The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m.

**Review of Minutes ~ October 10, 2014**  
The Minutes of October 10 were submitted in two formats – the traditional block format and the longer narrative format. Discussion ensued regarding which format the Committee would like to follow with the plan that they would be posted on the Web. The content of the Minutes of October 10 was not discussed for either amending or approval.

**Action:** The Committee approved a narrative format for taking minutes and any actions are to be noted after the pertinent agenda item discussion.

**Presentation from the Registrar, Karen Arnould**  
Karen provided an overview of the new Auto-Waitlist Function and Adding Online Program which will be implemented Winter 2015 and disseminated a FAQ Sheet. She explained that this new process was at the request of faculty and provided the history which lead to its implementation. She and Stacy have been meeting with various groups to explain the change and answer any questions regarding the new process.

**Auto-Waitlist and Adding**  
Students who are on a waitlist will be notified via email should a vacancy occur and they have 48 hours to register. If they do not, then they are dropped from the waitlist. On the first day of the semester, the waitlist will be wiped out and students will be able to add during Days 1-5. On days 6-10, students may add online if seats are available and the department has given an electronic override. Karen emphasized that we want the departments to let the system work for them and asked that they not process any overrides before Day 6. Doing so may over-enroll your class. Stacy added that the system helps to keep classes full. Discussion took place. A question arose regarding whether OEL is using this system and Karen indicated that they are. Some other advantages of the new online program will include:
- Time conflict checking which will be flagged.
- Mutual exclusion – graduate students will not be allowed to take a graduate course that they took when they were an undergraduate.
- Scripts will be run at the beginning of the semester to identify students who are repeating courses.

She concluded that the campus is being notified of the new system via meeting with groups of faculty and staff, emails, Black Board, Facebook, Twitter, and the SIS Website.

**Provost Announcements and Update**  
Gerard is planning to meet with the Executive Committee (CAS) and Management Team (SHPS) this coming week. Search committee members for each of the dean searches will be finalized as well.

**Budget Concerns Presentation by Adam Lutzker**  
Chair Baird indicated that Adam has been involved with budget issues primarily within CAS which has been an ongoing process, but most recently, as the Chair of the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee for Budget and Strategic Planning (CAC/BSP). That group met with Vice Chancellor Tewksbury on October 6 regarding the budget. Adam was asked to meet with AAAC to provide a summary of the CAC/BSP Meeting so that when AAAC meets with Vice Chancellor Tewksbury, the information will not be a duplicate.

Adam qualified his remarks by indicating that Greg was only able to cover ten pages of his presentation so they did not have end discussion. Greg’s presentation included the logistical and rules of the current budget model rather than the kind of strategic consequences that the budget model produces. He said that even though the institution is healthy, there is disconnect because CAS credit hours numbers have been flat, especially since the goal of the budget model is incentive-driven by credit hours. Adam said he would like to have a conversation regarding how the budget model plays out within the curriculum – that is harder to sort out and that is why the Curriculum Committee was established.

Adam explained that the other variable with the new Chancellor is how the budget model interacts with the Strategic Plan, which in the end, may change the model. Institutionally, this is an opportunity to discuss the model. Adam indicated that he is assuming that AAAC will address the philosophical problem of the budget model in terms of the curriculum. Adam indicated that with an incentivized budget model, strategizing goals in say a graduate cohort is much easier than in undergraduate programs. Discussion included allocation of marginal revenue and changes in tuition revenue, based on credit hours and State allocations, and the differential tuition return model with CAS receiving around 55% and SOM at 70-75%, for instance. Budget targets were discussed as well and Adam indicated that projecting a target for CAS is very difficult. Darryl concurred by saying that enrollment fluctuations have occurred in some departments, with no evident reason, so budget planning has been very difficult. Gerard commented that CAS is doing a better job in tracking data to project enrollments.

Adam explained that in CAS, we have not been able to control the forces; i.e. course duplication. He said that having a $3 million carry forward is good and bad. The good is the buffer, but the bad is the complication of providing evidence regarding the budget problem. He explained that the budget and curriculum is hard; we create a competition regarding the budget model; however, we don’t have property rights in curriculum. Much discussion took place regarding duplication with tailoring. There was general agreement that perhaps new programs should require certain thresholds regarding the inclusion of courses and the cost of new courses to prevent repackaging of current courses. In closing, a suggestion was made that perhaps the new Curriculum Committee could work on that. Another suggestion was made that sustainment of a program should be considered as well. AAAC expressed a desire to receive the minutes from CAC/BSP’s meeting of October 6. Some felt that Faculty Council needs to be empowered so that changes can be made in terms of creating thresholds for new programs and changes including budget perspectives. A decision-making body needs to be established.
**Faculty Council Report**

Tom reported that an additional meeting was held with Beth Manning and David Betts, Associate Director of the Office of Institutional Equity to rehash concerns regarding the process of Title IX complaints. There are still questions regarding the procedures; therefore, Anthony Walesby, Associate Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs, Senior Director, and Title IX Coordinator, has been invited to the November 5 Governing Faculty Meeting to talk about the procedure.

Tom indicated that he briefly met with Vahid Lotfi to seek his input regarding who might be a good source to seek advice regarding the Curriculog software. Vahid indicated that questions should be sent to him, the IT Committee, and then the Technology Committee should be the ones to review it.

| **Action:** Chair Baird indicated that he will try to get the Minutes from the CAC/BSP Meeting and at our next meeting we will try to formulate questions to address when a meeting is established with Vice Chancellor Tewksbury. |

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.