

**COMMITTEE NAME:** EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE (ECUS)

**MEETING DATE & TIME:** 2 DECEMBER 2016; 2:00 –3:15

**MEETING LOCATION:** TERRELL HALL, ROOM 114

**ATTENDANCE:**

<b>MEMBERS</b>	<b>“P” denotes Present, “A” denotes Absent, “R” denotes Regrets</b>
----------------	---

<b>aR</b>	Nicole DeClouette (CoE, ECUS Vice-Chair)	<b>R</b>	Susan Steele (CoHS, ECUS Member)
<b>P</b>	Steve Dorman (University President)	<b>P</b>	John R. Swinton (CoB, ECUS Chair Emeritus)
<b>P</b>	Chavonda Mills (CoAS, ECUS Chair)	<b>P</b>	Craig Turner (CoAS, ECUS Secretary)
<b>P</b>	Costas Spirou (Interim Provost)	<b>P</b>	Shaundra Walker (Library, ECUS Member)

<b>GUESTS</b>
None

<i>Italicized text denotes information from a previous meeting.</i>		
*Denotes new discussion on old business.		

AGENDA TOPIC	DISCUSSIONS & CONCLUSIONS	ACTION OR RECOMMENDATIONS	FOLLOW-UP {including dates/responsible person, status (pending, ongoing, completed)}
<b>I. Call to order</b>	The meeting was called to order at 2:00pm by Chavonda Mills (Chair).		
<b>II. Approval of Agenda</b>	A <b><u>MOTION</u></b> to approve the agenda was made and seconded. A proposed revision was made to add Policy Updates as the last item under New Business. This revision was accepted by those present.	The agenda was approved as amended.	
<b>III. Approval of Minutes</b>	A <b><u>MOTION</u></b> to approve the minutes of the 4 Nov 2016 meeting of the Executive Committee was made and seconded. A draft of these minutes had been circulated to the meeting attendees via email with no revisions offered. Thus, the minutes had been posted as circulated.	The minutes of the 4 Nov 2016 Executive Committee meeting were approved as posted, so no additional action was required.	

<b>IV. Reports</b>	The following reports were invited.		
<b>Presiding Officer Report</b>  <b>Chavonda Mills</b>	<p>Chavonda Mills reported on the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b><u>Newsletter</u></b> The most recent issue of the university senate e-Newsletter is in draft form, expect a final version early next week for review.</li> <li>2. <b><u>Academic Leadership Council</u></b> met on 14 Nov 2016. I reminded academic deans to submit elected faculty senator election procedures for their respective academic units to ECUS by 1 Dec 2016 and shared that university senate is addressing concerns raised by faculty regarding faculty/staff parking.</li> <li>3. <b><u>Monthly Meeting with Provost</u></b> held on 16 Nov 2016. Among other items, Interim Provost Spirou and I discussed the university senate’s role in the Liberal Arts Council. I recommended university senate involvement early in the process as we will likely be asked to endorse proposals stemming from this council and we prefer to be involved throughout the process as opposed to at its conclusion.</li> <li>4. <b><u>Faculty Concern</u></b> received en route to this meeting regarding the role of the academic administration in program deactivation under consideration by CAPC. I informed the faculty member their concern will be reported at this ECUS meeting, and any recommendations emerging from ECUS</li> </ol>		

	<p>deliberations will be shared with the chair of CAPC and others, as appropriate.</p> <p><b><u>ECUS Deliberation</u></b> After discussion and clarification of this matter, the following statement was formulated. In the spirit of shared governance, it is recommended that the executive administrators limit their influence in advancing contested proposals.</p>		
<p><b>Past Presiding Officer Report</b></p> <p><b>John R. Swinton</b></p>	<p>John R. Swinton indicated that he had nothing to report as Past Presiding Officer of the University Senate.</p>		
<p><b>Presiding Officer Elect Report</b></p> <p><b>Nicole DeClouette</b></p>	<p>As Nicole DeClouette had extended <i>Regrets</i> and was unable to attend the meeting, there was no Presiding Officer Elect Report.</p>		
<p><b>Secretary Report</b></p> <p><b>Craig Turner</b></p>	<p>Craig Turner indicated that he had nothing to report as University Senate Secretary.</p>		
<p><b>Library Senator Report</b></p> <p><b>Shaundra Walker</b></p>	<p>Shaundra Walker indicated that she had nothing to report as the Elected Faculty Senator from the Library serving on ECUS.</p>		
<p><b>President's Report</b></p> <p><b>President Dorman</b></p>	<p><b><u>4 Nov 2016</u></b>  <i>As President Dorman was unable to attend the joint meeting of ECUS with Standing Committee Chairs meeting at 3:30pm, he provided the President's Report to ECUS.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><u>Wellness Center</u></b> <i>A committee is being formed to advise on the implementation of the transition of the Wellness Center from the College of Health Sciences to Student Affairs. Leadership in both units are aware of this transition.</i></li> <li><b><u>Question</u></b> <i>Are you requesting a university senate representative for service on this committee? Answer. Thank you for asking,</i></li> </ol>		<p><b><u>4 Nov 2016</u></b>  <i>Nicole DeClouette, SCoN Chair, to ensure a nominee is identified for service as the university senate representative on this committee.</i></p> <p><b><u>2 Dec 2016</u></b>  <i>Nicole DeClouette, SCoN Chair, did ensure a nominee was identified for service as the university senate representative on this committee. In</i></p>

