COMMITTEE NAME: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE (ECUS) **MEETING DATE & TIME:** 3 APRIL 2015; 2:00–3:15 **MEETING LOCATION:** 301 PARKS ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

ATTENDANCE:

MEMBERS "P" denotes Present, "A" denotes Absent, "R" denotes Regrets				
Р	Kelli Brown (Provost)	P	Susan Steele (CoHS, ECUS Vice-Chair)	
Р	Ben Davis (Library)	Р	John Swinton (CoAS, ECUS Secretary)	
R	Steve Dorman (University President)	Р	Craig Turner (CoAS, ECUS Vice-Chair)	
Р	Lyndall Muschell (CoE, ECUS Chair Emeritus)			
GUESTS: Jordan Cofer (USG Executive Leadership Institute (ELI) Shadow of President Dorman visiting from Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College) Tom Ormond (Senior Associate Provost) Carter Shadden (Graduate Assistant of the 2014-2015 University Senate) Italicized text denotes information from a previous meeting.				
*Denotes new discussion on old business.				

AGENDA TOPIC	DISCUSSIONS & CONCLUSIONS	ACTION OR RECOMMENDATIONS	FOLLOW-UP {including dates/responsible person, status (pending, ongoing, completed)}
I. Call to order	The meeting was called to order at 2:05 pm by Susan Steele (Chair).		
II. Approval of Agenda	A <u>MOTION</u> to approve the agenda was made and seconded.	The agenda was approved as circulated.	
III. Approval of Minutes	A <u>MOTION</u> to approve the minutes of the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of the Executive Committee was made and seconded. A draft of these minutes had been circulated to the meeting	Committee minutes were approved as posted, so no	

	attendees via email with no revisions offered.
	Thus, the minutes had been posted (as
	circulated) to the minutes.gcsu.edu site.
IV. Reports	Reports from each elected faculty senator were
	invited by Susan Steele.
Provost Report	1. Major/Minor Task Force Requesting a
	University Senate representative for a
	newly formed Task Force on Minors and
	Double Majors.
	2. <u>Committee Registry</u> Following a meeting
	with Presiding Officer Susan Steele and
	President Dorman, it was decided a
	database of sorts of non-University Senate
	standing committees within each VP area of
	the university will be created. The
	information to be included is name of
	standing committee, charge of standing
	committee, and committee members by
	title. This information will be appropriately
	placed on the university website to be
	accessed by faculty, staff and students as
	well as external community members. Each
	VP area will be responsible for updating.
	Also to be included are groups within each
	area (i.e., Cabinet, Academic Leadership
	Team). The plan is to have the website in
	place by fall 2015.
Presiding Officer Report	1. Susan Steele had disseminated to the
	university community via the frontpage
Susan Steele	email digest the reports Provost Brown and
	President Dorman delivered to the
	university senate at its 27 Mar 2015

	meeting. This was the first time these
	reports were disseminated in advance of the
	meeting minutes in an attempt to get the
	information to the university community in
	a more timely manner. Both President
	Dorman and Provost Brown had authorized
	the dissemination of their reports in this
	manner.
	2. Susan Steele expressed appreciation for the
	faculty who had met on 25 Mar 2015 with
	a visiting Regent from the Board of
	Regents. Each of the colleges were
	represented and the conversation was
	productive.
	3. Susan Steele had surveyed the volunteers
	serving on university senate committees as
	to whether a wearable token of appreciation
	(like the university senate pin for university
	senators) was desired. The consensus
	opinion of the survey respondents was that
	no wearable token of appreciation was
	necessary. This feedback closed the
	consideration of establishing a practice to
	provide wearable tokens of appreciation to
	volunteers, realizing that of course this
	matter could be revisited in the future.
	4. Susan Steele provided an update on the
	university senate budget. She indicated that
	there was about \$600 worth of requests that
	had not yet paid out. Even after that, she
	noted that there would be a sufficient
	balance in the account to finance some of
N-	

