

# Proposal for Rules of Procedures of USG Committees

## 1 Current state

Currently the AAC is hardly concerned with major related issues, except perhaps for majors with many AAC members like IRPH. Lacking qualified members, the AAC would also hardly be able to judge major-specific issues.

## 2 Expected state

As a consequence of the AAC not taking up (and sometimes not knowing about) major-specific issues, various majors have fought separately for themselves without the support of the ones who are supposed to represent us and have the connections into the relevant university committees. They might not hear about each other and their experience is lost afterwards.

Instead, one would expect that there should be a structured way the AAC can get qualified feedback from a major, should have somebody they can contact in case of questions and that the students of the major, have a way to directly communicate their feedback and suggestions into the AAC, without having to join the AAC, which many might not be willing to do. This would also (in the authors' opinion) make the AAC too large to be still effective.

## 3 Suggestion

The main idea is to create *major representatives*, one student per major which can advise the AAC in matters regarding the major, represents the major to the AAC and informs the major about (major relevant) developments in the AAC. The major representatives would also have the right to make (major specific) agenda points for the AAC to inform the AAC on problems inside of the major and to propose possible solutions (after discussing them with his fellow students and ideally faculty). They would also usually be responsible for/involvement in any projects that specifically concern the major.

### 3.1 Further optional amendments to the proposal

Additionally, the authors would like to propose the following additional responsibilities of the major representative (or whoever they make responsible):

1. Organizing and reporting back from the student-organized round tables in the major
2. Serve as contact person also towards other university committees (e.g. the QM)
3. Being invited into the EAP or AS when needed, to advise our representatives in major-specific matters

## 4 Discussion

In the AAC meeting of May 3, 2018 when this proposal was initially discussed specifically amendment 1 and the aspect of the major representative informing the AAC, was criticized for reinventing the wheel, since this feedback is already gathered by the QM.

However, amendment 1 is merely a way to assigning the task of organizing the round tables also discussed in that meeting, to a person responsible for each major and seems to be a natural choice, in case the AAC continues to organize these round tables. On the other hand, having a contact person in each major advising the AAC allows us to get feedback directly during a meeting.

Another practical issue with this proposal is actually finding good major representatives. For the time being, current AAC members can find/serve as representatives for their major, but ultimately a proper selection procedure is needed and should be implemented until the beginning of next semester. This remains up for discussion.

On behalf of the:  
Academic Affairs Committee  
Undergraduate Student Government

Date: 10<sup>th</sup> May, 2018

**Project officers,**  
Dan-Andrei Corbeanu  
d.corbeanu@jacobs-university-usg.de  
Colin Rothgang  
c.rothgang@jacobs-university-usg.de

**USG AAC chair,**  
Marco David  
m.david@jacobs-university-usg.de