	<p><i>Yes, that would be appropriate and desirable.</i></p> <p>3. <b><u>ECUS Deliberation</u></b> <i>Chavonda Mills noted as has recently (this year) become our practice, the nomination of a university representative for this committee is steered to the Subcommittee on Nominations (SCoN). Thus Nicole DeClouette, SCoN Chair, was charged to ensure a nominee is identified.</i></p> <p><b><u>2 Dec 2016</u></b>  As President Dorman was unable to attend the joint meeting of ECUS with Standing Committee Chairs meeting at 3:30pm, he was invited to provide a President’s Report to ECUS. President Dorman expressed his appreciation for the opportunity and indicated that he had nothing to report.</p>		<p>particular, Ben McMillan was nominated and agreed to serve.</p>
<p><b>V. Information Items</b>  Actions/Recommendations</p>			
<p><b>University Senate Budget</b>   <b>Chavonda Mills</b></p>	<p><b><u>7 Oct 2016</u></b></p> <p>1. <b><u>Balance</u></b> <i>The balance of the university senate budget (\$5000 allocation annually) is presently holding at \$1711.24.</i></p> <p>2. <b><u>Expenditures</u></b> <i>The total cost for the 2016 governance retreat was \$3288.76, breaking down as follows.</i></p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">a. <i>Rock Eagle \$2077.00</i></p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">b. <i>Printing \$425.90</i></p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">c. <i>Supplies and Materials \$412.19</i></p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">d. <i>Transportation \$373.67</i></p> <p>3. <b><u>Foundation Account</u></b> <i>Chavonda Mills noted that there was presently no foundation account established for the university senate. A suggestion from the floor was that the Presiding Officer</i></p>		<p><b><u>7 Oct 2016</u></b></p> <p>1. <i>Chavonda Mills to explore the viability of the establishment of a foundation account for the university senate and report back (the pros and cons and best practices) to the Executive Committee.</i></p> <p><b><u>4 Nov 2016</u></b></p> <p>1. <i>Chavonda Mills did explore the viability of the establishment of a foundation account for</i></p>

*(Chavonda Mills) explore the viability of establishing such an account going forward and report back (the pros and cons and best practices) to the Executive Committee. Chavonda Mills agreed to implement this recommendation.*

**4 Nov 2016**

1. **Balance** *The balance of the university senate budget (\$5000 allocation annually) is presently holding at \$1711.24.*
2. **Expenditures** *Pending expenditures are the reimbursements for travel expenses incurred by Nicole DeClouette when she was attending the USGFC meeting.*
3. **Foundation Account** *Chavonda Mills noted that establishing a foundation account for the university senate was as simple as filing a completed form. There was no minimum balance.*

**ECUS Deliberation**

- a. **Restrictions** *It was noted that while foundation accounts can be used for food items, one has to be attentive to the set of restrictions on the use of foundation funds. Chavonda Mills was advised to consult with Monica Starley and/or Kathy Waers on these restrictions.*
- b. **An Option for SCCP** *It was noted that establishing a foundations account would allow employees to contribute to this account as part of the State Charitable Contributions Program (SCCP).*
- c. **AAUP** *One possible use of foundation funds might be to support attendance of events sponsored by the American*

*the university senate and reported back (the pros and cons and best practices) to the Executive Committee.*