Γ		
	the retreat materials as well as stock up on	
	copies of the 11 th edition of the AAUP	
	(American Association of University	
	Professors) Redbook. These Redbooks	
	would be doled out in future years in a	
	manner to be determined by leaders of the	
	future university senate(s). As a point of	
	context, AAUP Redbooks had been given	
	in some of the previous years (not annually)	
	at the discretion of the university senate	
	leadership as a token of appreciation to	
	ECUS members and some or all of the	
	committee officers. This may become a	
	more regular practice given that the 11 th	
	edition was just published in December	
	2014 as part of the centennial celebration of	
	the founding of the AAUP.	
Past Presiding Officer	Lyndall Muschell indicated that she had	
Report	nothing to report as Past Presiding Officer.	
_		
Lyndall Muschell		
Presiding Officer Elect	John Swinton indicated that he had nothing to	
Report	report as Presiding Officer Elect. He did have	
John Swinton	a report as Subcommittee on Nominations Chair.	
John Swinton	1. Committee Preference Surveys The	
	Qualtrics committee preference surveys are	
	done. I have an initial slate for	
	Subcommittee on Nominations review and	
	university senate confirmation once I fill	
	out the SoCC assignments. I do not have a	
	COHS person, a LIB person, an A2 person	
	or a GC1Y person.	

, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2. <u>University Senate Officers</u> We had seven
	nominations for presiding officer elect
	(spreadsheet). All have been contacted and
	have confirmed whether they have accepted
	the nomination or not (four declining, one
	acceptance, two maybes meaning accept if
	no other viable candidates identified).
	There was one nominee receiving multiple
	nominations for secretary and that nominee
	has accepted the nomination.
3	3. Bylaws Need to consider bylaws change to
	align years of service qualification for
	eligibility to serve as an elected faculty
	senator with the university senate and
	academic year contract calendars. As is
	presently stated, there have been different
	interpretations (i.e. there's ambiguity). The
	particular section in need of revision
	consideration is the last sentence of Article
	II.Section1.A.2.
	and as Governance Retreat Planning
	Committee Chair
1	1. Committee Members Five individuals
	(Macon McGinley, Lyndall Muschell,
	Barbara Roquemore, Susan Steele, Craig
	Turner) have volunteered to serve on the
	governance retreat planning committee.
2	2. Date The 2015 Governance Retreat is
	scheduled for 9:00am to 4:00pm on
	Tuesday 11 Aug 2015.
	3. Site The location for the 2015 Governance
	Retreat will be Rock Eagle. I have made the
	inquiry. I sent the forms to Susan and I
	think I am waiting for confirmation that we
	send some money to reserve the space.
4	4. <u>Invitees</u> The invitees for the 2015
	governance retreat will be all members of

r		
	 the committees of the 2015-2016 university senate. This list will be available following the organizational meeting of the 2015-2016 university senate scheduled to occur at 2:00 pm on Fri 1 May 2015 in Arts & Sciences 2-72. 5. <u>Surveys</u> I anticipate circulating surveys to collect preferences on intent to attend (RSVP), travel (bus/van/personal car) and food (dietary needs), likely after the organizational meeting of the 2015-16 university senate. 6. <u>Agenda</u> Another next task is to create a 	
	tentative agenda. This agenda will be informed by feedback on the recent surveys of volunteers and elected faculty senators as well as information shared in the retreat section of the 2014-15 committee annual	
	reports.	
Secretary Report	<u>14 Nov 2014</u>	<u>14 Nov 2014</u>
Craig Turner	1. <u>Redbooks</u> Craig Turner noted that he had	1. John R. Swinton Chair
	brought to this meeting nine copies of the 10 th edition of the American Association of University Professors Policies and Reports – more commonly known as The AAUP Redbook due to its red cover – which belonged to the University Senate. Further, he noted that the 11 th edition of this AAUP Redbook would soon be available (its publication and availability anticipated in January 2015). The question was: What to do with these nine copies? After a brief discussion, there was agreement by those present to first offer these copies to the committee officers at the 14 Nov 2014 3:30pm meeting of the Executive	of the Subcommittee on Nominations to contact Indiren Pillay to see how the constituency of elected faculty senator Andrei Barkovskii (who has indicated he will take a professional leave during Spring 2015) would like to be represented during the Spring 2015 semester. 2. Susan Steele to ensure that the recently hired Chief Human Resources

