

**All University Committee (AUC) Meeting**

**Thursday, October 5, 2023**

**3:30 PM**

**Miller Oval**

**Committee Members in Attendance:**

Patricia Arend, Franca Barricelli, Kervens Blanc, Rala Diakite, Laura Garofoli, Jonathan Harvey, Emily Maestri, Patricia Marshall, Kisha Tracy, Allison Turner, Amy Wehe, Paul Weizer

**Committee Members Absent:** Laura Bayless, Rachelle Dermer

**Guests in Attendance:** Karina Bautista, Linda LeBlanc, Audrey Pereira

*Meeting called to order by Co-Chair Dr. Weizer at 3:32 p.m.*

**Approval of AUC Minutes from Meeting on September 12, 2023**

Motion: Kisha Tracy Second: Rala Diakite

**Vote: 11/0/0 Unanimous**

**Review and Approval of Revisions to the 2022 – 2023 Procedures and Practices for  
AUC and Standing Committees**

Co-Chair Paul Weizer let the committee know that these were the same as last years. Each year the committee will look over to reconsider any changes. We are revising here. What the committee is discussion is from last year.

**Committee member made an amendment** to strike number 6, where it says non-substantive changes.

**Voting Methods Discussion:**

Committee member stated that some faculty/staff have made comments on the voting method. Robert's rule states that *"The majority vote is the majority of the votes passed and ignoring the abstentions"*. To be recommended a motion must receive a majority of yes votes of those committee members in attendance. Abstained is like a member is voting no.

Committee discussed and voted about the voting method. Discussion on majority on the votes casted.

Last year's AUC co-chair said the committee discussed this last year as well. Abstentions can be for a variety of reasons. Roberts rules are in favor of this.

Student member stated that the SGA also take abstentions. There has been discussions and the SGA uses the same methods and it works for the meetings/groups.

Committee member stated concerns about abstentions as counting as nos. Seen votes where people do not want to make a decision and it effected the voting of a proposal. Concern it punishes the proposers.

Committee member stated If there's that many people that don't understand the proposal and don't vote yes, than it probably shouldn't be passed. Need to be clear to committee that when a member abstains than it is a basically a no vote.

**Rala Diakite made a motion to change the wording, seconded by Laura Garofoli**

**Did not catch the full wording, but Co-Chair took the changes in real time and made changes to the document.**

Suggesting that Chair encourage members to vote yes and no. Basically, whatever the number in the room, the majority of the vote is what will pass.

Can we amend to say unless the number of abstentions reaches a threshold. 50% either have to revote or table.

**Friendly amendment by Laura Garofoli** that there has to be 50% of members voting; the votes cast must be 50% of committee in attendance. Half members of the committee.

**Vote: 3/8/0 (Y/N/A)**

In section 4: Put "an abstention is essentially a no vote". **Jonathan Harvey motioned Franca Barricelli seconded.**

**Vote: 11/0/0 Unanimous**

### **Meeting Times Discussion:**

Motion: Paul Weizer    Second: Kisha Tracy

Co-chair states meeting time ending at 4:30 pm is unrealistic, should be to 5:00 pm. The 4:30 pm time was during work to rule, now we don't have that. We should realistically change it to 5:00 pm and if we finish early we finish early. These are for the standing committees as well. And it's in the agenda and meeting schedule online as well that it is 5:00 pm.

Committee member wanted to encourage committee to consider the contract.

Another member stated committee work is volunteer and work takes until 5:00 pm and has that mind set the meetings go until 5:00 pm.

Last year the committee made a motion to always go until 5:00 pm for the rest of the year and it passed.

**Vote to have meeting end time at 5:00 pm: 7/4/0 (Y/N/A)**

### **Review and Approval of Additional Language for Governance Practices and Protocols**

Consider all of these amendments to the original document. Summer committee voted and discussed on these practices. This document is to help all chairs to have an understanding and this would give general parameters that people will follow. Have one set of rules everyone abides by and keeps meetings running smoothly.

#### **Written Statement Discussion:**

**Friendly amendment:** Remove the wording “inflammatory language”.

Committee member discussed Robert’s rules regarding statements: only way to have statement in is a vote from the motion and approval from the committee.

Committee member stated there have been written statements have been passed around and sent to certain members of the committee in the past. Need to address different ways the statements have been sent to committee members.

A statement can be included into the record upon vote of the committee votes. There’s danger when we let written statements read into the minutes. If it’s sent to the chair it will be sent to committee and read in advanced. Add something about procedure of how it is written in the record. The statements should only be sent to AUC chairs and then the AUC chairs will send them out to the committee from there.

A committee member stated this is not an issue of if it will be sent to the committee because it will be sent the committee through the chair regardless, the issue is if it would be officially added to the record and those are two totally separate things. What we are discussing is that the record be sent to the committee in advanced and then the committee decides if the record will be read into the record.

Would like to see a statement added that written statements be sent to the chair electronically 3 days in advanced and the AUC chair then sends to the committee 24-48 hours in advanced.

**Friendly amendment:** Comments would have to be sent solely to the chair 72 hours in advanced then distributed 48 hours in advanced to committee members. Written comments will not be part of the official record unless voted upon by the committee.

What happens if someone sends to whole committee? That would be trying to influence the vote.

Last comment: Must not be read in full. Should we value the open discussion and guests might have come to listen to discussion. Hope this will not limit them mentioning their statements. May assume that they have been read by committee members and need not reread.

**Friendly amendment:** Second sentence: Remove “solely to AUC chairs”.

**Vote: 12/0/0 Unanimous**

Concerns: Guests or other members of the campus or larger community who are in attendance.

**Vote: 12/0/0 Unanimous**

Bullet 3: Rather than leave to the AUC chair, spread this to the whole committee. Committee members can decide how long the meeting will run. Committee always has had a choice about this with Roberts rule. Any comments will be limited to amount of time.

**Friendly amendment:** Delete first phrase. Eliminate at discretion of the chair.

**Vote: 12/0/0 Unanimous**

**Friendly amendment:** Bullet 4: Should include proposers as well.

**Friendly amendment:** In first paragraph: Subcommittees should be changed to standing committees; as well in bullet 2.

The well function of all the committees is a concern. Suggestion: This will be disseminated each year to the whole campus community. It goes on the website each year and its part of the memo.

**Friendly amendment:** Put in that “the procedures and practices are going to be reviewed annually by the AUC committee with the invited input of the campus community”.

**Vote for whole: 12/0/0 Unanimous**

## **Adjournment**

Motion: Kisha Tracy      Second: Allison Turner

*Meeting adjourned at 4:54 p.m.*

**Vote: 12/0/0 Unanimous**