. Tu: I misunderstood that.

a) Certificate in Communication Leadership

(see curriculog: <https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal:4563/form>)

b) Certificate in Digital Media Communication

(see curriculog: <https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal:4561/form>)

c) Certificate in Health Communication

(see curriculog: <https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal:4562/form>)

d) Certificate in Public Advocacy Communication

(see curriculog: <https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal:4564/form>)

1. FEBC Item
2. Graduated Summer Pay Schedule File #6

Motion to approve C. MacDonald, L. Eberman: 0-6-0 Motion Fails

D. Israel: I know that there have been several documents about summer compensation that have come across your desk in the recent weeks. This one is a little complicated. At the current time, summer pay has jumps at certain levels. This had led to a lot of gaming through different sources. Results of the gaming include being cancelled if a certain number of students aren’t in it, limits being placed on class size, and setting class size to keep the number below twenty. We have suggested an equal level increase starting with five students and going up to twenty students. While there are some student sizes that are lower paying with the new scale, there are others that have an increased pay. We believe that will stop the gaming because of the smooth transitions. This was passed 4-3-0. There are members on the committee who have been on it for 2 years and they seemed to be the ones that were more favorable to this motion. The preferred outcome is to have fewer classes cancelled.

L. Eberman: I was part of this conversation. My concern is for staff workloads when entering this information. I also see a way for there to be more gaming with this system. Paying some the higher paying faculty more money while also adding complexity to the system.

R. Guell: Each student brings in $1000 so between $300 to $600 will be brought in after paying the faculty. Every student added will have marginal increase in profit. I would say that with the previous Provost this would have been happily accepted, as he was in favor of smoothing. However being married to a staff member that would be implementing it during her busiest time of the year, this will be a problem. Lindsey is absolutely right that this administrative pain in the neck or worse. It probably wouldn’t be as much on the payroll side. It would be miserable for the various associate deans that actually do the calculations. The way I understand the process is that once a summer course gets over 20 students and stay solids, the paperwork goes through. The rest of them depend on that third day enrollment. So the faculty members fill out the paperwork that lands on the desk of the administrator that enters this into the system, but there are times that the forms have to be corrected because of the addition or subtraction of one student that moves them into a different bracket. The circumstance that we would be facing with a smoothing every time there was change to the number of students this would have to be redone and land in a variety of administrative offices taking up more time. Debra is absolutely correct that this was a consequence of game playing. I believe that the real solution here is a directive memo from the Provost to the deans identifying the games that are forbidden or at least identifying the known games that have been played and making sure they don’t continue to be played.

C. Olsen: I am okay with that. Another way to go at some of this is to not calculate it on the third day enrollment. We could calculate it on the last day of enrollment.

R. Guell: This would be an administrative nightmare as there wouldn’t be any way to get it through payroll on time.

C. Olsen: Maybe the third week.

D. Israel: Just a technical clarification here. So someone generates the number for us or we get a notification that this is the third day enrollment and that is the one we use. If the change come afterwards we don’t change the pay. I understand that can also cause weird things.

R. Guell: The way those additions and subtractions happen is student asserts a payment mistake or a registration mistake and that individual moves up or down in the enrollment. If they span a bracket then the dean’s office either pays them or remove it depending on if it was on that third or fourth day. They are rare but they do occur.

D. Israel: It was my understanding that it wasn’t allowed to happen and that you were just stuck with whatever pay you received. We may be underestimating the difference in people’s ability to make mistakes when you have a different percentages to use. So I understand that people are already making mistakes as it is now. It does seem to me making mistakes because of percentages might not be the right reason reject or decide you want to go with something like this.

V. Sheets: Was there a graduate version as well?

D. Israel: We didn’t talk about the graduate one. It didn’t seem like it was as large an issue.

C. MacDonald: We actually teach a lot more graduate courses during the summer.

D. Israel: Is there a lot of an issue with the size of the class jumping?

V. Sheets: There can be. Yes.

D. Israel: We would be happy to take it up if you want.

R. Guell: It strikes me if Virgil and Chris are interested in seeing what the graduate numbers would look like the motion to recommit is appropriate. If we want to reject it as is then we just vote and be done. I don’t know where people stand. I am going to vote no because I am happy with a notification from Chris.

C. MacDonald: I am particularly not in favor of this document for a number reasons including the amount of work staff would have to do trying to figure out who gets paid what. I am also dismayed that graduate pay wasn’t considered at all especially given in my college we are predominately graduate programs. Much of the teaching that goes on in the college is graduate, especially in summer.

M. Chambers: I wasn’t keen on it either based on the workload for staff.

L. Brown: Is there any interest in recommitting and getting the graduate pay included? It doesn’t sound like there is.

1. Standing Committee Reports
2. AAC (M. Chambers) Working the annual staffing report. We need to send out a reminder about the textbook order deadline. Susan Powers address the item at a meeting. We need to remind all faculty that this is based on a Title 4 regulation. Other universities such as Ball State have been fined for not having their orders in on time. The books need to be ordered so that students can determine the cost of the terms education. This is part of the Higher Learning Commissions regulations.

L. Brown: Chris Olsen can you put this in your Friday newsletter?

C. Olsen: I don’t mind.

C. MacDonald: Faculty also doesn’t want to order the wrong textbooks.

S. Powers: That will trigger an audit as well.

C. MacDonald: Sometime changing a book is beyond our control. Sometime we are forced to replace faculty and they want to use a different book.

1. AEC (R. Guell) Met last week. Worked on an allocation recommendation.
2. CAAC (C. MacDonald) Working with GC on cross college/department programs language. They are working on finalizing that and which programs are included in that.
3. FAC (V. Sheets) Met last week. FAC is not happy with the changes made by Katie Butwin to the outside work policy. They like the language the put forth better.
4. FEBC (L. Eberman) Have not met. Will meet on Wednesday
5. GC (T. Hawkins) Rusty met with CAAC reps about the comments on the CAPS manual revisions and the decision was to forward the document as it was approved by GC and CAAC. Program review: we anticipate finishing up review of COT graduate programs by mid-April. We will be discussing revisions to the Program Review process as we just got feedback from our ad hoc committee. That's it.
6. SAC (K. Yousif) No report
7. URC (J. Gustafson) No report
8. Adjournment: 5:15 pm