2. *Chavonda Mills to consult with Monica Starley and/or Kathy Waers to learn the restrictions on the use of foundation monies.*
3. *Chavonda Mills to take the actions necessary to establish a foundation account for the university senate.*

*Association of University Professors (AAUP). President Dorman indicated that he was willing to support this type of activity from other resources.*

- d. **Enticing Donors** *It was advisable to consider the possible ways the dollars in the foundation account would be used to inform its advertising. Perhaps certain uses of the funds would entice potential donors to contribute. The articulation of these particulars were postponed pending knowledge of the aforementioned restrictions.*
- e. **Establish a Foundation Account** *Those present recommended that Chavonda Mills complete the form and take the actions necessary to establish a university senate foundation account.*

**2 Dec 2016**

1. **Balance** The balance of the university senate budget (\$5000 allocation annually) is presently holding at **\$1711.24**.
2. **Expenditures** Pending expenditures are the reimbursements for travel expenses incurred by Nicole DeClouette when she was attending the USGFC meeting. Chavonda Mills indicated her intention to check into this as this reimbursement was taking longer than usual.
3. **Foundation Account** Chavonda Mills sought assistance in filling out the form for requesting a foundation account for the university senate. After receiving some guidance, it was suggested that Chavonda Mills consult with foundation personnel for further assistance.

<b>VI. Unfinished Business</b> <b>Review of Action &amp; Recommendations, Provide updates (if any) to Follow-up</b>			
<b>Routing (Steering) of Items to University Senate Committees</b>  <b>Chavonda Mills</b>	<p><b><u>7 Oct 2016</u></b>  <i>There are a number of items that are under consideration of being routed (steered) to a university senate committee for consideration.</i></p> <p>1. <b><u>Distance Education Policy</u></b> <i>This item was brought to the attention of ECUS at its final meeting of the 2015-2016 academic year. Since that time was concurrent with the final meetings of the standing committees to which it might be steered, the steering of this item was referred to the 2016-2017 ECUS for consideration. The interested reader is referred to the 1 Apr 2016 ECUS minutes for additional detail. After a brief discussion, this item was steered to the Academic Policy Committee (APC) for review. Suggested revisions to the procedures should be communicated to Interim Associate Provost Dale Young by APC. Suggested revisions to the policy should be submitted as a motion for university senate consideration.</i></p> <p>2. <b><u>Termination of the Institutional Overlays as a Graduation Requirement</u></b> <i>This item was brought to the attention of ECUS at its final meeting of the 2015-2016 academic year. Since that time was concurrent with the final meetings of the standing committees to which it might be steered, the steering of this item was referred to the 2016-2017 ECUS for consideration. The interested reader is referred to the 1 Apr 2016 ECUS minutes for additional detail.</i></p>		<p><b><u>7 Oct 2016</u></b>  <i>Chavonda Mills to share contextual information on each of these matters to the respective chair of the receiving committee to facilitate review of the matter by that committee.</i></p> <p><b><u>4 Nov 2016</u></b>  <i>Chavonda Mills did share contextual information on each of these matters to the respective chair of the receiving committee to facilitate review of the matter by that committee.</i></p> <p><b><u>2 Dec 2016</u></b>  <i>Chavonda Mills to steer the request to draft an election procedure (eligibility to serve, call for nominations, voting eligibility, election method, etc) for the second USGFC representative to Nicole DeClouette, SCoN Chair.</i></p>

*After a brief discussion, this item was steered to the Subcommittee on the Core Curriculum (SoCC) for consideration.*

3. **Review of Standing Committee Composition** *Each standing committee (APC, CAPC, FAPC, RIPC, and SAPC) has been invited to review its composition as articulated in the current university senate bylaws. This invitation was extended at the 2016 Governance Retreat and will be reiterated at the joint meetings of the Standing Committee Chairs and the Executive Committee.*

4. **USGFC Representative Term of Service** *This matter was considered at the 2016 Governance Retreat, at which time a revision to the current practice was proposed for consideration. Our current practice is for the Presiding Officer Elect of the University Senate to serve as the institution's voting representative on the USGFC (University System of Georgia Faculty Council) for a one year term of service. The proposed revision is to broaden the pool of those eligible to serve to all elected faculty senators and to extend the term from its current one year term to a two or three year term. This item was steered to ECUS and will be discussed further at a future ECUS meeting.*

**4 Nov 2016**

1. **USGFC Representative Term of Service** *The following were conversation points.*  
a. *Our current practice is that the Presiding Officer Elect serves as the voting member of the USGFC for a one year term concurrent with their time as*

