Meeting was called to order at 1:10 pm

1. Minutes of the November, 29, 2007 meeting were approved as distributed.

2. The agenda, as distributed, was approved.

3. Mary distributed and briefly discussed a handout showing the AQ/PQ status of CBA Faculty. Based on current targets for AACSB re-accreditation, Marketing and Finance are in good shape, BLaw and IS are slightly lower than target, and Accounting and Management are significantly below the target numbers.

4. Mary also distributed a list of issues that the Task Force needs to address in the near future related to AACSB re-accreditation. These are as follows:
   (1) Should part-time Law Faculty be potentially classified as “academically qualified” (AQ)? If so, what will our standard(s) be?
   (2) The current AACSB guidelines allow schools to define an AQ standard for administrators that is lower than the regular faculty standard. Should CBA define such a standard, and if so, how should it be defined?
   (3) The AACSB has a current white paper indicating that it is open to broadening the definition of AQ. The criterion for including more kinds of activities under the AQ umbrella seems to be “impact”. For example, if a practitioner-oriented book or a textbook is written, “substantial” sales might be an acceptable criterion to argue that the author is AQ. Alternatively, if a faculty member developed a new manufacturing process that is widely adopted by businesses, the faculty member might be defined as AQ. Are there faculty in any CBA departments who might be affected by such a broadened standard? If CBA decided to broaden the definition of AQ along these lines, how would we define “impact”?

5. The Committee briefly discussed the potential change in definition of AQ for part-time Law Faculty who are engaged in a significant and active law practice. Kathleen Lacey was not present, but indicated in an e-mail prior to the meeting that there are currently four BLAW lecturers who would likely qualify using criteria that the Committee had discussed earlier. No further action was taken at this time.

6. The Committee reminded Chanwit and Herb that before journals can be added to the existing rankings or journals currently classified can be moved up or down the rankings, the suggested changes must be vetted at the appropriate departmental level and presented to the
Committee with supporting evidence. Thus, no formal action was taken with respect to *Applied Economics, Corporate Ownership & Control* or *Review of Accounting Studies.*

7. Chair Hunt distributed several handouts containing the most recent law journal rankings maintained on the Washington and Lee (WL) Law School website including all U.S.-based journals written in English (n=885) and various subsets of these journals. He suggested that one approach to reducing the number of law journals in the current ranking system to a manageable level, and to bring the law journal rankings more in line with the other functional areas, would be to include only those journals in the rankings that BLAW Faculty are likely to publish in. Initially, this might be done by developing a subset of journals contained in the WL list under topical headings and areas where current CBA Faculty have published or are likely to publish in the future and then classifying the resulting journals based on recommendations from BLAW Faculty and other available evidence. The Committee briefly discussed this approach but no action was taken. Chair Hunt agreed to try meeting with Kathleen Lacey to discuss whether such an approach might meet with the approval of the BLAW Faculty.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Herb Hunt
Recording Secretary

These minutes have been approved.