	Committee with the Standing Committee	Officer Leslie Pierce is
	Chairs, and second if there were any copies	aware of the need for a
	remaining, to offer them to the elected	verification list to be
	faculty senators at the 5 Dec 2014 meeting	circulated by Human
	of the University Senate. Note: During the	Resources as part of the
	preparation of these minutes, it was known	implementation of the
	that all nine copies were distributed to	Service Recognition
	committee officers at the 14 Nov 2014	Policy.
	meeting of the Executive Committee with	r oney.
	Standing Committee Chairs.	<u>23 Jan 2015</u>
	2. <u>Elected Faculty Senator on Leave</u> Craig	1. John R. Swinton Chair
	<i>Turner noted that he and Susan Steele had</i>	of the Subcommittee on
	received an email from elected faculty	Nominations did
	senator Andrei Barkovskii indicating that	contact Indiren Pillay
	Andrei would be on professional leave	to see how the
	during the Spring 2015 semester and did	constituency of elected
	not intend to attend meetings of the	faculty senator Andrei
	university senate or its committees during	Barkovskii (who has
	this time. A relevant university senate	indicated he will take a
	bylaw states	professional leave
	II.Section1.B.	during Spring 2015)
	Replacements. Vacancies (i.e.	would like to be
	professional leave, sick leave, etc) or	represented during the
	resignations that occur during a term of	Spring 2015 semester.
	service shall be filled for the remainder	It was determined that
	of that term following the process used	Mike Gleason would
	in the original election, selection or	complete Andrei's
	appointment.	term.
	To initiate this process the individual or	2. Susan Steele will
	proxy (i.e., colleges/library, Student	<i>ensure that the recently</i>
	Government Association, Staff Council,	hired Chief Human
		0
	presidential appointee) should notify the Chair of the Committee on	Resources Officer Leslie Pierce is aware
	the Chair of the Committee on Nomingtions in writing (electronic)	
	Nominations in writing (electronic forms are accentable)	of the need for a
	forms are acceptable).	verification list to be
	It was further noted that the current elected	circulated by Human
l	faculty senator term of Andrei Barkovskii	Resources as part of

 ended 1 May 2015. During discussion, a	the implementation o
consensus opinion emerged that this	the Service Recognition
information should be shared with the	Policy. In particular
constituency of Andrei Barkovskii (his	there is a meeting
department colleagues) who could then	scheduled for 27 Jan
decide if they wanted to name a	2015 at 3:00 pm to
replacement to complete the term of Andrei	discuss this matter and
	ensure this awareness
Barkovskii and serve as their elected	
faculty senator for Spring 2015. As current	The meeting attendee
Chair of the Subcommittee on Nominations,	include Leslie Pierce
this responsibility fell to John R. Swinton.	Crystal Reeves, Monic Starley Sugar Starle, an
3. <u>Service Recognition Policy</u> A concern	Starley, Susan Steele, an
regarding the implementation of this policy	Craig Turner.
that was discussed earlier this academic	3. Susan Steele to shar
year by the Executive Committee may still	with President Dorma
be unresolved. The primary point of	as an information iter
concern was whether or not a list seeking	Motion 0708.EC.003.
the verification of the time in service has	regarding the keepin
been circulated to supervisors as called for	of a university-wid
in the policy. The specific policy language	committee registry.
is	4. Susan Steele to see
The Office of Human Resources and	permission from
Employee Relations shall be responsible	President Dorman t
for identifying employees to be recognized	circulate (in advance o
based on the eligible service criteria.	minutes being posted
• Employees shall be recognized at the	the president's report
Service Recognition Ceremony that	to the university senate
next occurs after they reach the	If secured, these two
specified years of eligible service.	reports (president an
• A list of all employees, including their	provost) should b
length of service, shall be distributed to	circulated to th
supervisors by August 1st each year.	university communit
Supervisors by August 1st each year. Supervisors shall be responsible for	by the presiding office
confirming with the employee that the	of the university senat
length of service is accurate.	via the FrontPag
Discrepancies shall be reported	digest email system.
Discrepancies shall be reported	argest email system.

immediately to the Office of Human	5. Susan Steele to ensure
Resources and Employee Relations.	that consultation with
• To assist in the identification process,	individuals who serve
employees with discrepancies or	on university senate
unusual service records (e.g. non-	committees (in roles
continuous service, leave of absence,	other than university
part-time to full-time) are encouraged	senator) have the
to complete the Employee Service	opportunity to offer
Update Form and submit it to the Office	suggestion for possible
of Human Resources and Employee	tokens of appreciation
Relations.	to recognize their
It was noted that the Service Recognitions	service that would be
Policy was adopted on 2 May 2013 as the	meaningful to them (to
result of motion 1213.EC.002. found in the	possibly be added as a
online motion database at the url	parallel practice to th
http://senate.gcsu.edu/senate/view_motion.	current awarding of th
<u>$php?mid=557$</u> and that this circulation of	university senate pin
the list for verification has yet to be	to university senators)
implemented. After brief discussion, the	
consensus recommendation was to contact	27 Feb 2015
the recently hired Chief Human Resources	1. Susan Steele will soo
Officer Leslie Pierce to acquaint her with	be meeting with bot
this facet of the Service Recognition Policy.	President Dorman an
As current Presiding Officer of the	Provost Brown t
University Senate, this responsibility fell to	discuss the content of
Susan Steele.	Motion 0708.EC.003.
4. <u>Communication</u> Craig Turner offered for	which advocates for th
consideration of those present a suggestion	keeping of a registry of
that the reports to the university senate	university-wide
from the university president and the	committees. Susan wi
provost be distributed more widely in closer	also formally see
proximity to the university senate meeting	permission from
at which they are delivered than is present	President Dorman t
practice. He observed that all members of	circulate to th
the university community could read these	university communit
reports from the university senate minutes	(in advance of minute
which were typically posted closer to the	being posted) th

