

ALL UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE

Friday, July 7, 2023

9:30AM

Remote

<https://meet.google.com/djy-wfha-wxa>

+1 636-373-8835 PIN: 976 886 055#

Minutes

1. Call to Order and Identify Secretary

- Laura Bayless will serve as secretary.
- In attendance:

Members: Kisha Tracy, Paul Weizer, Allison Turner, Patricia Marshall, Laura Bayless

Guests: Laura Garofoli, Soumitra Basu, Barbara Cormier, Franca Barricelli, Sean Goodlett, Cameron Emanuel, Christine Dee, Katherine Jewell

2. Proposed Revision to Non-Substantive Changes Process (to bring to 2023-2024 AUC for consideration)

- [Proposed Revisions to AUC Proposal Form](#)
- We are working toward using the same proposal form for both expedited and full review proposals.
- At the last informal meeting, we discussed the importance of expedited proposals being part of the official record and searchable. Some discussion of whether we require questions 1-5 and include an “other” category for why it should be expedited, which would require a rationale OR require 1-6. “Rationale” for question 6 is intended to be rationale for the whole proposal rather than for why it should be considered for the expedited process.
- Some discussion of what kinds of rationale(s) we need to consider. Both for why it should be expedited and why the proposal.
- Note that expedited is potentially not the term that describes what we are attempting to develop a process for.
 - One option is “Approval Not Required”.
 - Are we going to go with the “Approval Not Required” moniker?
- Move the checkboxes for the reason for “Approval Not Required” process earlier in the form.
- Discussion about whether the proposers have discussed with other departments any implication for the other departments. Note that “Approval Not Required” proposals cannot have implications for other departments. One challenge is if the proposers are not aware of the impact on other departments.
- Prerequisites: It is important to consider whether we use “OR” vs “AND”. Using AND restricts students from the course, and OR gives more flexibility. Add another checkbox that allows for the addition of another alternative prerequisite (provide an example to help clarify?). Say in the checkbox that the proposal language must include “OR”.
- Provide a space in the form where AUC can review the exact intended catalog language.

- If it is too substantive, it will have to go with a full proposal.

3. Proposed Revisions to AUC Forms (to bring to 2023-2024 AUC for consideration)

- [Folder](#)
- Barbara has been attempting to categorize elements of the forms differently to facilitate the Registrar's Office in making all of the changes that have been codified. The folder includes PDFs of the forms that Barbara created.
- Added logic to the forms so that proposers only will see what needs to be included based on their answers.
- Is this a good time to separate the Major form from Minors and Concentrations?
- The form revisions also need to take into account requirements from the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education.
- Question: what is the point of acknowledging the conversation with the dean? The form doesn't imply "approval." Answer: it is a way to improve communication and support of proposals, ensuring that the deans are well aware of the changes being proposed and can contribute their expertise.
- Proposal Form:
 - Need to edit to correct #4 with the new process.
 - #9 (Change Type) - does this cover all categories?
 - Appears to do so.
 - The new specificity appears to be helpful.
- New Course Proposal Form:
 - Barbara struggled with the Proposal Title to avoid being redundant while keeping in mind that proposals are searchable only by knowing what the proposal was called. One suggestion is to call the field "Proposal Title for AUC Database." Perhaps this should be on all forms. And indicate that the Proposal for AUC database may be changed.
 - Registrar preference is that the departments can choose their own course numbers. (This would be a culture shift.)
- Switched to asking if there are any issues with the other forms, rather than going through each form individually, due to time constraints.
- Kisha and Barbara will go through the proposals before the next meeting to clarify a few things and provide clean forms for consideration.
- Thanks to Barbara for this great work!

4. Proposed Revisions to AUC Policies and Practices (to bring to 2023-2024 AUC for consideration)

- [Current AUC Policies and Practices](#)
- [Draft Language](#)
- Want to clarify the processes that drive our meetings, including Robert's Rules of Order and our own stated expectations.
- One question: there is a proposed 5 minute limit for guest speakers. That seems long for a guest. Is it total? Or each time they speak? Etc.? Who is the arbiter of time? Someone could be appointed if it's the will of the committee. Would it be more effective to say

something like, “Limited for a reasonable amount of time at the discretion of the Chair”? How does “rebuttal” or “response” play into the expectations? (Perhaps, “Responses and rebuttals may be facilitated at the discretion of the chair.”?)

- Is the proposer considered a guest?
- There is some discussion that the proposer has a different role in contribution to the meeting than guests do. So we may want to create committee member, proposer, and guest roles.
 - Define roles
 - Explicitly state the priority order of speaking (1. Committee Members, 2. Proposers, and finally 3. Guests)
- Regarding requests to have lengthy statements read into the record: it might be effective to have the statement submitted ahead of time to the Chair (like no less than 48 hours in advance of the start of the meeting?), by a certain time the day before the meeting, who will distribute it so that the committee can read it ahead of time, and it is included as an addendum to the minutes. Also, the statements should be explicitly about the proposal specifically.
 - Do we want to define the process of submitting any statement? Perhaps submitted electronically via email to allow for email distribution to the committee.
- Add language that if the written comments submitted to the committee violate the guidelines provided in areas such as decorum or focus on the subject of the proposal it can be commented on in the meeting or the committee might request that it be revised or not included in the minutes or have a note that the proposal did not meet guidelines in the minutes along with it?
- Kisha will create a clean version of the document for consideration at the next meeting. It will, of course, be distributed as part of the notification of the meeting to the campus community.

5. Other Business

- As a result of a policy audit with the Department of Defense, one item arose.
 - We are legally required to have a specific statement regarding re-admission of Veteran students.
 - The deadline for us to get into compliance is early November.
 - Might the summer AUC consider this policy revision?
 - Yes to submit. Reserve the right to refer to Fall 2023 if we wish.
- Kisha will look at our calendars for the next summer meeting.

6. Adjourn