*Presiding Officer Elect. This practice emerged as motion 1011.EC.001.R.*

- b. The recommendation under review was to broaden the pool to all elected faculty senators and extend the term of service to two or three years.*
- c. It is good to have the USGFC representative serving on ECUS to facilitate consultation.*
- d. Serving on the USGFC is a great developmental experience for the Presiding Officer Elect.*
- e. Serving only one year – typically only two meetings of the USGFC – has seemed to be too short a term to some past Presiding Officer Elects.*
- f. Those present recommended to continue the current practice that the Presiding Officer Elect serving a one year term as Georgia College’s voting member of the USGFC.*
- g. In addition, a second representative for Georgia College with a two year term of service to attend USGFC meetings was proposed. This representative shall be an elected faculty senator and shall be elected by the university senate. It was further recommended that the Subcommittee on Nominations conduct this election.*

**2 Dec 2016**

**1. USGFC Representative Term of Service**

- a. Chavonda Mills provided a recap of the discussion at the previous meeting (see the entry above for 4 Nov 2016).
- b. Chavonda Mills inquired whether the eligibility for the second representative

	<p>should be restricted to elected faculty senators with at least two years remaining in their three year elected faculty senator term. The question did not stimulate any discussion and no opinions were vocalized.</p> <p>c. Chavonda Mills recommended that the drafting of an election procedure (eligibility to serve, call for nominations, voting eligibility, election method, etc.) be charged to Nicole DeClouette, SCoN Chair. Naturally, drafting this in consultation with members of the Subcommittee on Nominations (SCoN) is appropriate.</p>		
<p><b>Review of Tasks Requiring Follow-up from the 2015-2016 ECUS Annual Report</b></p> <p><b>Chavonda Mills</b></p>	<p><b><u>7 Oct 2016</u></b>  <i>A number of items were recommended for consideration by the 2016-2017 ECUS in the committee annual report of the 2015-2016 ECUS. These include (yet may not be limited to) the following.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><u>Faculty Listserv</u></b> <i>The establishment of a university faculty email list to which any subscriber can post a message has been under consideration. Required is a volunteer to serve as moderator of this list, and this requirement has not yet been met. Those present at this meeting felt that the committee action should be a wait-and-see approach. Specifically, to wait and see if one or more individuals step forward to serve as moderator.</i></li> <li><b><u>Streamline Curricular Routing</u></b> <i>This matter is already in progress. A work group including Interim Associate Provost Dale Young, University Registrar Kay Anderson, and CAPC Chair Lyndall Muschell has been actively meeting and has been in</i></li> </ol>		<p><b><u>7 Oct 2016</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Shaundra Walker to gather contextual information to inform the ongoing GC Story Archivist deliberation.</i></li> <li><i>Chavonda Mills to explore the viability of the establishment of a foundation account for the university senate and report back (the pros and cons and best practices) to the Executive Committee.</i></li> </ol> <p><b><u>4 Nov 2016</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Shaundra Walker did gather contextual information to inform the ongoing GC Story Archivist deliberation.</i></li> </ol>

	<p><i>consultation with ECUS Chair Chavonda Mills. Plans include electronic implementation in coordination with IT personnel.</i></p> <p>3. <b><u>Regular Review of the PPPM</u></b> <i>This item is proposing the regular review of the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual (PPPM). Our current university policy officer, Sadie Simmons, is receptive to any recommendations on this matter. Craig Turner was the only committee member to volunteer to assist in this initiative. He indicated that his thoughts would be to advocate for</i></p> <p>a. <i>a review of all university senate policy motions (type P motions) to ensure that they are present in their entirety (not just the policy part, but pertinent procedures as adopted as well) in the PPPM, and</i></p> <p>b. <i>adoption of the university senate policy template as a template for entries in the PPPM going forward.</i></p> <p><i>Those present supported these ideas.</i></p> <p>4. <b><u>GC Story Archivist</u></b> <i>This item was on the agenda of each meeting of the 2015-2016 ECUS and was recommended for ongoing consideration by the 2016-2017 ECUS. Shaudra Walker noted the recent hiring of a Digital Archivist and agreed to gather contextual information pertinent to this matter to inform future ECUS deliberation.</i></p> <p>5. <b><u>Feasibility of Foundation Account for the University Senate</u></b> <i>Chavonda Mills noted that there was presently no foundation account established for the university senate. A suggestion from the floor was that the Presiding Officer (Chavonda Mills)</i></p>		<p>2. <i>Chavonda Mills did explore the viability of the establishment of a foundation account for the university senate and report back (the pros and cons and best practices) to the Executive Committee. To see this, look to the budget entry in the list of information items.</i></p> <p>3. <i>Chavonda Mills to pass the template for SCC reports at ECUS-SCC meetings on to the SCCs commencing its implementation at the 2 Dec 2016 ECUS-SCC meeting.</i></p> <p><b><u>2 Dec 2016</u></b>  <i>Chavonda Mills did pass the template for SCC reports at ECUS-SCC meetings on to the SCCs.</i></p>
--	--	--	--