Page 9 of 42

	following mosting of the university gampte	nuccidant's non out to
	following meeting of the university senate	president's report to
	and that was typically four to five weeks	the university senate.
	after the reports were given to university	2. Susan Steele drafted a
	senators. After brief discussion, the	survey to circulate to
	consensus opinion of those present was that	non-university-senator
	this was a good idea and that it could be	members of university
	implemented by sharing the reports with the	senate committees to
	elected faculty senators of the executive	gather information on
	committee who would in turn be	the interest of this
	responsible to share the information with	group in receiving a
	their academic units OR these reports could	wearable token of
	be distributed to the university senators	appreciation for their
	who would be charged to get the	university senate
	information to their constituencies. No	committee service. This
	particular strategy was agreed upon for	recognition would be
	implementation. There was also consensus	comparable to the
	opinion that permission from each of the	university senate pin
	university president and provost should be	awarded to (first-time)
	secured prior to any implementation.	university senators for
	a. <u>Concern</u> A more general concern was	service on the
	offered during this discussion that	university senate.
	sometimes the grapevine information is	5
	ahead of the official information on the	
	campus network. There was agreement	3 Apr 2015
	that there is always room for	1. Susan Steele did meet
	improvement in communication in any	with both President
	organization. No specific remedy was	Dorman and Provost
	offered for implementation, yet it was	Brown to discuss the
	noted that communication might be	content of Motion
	more direct in certain instances rather	0708.EC.003.R which
	than flowing through the administrative	advocates for the
	chain.	keeping of a registry of
		university-wide
	<u>23 Jan 2015</u>	committees. Susan did
	1. <u>Committee Registry</u> Craig Turner shared a	also formally seek and
	copy of Motion 0708.EC.003.R, a	secure permission from
	resolution from 2007-08 regarding the	President Dorman to

desire to maintain a registry of university- wide committees. Specifically the motion text reads as followsWhereas the primary goals are to support the governing concepts of transparent decision-making and shared information, specifically the sharing of information deemed relevant to the deliberations within the decision-making process, therefore be it resolved by the University Senate of Georgia College & State University that the University President identify an appropriate university official to maintain a registry of university-wide committees or a master list of committees that1. provides appropriate information, including but not limited to membership rosters, committee charge, and committee meeting minutes,2. is accessible to members of the university status of each committee. A brief history of this matter was shared	circulate to the university community (in advance of minutes being posted) the president's report to the university senate. 2. Susan Steele has now implemented a survey to volunteers (non- university-senator members of university senate committees) to gather information on the interest of this group in receiving a wearable token of appreciation for their university senate committee service. This recognition would be comparable to the university senate pin awarded to (first-time) university senators for service on the
· · ·	
	-
that	wearable token of
	appreciation for their
· · · ·	-
0	
ő	0
•	-
	• 1
	-
indicating that prior to this resolution, it	university senate.
was a university senate bylaw that ECUS	
maintain a registry of administrative	
committees. In both instances, the desire	
was to supporting the governing concepts	
of transparent decisions making and shared	
information as well as maintain a list of the committees that were both representative of	
the university as a whole and reporting to	
an administrator so that any member of the	
university community could (if interested)	
find out about the activity and deliberations	

of such committees. The motion
implementor assigned [Paul Jones] is
presently on leave. After some brief
conversation, it was recommended that
Susan Steele bring this matter to the
attention of President Dorman as an
information item.
2. Administrative Report Circulation As part
of the communication item of 14 Nov 2014
executive committee secretary report (see
above), the recommendation of circulating
to the university community the reports
given at university senate meetings by the
university president and the provost as soon
after the meeting as feasible was revisited.
It was noted that permission to circulate the
provost report was obtained at the 14 Nov
2014 meeting of the executive committee
with standing committee chairs directly
from Provost Brown. To date, there had not
been an attempt to secure such permission
from President Dorman. After some brief
discussion, the agreement was that Susan
Steele should seek permission from
President Dorman to circulate the
president's report and if secured, these two
reports (president and provost) should be
circulated to the university community by
the presiding officer of the university senate
via the FrontPage digest email system.
3. <u>Tokens for Governance Service</u> Craig
<i>Turner suggested to those present that pins</i>
for service on the university senate not be
exclusive to the university senators but also
be awarded to those members who serve on
committees in other capacities (faculty
volunteers, appointees by SGA, Staff

