**Undergraduate Council Website Discussion:**

**Agenda/Minutes Presentation and Archiving**

**Proposal being considered:**

1. updating how we present agendas and minutes on the website
2. archiving agendas/minutes for all years prior to the last three academic years (2022 and before)

**Updating how we present agendas and minutes on the website**

CURRENT PRACTICE: each agenda item includes embedded PDFs of the item’s “report” from CourseLeaf and any/all supporting documentation uploaded in CourseLeaf (typically ADHE or DESE paperwork).

* 1. PROs: all relevant information is readily available for Council members (and others) to review proposals from the UC website by opening each linked document.
  2. CONs: uploading/linking PDFs is time consuming and creates accessibility issues. Even if we make all PDFs accessible now, the likelihood that they will still meet accessibility requirements in the future is slim.

\*Note: University websites must be ADA compliant in the next 2 years; we are verifying that making them OCR compatible meets the definition of ADA compliance.

PROPOSED PRACTICE: prepare agenda as usual for both the Course and Program Change Proposal reports, with corresponding PDFs uploaded to the website. For individual agenda items, provide links for Program Management and/or Miscellaneous Request Management, along with instructions for logging in and viewing these proposals in CourseLeaf. When posting minutes to the website, include additional instructions for identifying historical proposals in CourseLeaf.

1. PROs: all relevant information is readily available for Council members (and others) to review by logging in to CourseLeaf. Reduces the number of PDFs on the website, thereby alleviating the time/labor issue and accessibility concerns. The course and program proposal reports, generated by CourseLeaf, are already ADA compliant.
2. CONs: loss of historical program proposal data should the university choose to discontinue using CourseLeaf in future; however, the Registrar’s Office maintains scanned copies of program/course proposals in Perceptive Content and the Provost’s Office maintains copies of any/all corresponding ADHE and DESE paperwork.

**Archiving agendas/minutes for all years prior to and including 2022 (rolling process to maintain just 3 academic years on the website at any given time)**

CURRENT PRACTICE: new years are added to the website for both agendas and minutes; currently, there are entries going back to 2004.

1. PROs: agendas and minutes are readily available for Council members (and others) to view, though usage is minimal (102 views on all minutes and agendas from 2004-2022 in the last year).
2. CONs: although users can view these meeting agendas and minutes, many links to documents associated with individual agenda items no longer work; additionally, the 4,000+ PDFs currently posted on the website create accessibility issues that must be addressed within the next 2 years to meet ADA compliance. To address this would take 11 weeks of full-time labor (40 hours per week).

PROPOSED PRACTICE: retain 3 academic years of agendas and minutes on the website and archive the remaining years. PDFs currently posted to the website for the retained years would be updated for OCR accessibility, but if/as the new agenda/minutes practices are adopted, PDFs would slowly be eliminated from the website (Course and Program Change Proposal reports being the exception). Pros and cons are dependent upon which archiving solution is adopted. An overview of archiving options is provided below.

**Option 1**: remove older agendas/minutes from the website and replace them with a statement that they are available upon request by emailing the Director of Curriculum Review and Program Assessment. Agendas/minutes and all supporting documentation are already stored in the Provost’s Office file directories. Access to prior files would be mediated.

**Option 2:** partner with the University Libraries to archive the UC website on the Wayback Machine, similar to what has been done for the Faculty Senate website. See the archived FS website here: <https://wayback.archive-it.org/org-1034/20170803173350/http://facultysenate.uark.edu/>. Anyone would be able to access the information.

**Option 3:** partner with the University Libraries to archive the UC website as part of the Institutional Repository, similar to what has been done for the Faculty Senate website. See the link in ScholarWorks here: <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/>. Anyone would be able to access the information. This readily fits the scope of the Repository and is viewed as a best practice for maintaining institutional documents.

**Recommendation to consider:**

Based on conversations held with the web team from University Relations and the University Archivist in Mullins Library, the recommendation is to a) archive the website via the Wayback Machine now and b) move the archived contents to the Institutional Repository over the course of the next two years.