explore the viability of establishing such an account going forward and report back (the pros and cons and best practices) to the Executive Committee. Chavonda Mills agreed to implement this recommendation.

6. **How Best to Receive Updates from University Senate Representatives on Task Forces, Committees, and Other Groups**

After a brief discussion, the consensus was that a written report included for archiving in the minutes –supplemented at the discretion of the representative with a brief oral report at the university senate meeting – was desirable.

7. **Details in Standing Committee Chair Reports for ECUS-SCC Meetings**

After a brief discussion, the consensus was that the oral report of the standing committee chair given at Executive Committee (ECUS) with Standing Committee Chairs (SCC) meetings should generally be a brief overview of the topics discussed at the committee meeting, rather than a detailed specification of the committee deliberation of each topic discussed at the committee meeting.

**4 Nov 2016**

1. **GC Story Archivist** Shaundra Walker noted that Holly Craft had been hired as a Digital Archivist and that the story-telling aspect of her position would be to tell the story about an event that has occurred as part of the process of archiving information pertinent to the event. All agreed this is ideal and precisely what was desired.

**Question** How does this differ from our university historian role? Answer: The

	<p><i>digital archivist document events that occur on campus as they are archived. The university historian reviews this documented events as artifacts and might select one or more for inclusion in the history of the university.</i></p> <p><i>All present agreed that this completes ECUS deliberation of a GC Story Archivist</i></p> <p><b>2. <u>Details in Standing Committee Chair Reports for ECUS-SCC Meetings</u></b> <i>At the 7 Oct 2016 ECUS meeting, Susan Steele had offered to prepare a template to guide the content of a report by each Standing Committee Chair (SCC) to the participants of the ECUS-SCC meetings. This template is available in the supporting documents attached to these minutes. The first review of the draft was “Brilliant!” and “Inspired!” Others concurred with this assessment. The recommendation of those present was to share the template with the standing committee chairs and for implementation to commence at the 2 Dec 2016 ECUS-SCC meeting. After a bit more discussion, it was agreed that this template – as appropriately modified – will also serve as a guide for the preparation of reports to university senate by university senate representatives serving on university-wide committees, task forces, and other groups.</i></p>		
<p><b>American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Redbooks for University Senate Leaders</b></p> <p><b>Craig Turner</b></p>	<p><b><u>4 Nov 2016</u></b>  <b><u>What is the Redbook?</u></b> <i>The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) celebrated the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of its 1915 founding during 2015. As part of this celebration, a new (eleventh) edition of the Redbook (so called due to its red cover and</i></p>		<p><b><u>4 Nov 2016</u></b>  <i>Chavonda Mills to survey committee chairs (APC, CAPC, FAPC, RPIPC, SoCC, SAPC) to determine which committee chairs (if any) don’t have a Redbook</i></p>

	<p>more formally titled <i>Policy Documents and Reports</i>) was published in December 2014 and is now available for purchase. The Redbook is a compendium of statements of national best practice for all things academic.</p> <p><b><u>Continue Recent Practice?</u></b> Craig Turner noted that recent practice has been to consider annually the purchase of AAUP Redbooks for the university senate leadership – including all members of ECUS and committee chairs (APC, CAPC, FAPC, RPIPC, SoCC, SAPC) – and asked if those present were in favor of continuing this practice. The answer was Yes (with no dissenting voice) noting that the book should be a token of appreciation to be kept by the individuals serving in these leadership positions.</p> <p><b><u>Distributing Redbooks to Leaders</u></b> It was noted that there were extra copies of the Redbook purchased during the 2015-2016 academic year so that there may be a sufficient supply with no necessity to purchase more. Chavonda Mills asked if those present had a copy of the Redbook and all responded that they did. Chavonda Mills indicated her intent to survey the committee chairs (APC, CAPC, FAPC, RPIPC, SoCC, SAPC) to determine which committee chairs (if any) don't have a Redbook and issue Redbooks as necessary.</p> <p><b><u>2 Dec 2016</u></b> Chavonda Mills indicated her intent to survey committee chairs to see who needs a Redbook at the 2 Dec 2016 3:30pm meeting of ECUS with Standing Committee Chairs.</p>		<p>and issue Redbooks as necessary.</p> <p><b><u>2 Dec 2016</u></b> Chavonda Mills did survey committee chairs (APC, CAPC, FAPC, RPIPC, SoCC, SAPC) to determine which committee chairs (if any) don't have a Redbook and issue Redbooks as necessary</p>
<p><b>VII. New Business</b> Actions/Recommendations</p>			