1	
	Council or the Chief Administrative
	Officers). There was general agreement
	with the spirit of the recommendation but
	not necessary the letter. After some
	discussion, there was agreement to consult
	with those presently serving in these other
	capacities to find out what token of
	appreciation would be a meaningful one
	for them, realizing this might not result in
	the awarding of a pin. Susan Steele agreed
	to ensure that this consultation is done.
	4. <u>Minutes Cleanup</u> Craig Turner requested
	assistance on some minutes cleanup to
	obtain updates on the open actions charged
	at previous meetings of the executive
	committee. These included (1) the fraud
	awareness representative (Ben McMillan
	identified) (2) Orientation for Standing
	Committee Officers email (Susan Steele
	sent this email and received no responses)
	(3) Graduate Task Force representative
	(before a replacement could be named, the
	task force completed its work with
	Catherine Whelan serving as university
	senate representative).
	<u>27 Feb 2015</u>
	Craig Turner indicated that he had nothing to
	report as University Senate Secretary.
	<u>3 Apr 2015</u>
	Craig Turner indicated that he had nothing to
	report as University Senate Secretary.
Library Senator Report	Ben Davis indicated that he had nothing to
	report as Library Senator.
Ben Davis	

V. Information Items Actions/Recommendations		
Faculty/Staff Celebration	Provost Brown reminded attendees of the faculty and staff celebration of excellence slated for 9:00 am in Russell Auditorium on Thursday 16 Apr 2015.	
Governance Calendar Susan Steele	1. <u>Campus Resources</u> With the assistance of our Chief Information Officer Bob Orr, we	
	 have been able to add a link to the Governance Calendars to the list of links to Campus Resources within Unify. 2. <u>iCal and Outlook Versions</u> Our graduate assistant Carter Shadden has attempted (to this point unsuccessfully) to populate the iCal and Outlook versions of the 2015-2016 Governance Calendar. Given that Carter Shadden is resigning as graduate assistant of the university senate effective 10 Apr 2015, Craig Turner has agreed to continue these 	
Graduate Council Bylaws	efforts. 27 Feb 2015	
Senior Associate Provost Ormond and Provost Brown	A draft of the graduate council bylaws had been forwarded as an information item to Susan Steele for circulation to the executive committee. At this meeting, feedback was invited by Senior Associate Provost Tom Ormond. A number of suggestions and observations were offered including but not limited to • a suggestion to use the term Director of Graduate Studies as a replacement for	

Senior Associate Provost or Senior	
Associate Provost on Senior Associate Provost and Director of	
Graduate Studies throughout the draft.	
While presently Tom Ormond holds	
both titles, it seems that the relevant	
title for use in the Graduate Council	
Bylaws is Director of Graduate Studies	
 In section IV.A.c, the use of the phrase 	
• In section IV.A.C, the use of the phrase up to two would allow 0, 1, or 2 and	
some phrasing equivalent to at least	
one and at most two is perhaps what is intended	
• How are the representatives in IV.A.c	
selected? Might it be more appropriate	
to have an election rather than a	
selection? In any case, specification of	
the process of selection – preferably an	
elected representative of a faculty	
constituency – is recommended for	
consideration	
• One of the reasons for creating this	
graduate council is to provide this	
group a seat at the table for the	
discussions of graduate issues.	
• It was noted that there is intentionality	
to review the bylaws at least annually	
built into the current draft.	
• As currently drafted, some were	
reading the consideration of graduate	
curricular matters to sidestep CAPC	
(Curriculum and Assessment Policy	

not the intent as the curricular review	
not the intent as the curricular review was intended to include	
review/approval by the CAPC as is	
presently the case.	
• Is the graduate council treated as an	
academic unit from the perspective that	
certain policies might be made for only	
those matters in the graduate domain	
and thus not be university policy?	
There was some agreement that this	
was an appropriate way to view this	
group.	
• In IV.D, can't have both two-year terms	
of service and one-third replaced each	
year – either need three-year terms and	
one-third OR two-year terms and one-	
half.	
• In IV.D, the use of the term	
appointments may not be consistent	
with the suggested election insertion	
into section IV.A.c.	
• In Article IX, a two-third vote should be	
a two-thirds vote (add an "s" to the	
word third)	
Senior Associate Provost Tom Ormond took	
copious notes and expressed appreciation for	
the observations and suggestions indicating	
that each would receive consideration for	
incorporation into the draft.	
<u>3 Apr 2015</u>	