<p><b>Individual Faculty Report Procedures Concern</b></p> <p><b>Chavonda Mills</b></p>	<p>A faculty concern had been received regarding the recent call for Individual Faculty Reports (IFR) for 2016 being due 15 Jan 2017 rather than the 15 Mar due date given in the Policies, Procedures and Practices Manual (PPPM). The concern was less about the particular due date designated and more about the short notice (given to faculty in mid-November) of this due date and it being out of compliance with the PPPM. Primary concerns were</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• faculty need sufficient notification of a deadline change, and</li> <li>• can the deadline be changed without due process and faculty input?</li> </ul> <p>The following were conversation points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was general agreement that faculty should have earlier notification of a change to the due date.</li> <li>• The factor driving this change in due date is to allow department chair merit increases in annual salary to be informed by the most recent activity by the faculty member.</li> <li>• In the procedures in the PPPM, the IFR due date is 15 March which made more sense when these reports were based on an academic year. Now that the IFR is based on a calendar year, the due date could reasonably be earlier.</li> <li>• There is presently some variation by college in the due date and not all colleges presently comply with the 15 March due date, some having due dates as early as 1 Jan.</li> <li>• Those present recommended steering the review of the pertinent PPPM language to FAPC for review and</li> </ul>		
---	--	--	--

recommended updates noting in particular the fact that for the last several years, the IFR has been based on a calendar year, and so the language which indicates the IFR based on an academic year is decidedly in need of review.

*The faculty member completes the Individual Faculty Report (IFR) and submits it to the chairperson on March 15 [or the first business day following March 15 should March 15 be a Saturday or Sunday] of the academic year to which it applies*

The PPPM entry can be found at <https://gcsu.smartcatalogiq.com/en/Policy-Manual/Policy-Manual/Academic-Affairs/EmploymentPolicies-Procedures-Benefits/Performance-Evaluations-Administrators-and-Faculty/Faculty-Performance-Evaluation/Faculty-Review-System-Philosophy-and-General-Procedures>

- For calendar year 2016 IFR submission, ECUS recommends Interim Provost Spirou consult with Deans Council to propose a deadline, and communicate the deadline to faculty as early as possible.
- The Deans Council will discuss the due date at its December 2016 meeting, seeking a due date that is feasible to all academic units (colleges and library) and taking into account the allocation of faculty time to complete the IFR and having the annual evaluation completed in time for department chairs to make faculty annual salary merit pay increase recommendations. This recommended due date will be forwarded to FAPC.

<p><b>Role of University Senate in Liberal Arts Council (LEAP initiative)</b></p> <p><b>Chavonda Mills</b></p>	<p>What is the role of university senate in the LEAP initiative being considered through the Liberal Arts Council? It is anticipated that at some future time, this council will submit a request for university senate review and possibly seek university senate endorsement. A desire is to facilitate university senate involvement as these potential future requests are formulated rather than having university senate action only on a finished product.</p> <p>Thus ECUS recommends</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the university senate representative (presently Susan Steele) on the Liberal Arts Council provide monthly written and oral updates on council business. These updates should be informed by consultation with other members of the Liberal Arts Council and its subcommittees who are serving on the university senate and/ or university senate committees.</li> <li>• the university senate representative is encouraged to inform the council of items requiring university senate consideration to ensure university senate involvement throughout decision-making processes.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>University Senate Procedures if Proposal under Standing Committee Review is Denied</b></p> <p><b>Chavonda Mills</b> <b>Craig Turner</b></p>	<p>A question seeking clarification on the process of university senate consideration of a matter was received. Specifically, the question asked whether a standing committee (APC, CAPC, FAPC, RPIPC, SAPC) disapproving a matter would end university senate consideration of that matter, and thus in effect prevent the consideration of the matter by the full university senate.</p>		