Director of Graduate Studies Tom Ormond was
attending as a guest and had incorporated into
the draft graduate council bylaws all of the
suggestions offered at the 27 Feb 2015 ECUS
meeting. Prior to this (3 Apr 2015 ECUS)
meeting, Tom Ormond had circulated the latest
draft of the graduate council bylaws and again
welcomed any suggestions for editions to the
draft. There was one minor suggestion of <i>shall</i>
replacing a <i>will</i> (one will had slipped through
when the find/replace of <i>will</i> to <i>shall</i> had been
made.) in Article VIII. Tom Ormond reiterated
his appreciation for the editorial suggestions
received at the 27 Feb 2015 ECUS meeting as
well as those he had received via email since
that session and is delighted for the iterative
editorial process that has served to tighten up
and improve the draft of the graduate council
bylaws. The clause requiring annual review of
these bylaws by the Graduate Council remains
in the draft and is intended to continue this
iterative maintenance and development of
these bylaws.
Tom Ormond indicated that it's desirable to
implement the Graduate Council sooner rather
than later and that the domain of the proposed
Graduate Council is broader than graduate
curriculum and also embraces best practices
and welfare of the graduate programs including
graduate faculty and graduate students. A
rather lengthy list of graduate student welfare
issues has been provided by the Student

Government Association and will be among
the first agenda items for the budding council.
A brief history of the emergence of SoCC as a
university senate committee was offered
indicating that prior to being incorporated as a
university senate subcommittee of CAPC,
SoCC had been called the University
Curriculum Committee (UCC) and had been
realized for one year as an administrative
committee advisory to the Provost (then Dr.
Sandra Jordan) and then realized for one year
as an ad hoc committee of university senate
reporting to CAPC to test-drive the committee
(with the name UCC) before formally
proposing the revising of the university senate
bylaws. This test-drive was well-received and
it (SoCC) was indeed added formally into
university senate bylaws as a subcommittee of
CAPC. It was also noted that the first year of
the university senate (2002-2003), the body
was called the interim university senate and
educated the university community on its
pending arrival as a governance body in 2003-
2004 and drafted its bylaws. Tom Ormond
liked the idea of mimicking these approaches
and being intentional with the implementation
of the graduate council. The members of ECUS
were supportive of drafting a resolution for
university senate consideration at its 24 Apr
2015 meeting of endorsing the proposed
intentional process by which the graduate
council will likely emerge. Susan Steele agreed

to take point on the drafting of this resolution.	
There was encouragement from ECUS	
members to establish the (interim) graduate	
council. At the time of the meeting, Tom	
Ormond indicated that it would be likely that	
the current graduate coordinators would be	
invited to populate the interim graduate council	
for the test-drive year.	
Tom Ormond indicated that there will be some	
revisions to the bylaws of each of the colleges	
(CoAS, CoB, CoE, CoHS) to include language	
referencing the graduate council role within the	
college and its governance.	
In addition, the curricular review process of	
graduate curriculum will incorporate a review	
by the graduate council into existing curricular	
review processes.	
Tom Ormond indicated that Susan Steele is	
serving as point for a task force consisting of	
himself and a faculty member from each	
college to draft a policy relating to curriculum	
review. The scope and details of the policy are	
still being worked out as Susan Steele has just	
started to pull some of the pieces (USG and	
BoR policy, existing language from the GC	
Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual	
(PPPM), CAPC guidelines, etc.) together. The	
hope is to have a draft of the policy ready for	
submission to the 2015-2016 ECUS for	
steering (likely to the 2015-2016 CAPC)	
during the Fall 2015 semester (ideally early in	
the semester). Informally the policy is intended	

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	to provide a one-stop shop for university	
	curriculum review being mindful to respect the	
	existing review processes within departments	
	and colleges of curriculum. Note: During the	
	preparation of these minutes, the membership	
	of this task force has been finalized (as	
	tentative members agreed to serve) and the	
	membership is Tom Ormond, Susan Steele	
	(CoHS), Stephen Wills (CoE), Lynn Hanson	
	(CoB) and Craig Turner (CoAS).	
	As this was the final scheduled meeting of	
	ECUS for the 2014-15 academic year, this	
	brought closure to the 2014-2015 ECUS	
	deliberation of the graduate council bylaws.	
AAUP Redbooks (11 th	23 Jan 2015	23 Jan 2015
Edition) Purchase Any?	Ben Davis and Craig Turner noted that this	Susan Steele to ensure this
	book has been donated to the library and is	topic is placed on the
Craig Turner	available in the reference section and cannot	tentative agenda of a future
	be checked out of the library. Some of the	ECUS or ECUS/SCC
	previous editions of this book are available in	meeting.
	the library in the general collection and	27 E-1 2015
	available for checkout by patrons. Further consideration of this matter	<u>27 Feb 2015</u> Susan Steele placed this
	(specifically whether to allocate university	item on the tentative
	senate funds to purchase copies) was	agenda of the 27 Feb 2015
	postponed to a future meeting of ECUS or	ECUS/SCC meeting
	ECUS-SCC due to lack of time for its	0
	deliberation.	
	$\frac{3 \text{ Apr } 2015}{2 \text{ Apr } 1}$	
	During the discussion of the university senate	
	budget during the Presiding Officer Report of this (3 Apr 2015 ECUS) meeting, the members	
	of ECUS were supportive of using some of the	
	or Leos were supportive of using some of the	

	remaining university senate budget dollars to purchase (11 th edition) <i>AAUP Redbooks</i> . The exact number of <i>Redbooks</i> to be ordered was left to the discretion of Susan Steele who was invited to consult with other ECUS members as she deemed appropriate. This discussion brings closure to the 2014-15 ECUS consideration of this matter.	
VI. Unfinished Business Review of Action & Recommendations, Provide updates (if any) to Follow-up		
Service Recognition Policy Changes	27 Feb 2015 1. <u>Committee</u> First it was noted that a group	
Susan Steele	consisting of Leslie Pierce, Crystal Reeves, Monica Starley, Susan Steele, and Craig Turner had met a couple of times to discuss the Service Recognition Policy.	
	2. <u>Revisions</u> As a result of these meetings, a set of revisions have been drafted (and submitted in the policy template format) by Crystal Reeves and Leslie Pierce for university senate review. Highlights of the	
	revisions include a. streamlined procedures that can be implemented to extend to each employee via her/his supervisor an opportunity to review for accuracy the Human Resources record of her/his	
	years of service and to propose corrections if that record is in error. b. ownership of the service recognition ceremony is shifting from the University	