It was noted that the pertinent university senate bylaw was

***IV. Section 1. Committee Business. The regular operations of the University Senate shall follow a committee review procedure. The University Senate by a two-thirds majority vote may suspend committee review of a specific matter and act as a committee of the whole. In all other cases, the University Senate shall submit all matters of substance for study, recommendations, and/or action by a committee prior to definitive action being taken by the University Senate. Standing committee business may be initiated by any member of the committee, by the Executive Committee of the University Senate, by the University President, or by a written request to the Executive Committee signed by at least three Senators.***

While this bylaw does not explicitly address whether disapproval of the standing committee ends the consideration of a matter by the university senate, the practice has been for the university senate to consider matters only if they emerge from a standing committee unless the university senate by a two-thirds vote decides to consider the matter as a committee of the whole. Thus, from one point of view the standing committees serve as filters and may result in a matter not being brought for consideration by the university senate. That is, not every matter that is steered to a standing committee emerges from the committee with a recommendation for or against for a decision by the university senate. So at present, in some cases the disapproval of a standing committee MIGHT be the final consideration (and thus

effectively end consideration) of a matter by the university senate.

**BEGIN NOTE:** During the preparation of these minutes, the ECUS Secretary notes that the University President interprets bylaws.

*V.Section I.C.4. Steering Function. Except when the University Senate gives specific directions, the Executive Committee shall, when consideration is being given to referring any matter to a standing committee, determine the standing committee that shall have jurisdiction; provided, however, that nothing in this responsibility shall challenge the University President's authority and responsibility for interpretation of the Statutes and bylaws or for determining ultimate jurisdiction when conflicts arise.*

**END NOTE**

There was general agreement by those present that a review of the university senate process of consideration of matters was in order. The conversation points included the following.

- 1) While the official standing of a recently emerging curricular flowchart document is uncertain, it offers guidance pertinent to the question. Specifically, in the subtitle above the flowchart, it reads *A denial at any approval point either stops this process or moves it to an appeal.* Those present did not find particular details on venues of appeal articulated in this curricular document.
- 2) What is the role of standing committees in reviewing a proposal emerging from a department and/or college? Matters that emerge from these sources are often curricular, but this issue was broadened to

	<p>all standing committees not simply CAPC. There is a need to attempt to remove the gray areas in the committee charges and perhaps to codify the role of the standing committee more clearly and specifically. As one example, should CAPC be reviewing the merits of a curricular proposal or simply ensuring the proposal has been adequately considered at the department and college levels with good practice in shared governance? At present, the university senate bylaws are silent on guidance in these matters and so there are some gray areas in current committee charges. ECUS subcommittee consisting of Chavonda Mills, Shaundra Walker and Craig Turner was formed and this subcommittee was charged to review committee charges in the university senate bylaws. Some felt removal of all gray areas would be easier said than done.</p> <p>3) The absence of an appeal process may also be a point of tension. ECUS subcommittee consisting of Interim Provost Spirou, John Swinton, and Craig Turner was formed and this subcommittee was charged to draft language for appeal processes. Initially this might be considered with respect to the curricular flowchart that recently emerged as well as for decisions of the standing committees of the university senate.</p> <p>4) In the consideration of curricular matters, faculty have primacy in the curricular content and the pedagogical delivery of this content and administrators have the responsibility to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in the resource management</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>in the delivery of curriculum. At times there is a tension between these.</p> <p>5) There is always room for more clarity in existing governance documents, and the recent issue has brought this to light. It is hoped that we can move forward together and bring additional clarity to our shared governance processes including the university senate bylaws and recently emerging curricular flowchart.</p>		
<p><b>Governance Calendar 2017-2018</b></p> <p><b>Chavonda Mills</b></p>	<p>Chavonda Mills noted that one of the annually recurring ECUS tasks is the preparation of the governance calendar, and that the university senate bylaws call for completion by 1 April. Recent practice has been</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to inform the drafting of the calendar with a consultation of the university senate at its February meeting, and</li> <li>• to have the university senate officers serve as the ECUS subcommittee to draft the calendar for ECUS review.</li> </ul> <p>Chavonda Mills recommended continuation of recent practice, specifically that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the current university senate officers (Presiding Officer Chavonda Mills, Presiding Officer Elect Nicole DeClouette, Secretary Craig Turner) serve as the ECUS subcommittee to draft the 2017-2018 Governance Calendar for review by ECUS at its 3 Feb 2017 meeting, and</li> <li>• review of the draft calendar by the university senate at its 17 Feb 2017 meeting.</li> </ul> <p>All who were present at this meeting supported this recommendation.</p>		

<p><b>Policy Updates</b></p> <p><b>Chavonda Mills</b></p>	<p><b>Issue</b> ECUS considered a query regarding the process for ensuring existing university policies are in compliance with USG/BoR policy when USG/BoR policies are updated. ECUS noted that the University Compliance/ Policy Officer (presently Sadie Simmons) is the responsible party for ensuring policy compliance and recommends this officer notify the university senate of USG/BoR policy changes. University Senate will present these USG/BoR policy updates as information items as no deliberation is necessary unless it is to contest the policy change.</p> <p><b>Proposal</b> ECUS proposed formation of a policy oversight committee to ensure proposed policies are in compliance with external (USG/BoR) as well as existing internal (GC) polices, processes, and procedures. Recommended as committee members were the Policy/ Compliance Officer and representatives from the following: Legal Affairs, Human Resources, Academic Affairs, and Finance and Administration. This committee might also draft policies.</p>		
<p><b>VIII. Next Meeting</b> (Tentative Agenda, Calendar)</p>			
<p><b>1. Calendar</b></p>	<p>20 Jan 2017 @ 2:00pm Univ. Senate A&amp;S 2-72 3 Feb 2017 @ 2:00pm ECUS in 301 Parks 3 Feb 2017 @ 3:30pm ECUS-SCC in 301 Parks</p>		
<p><b>2. Tentative Agenda</b></p>	<p>Some of the deliberation today may have generated tentative agenda items for future ECUS and ECUS-SCC meetings.</p>		<p>Chavonda Mills to ensure that such items (if any) are added to agendas of an ECUS and/or ECUS-SCC meeting in the future.</p>
<p><b>IX. Adjournment</b></p>	<p>As there was no further business to consider, a <b>MOTION</b> to adjourn the meeting was made and seconded.</p>	<p>The motion to adjourn was approved and the meeting adjourned at 3:08 pm.</p>	

**Distribution:**

First; To Committee Membership for Review

Second: Posted to the Minutes Website

**Approved by:** \_\_\_\_\_

Committee Chairperson (Including this Approval by chair at committee discretion)

**COMMITTEE NAME:** EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE (ECUS)

**COMMITTEE OFFICERS:** CHAVONDA MILLS (CHAIR), NICOLE DECLOUETTE (VICE-CHAIR), CRAIG TURNER (SECRETARY)

**ACADEMIC YEAR:** 2016-2017

**AGGREGATE MEMBER ATTENDANCE AT COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THE ACADEMIC YEAR:**

**“P” denotes Present, “A” denotes Absent, “R” denotes Regrets**

*Note: 2 Sep 2016 meeting canceled due to University officially closing (tropical storm)*

Acronyms	EFS = Elected Faculty Senator; CoAS = College of Arts & Sciences, CoB = College of Business; CoE = College of Education; CoHS = College of Health Sciences										
	Meeting Dates	09-02-16	10-07-16	11-04-16	12-02-16	02-03-17	03-03-17	03-31-17	Present	Regrets	Absent
Nicole DeClouette <i>EFS; CoE; ECUS Vice-Chair</i>	N/A	P	P	R					2	1	0
Steve Dorman <i>University President</i>	N/A	R	P	P					2	1	0
Chavonda Mills <i>EFS; CoAS; ECUS Chair</i>	N/A	P	P	P					3	0	0
Costas Spirou <i>Interim Provost</i>	N/A	P	P	P					3	0	0
Susan Steele <i>EFS; CoHS; ECUS Member</i>	N/A	P	P	R					2	1	0
John R. Swinton <i>EFS; CoB; ECUS Chair Emeritus</i>	N/A	P	P	P					3	0	0
Craig Turner <i>EFS; CoAS; ECUS Secretary</i>	N/A	P	P	P					3	0	0
Shaundra Walker <i>EFS; Library; ECUS Member</i>	N/A	P	P	P					3	0	0

CHAIRPERSON SIGNATURE \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_ -(Including this Approval by chair at committee discretion)