President's Office to Human Resources. c. begin recognition at the five-year milestone rather than the ten-year milestone rather than the ten-year milestone rather than the ten-year milestones, twenty-five years, thirty years, and multiples of five year milestones realized beyond thirty years as well. It may be rare to have individuals work longer than a typical thirty year career. 3. Next Step As the next step of deliberation was considered, it was noted that the policy template includes policy, procedures, and guidelines among other information. A question from the floor was asked – "Did the policy section change?" After pulling up the current version of the Service Recognition Policy in the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was made to propose consideration of these	[Duogidant'a Office to U	
 c. begin recognition at the five-year milestone rather than the ten-year milestone - thus recognizing milestones of five years, ten years, fiften years, twenty years, twenty-five years, thirty years, and multiples of five year milestones realized beyond thirty years as well. It may be rare to have individuals work longer than a typical thirty year career. 3. <u>Next Step</u> As the next step of deliberation was considered, it was noted that the policy template includes policy, procedures, and guidelines among other information. A question from the floor was asked – "Did the policy section change?" After pulling up the current version of the Service Recognition Policy in the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was 		00	
 milestone rather than the ten-year milestone – thus recognizing milestones of five years, ten years, fifteen years, twenty years, twenty-five years, thirty years, and multiples of five year milestones realized beyond thirty years as well. It may be rare to have individuals work longer than a typical thirty year career. <u>Next Step</u> As the next step of deliberation was considered, it was noted that the policy template includes policy, procedures, and guidelines among other information. A question from the floor was asked – "Dild the policy section change?" After pulling up the current version of the Service Recognition Policy in the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was 			
 milestone – thus recognizing milestones of five years, ten years, fifteen years, twenty years, twenty-five years, thirty years, and multiples of five year milestones realized beyond thirty years as well. It may be rare to have individuals work longer than a typical thirty year career. 3. Next Step As the next step of deliberation was considered, it was noted that the policy template includes policy, procedures, and guidelines among other information. A question from the floor was asked – "Did the policy section change?" After pulling up the current version of the Service Recognition Policy in the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was 		· · ·	
of five years, ten years, fifteen years, twenty years, twenty-five years, thirty years, and multiples of five year milestones realized beyond thirty years as well. It may be rare to have individuals work longer than a typical thirty year career. 3. <u>Next Step</u> As the next step of deliberation was considered, it was noted that the policy template includes policy, procedures, and guidelines among other information. A question from the floor was asked – "Did the policy section change?" After pulling up the current version of the Service Recognition Policy in the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was		-	
 twenty years, twenty-five years, thirty years, and multiples of five year milestones realized beyond thirty years as well. It may be rare to have individuals work longer than a typical thirty year career. 3. <u>Next Step</u> As the next step of deliberation was considered, it was noted that the policy template includes policy, procedures, and guidelines among other information. A question from the floor was asked – "Did the policy section change?" After pulling up the current version of the Service Recognition Policy in the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was 		milestone – thus recognizing milestones	
 years, and multiples of five year milestones realized beyond thirty years as well. It may be rare to have individuals work longer than a typical thirty year career. 3. <u>Next Step</u> As the next step of deliberation was considered, it was noted that the policy template includes policy, procedures, and guidelines among other information. A question from the floor was asked – "Did the policy section change?" After pulling up the current version of the Service Recognition Policy in the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was 		of five years, ten years, fifteen years,	
 milestones realized beyond thirty years as well. It may be rare to have individuals work longer than a typical thirty year career. 3. <u>Next Step</u> As the next step of deliberation was considered, it was noted that the policy template includes policy, procedures, and guidelines among other information. A question from the floor was asked – "Did the policy section change?" After pulling up the current version of the Service Recognition Policy in the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was 		twenty years, twenty-five years, thirty	
as well. It may be rare to have individuals work longer than a typical thirty year career. 3. <u>Next Step</u> As the next step of deliberation was considered, it was noted that the policy template includes policy, procedures, and guidelines among other information. A question from the floor was asked – "Did the policy section change?" After pulling up the current version of the Service Recognition Policy in the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was		years, and multiples of five year	
individuals work longer than a typical thirty year career. 3. <u>Next Step</u> As the next step of deliberation was considered, it was noted that the policy template includes policy, procedures, and guidelines among other information. A question from the floor was asked – "Did the policy section change?" After pulling up the current version of the Service Recognition Policy in the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was		milestones realized beyond thirty years	
thirty year career. 3. <u>Next Step</u> As the next step of deliberation was considered, it was noted that the policy template includes policy, procedures, and guidelines among other information. A question from the floor was asked – "Did the policy section change?" After pulling up the current version of the Service Recognition Policy in the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was		as well. It may be rare to have	
3. <u>Next Step</u> As the next step of deliberation was considered, it was noted that the policy template includes policy, procedures, and guidelines among other information. A question from the floor was asked – "Did the policy section change?" After pulling up the current version of the Service Recognition Policy in the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was		individuals work longer than a typical	
was considered, it was noted that the policy template includes policy, procedures, and guidelines among other information. A question from the floor was asked – "Did the policy section change?" After pulling up the current version of the Service Recognition Policy in the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was		thirty year career.	
template includes policy, procedures, and guidelines among other information. A question from the floor was asked – "Did the policy section change?" After pulling up the current version of the Service Recognition Policy in the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was	3.	<u>Next Step</u> As the next step of deliberation	
guidelines among other information. A question from the floor was asked – "Did the policy section change?" After pulling up the current version of the Service Recognition Policy in the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was		was considered, it was noted that the policy	
question from the floor was asked – "Did the policy section change?" After pulling up the current version of the Service Recognition Policy in the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was		template includes policy, procedures, and	
the policy section change?" After pulling up the current version of the Service Recognition Policy in the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was		guidelines among other information. A	
the policy section change?" After pulling up the current version of the Service Recognition Policy in the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was		question from the floor was asked – "Did	
up the current version of the Service Recognition Policy in the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was		the policy section change?" After pulling	
Recognition Policy in the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was			
Procedures, and Practices Manual, it was noted that there were revisions to the short (two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was		Recognition Policy in the Policies,	
(two to three sentence) policy statement. The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was		· ·	
The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was		noted that there were revisions to the short	
The changes were not substantive and seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was		(two to three sentence) policy statement.	
seemed in the judgment of those present to be editorial in nature. A suggestion was			
be editorial in nature. A suggestion was		0	
\mathbf{r}			
revisions as a committee of the whole by			
the university senate at its 27 Mar 2015			
meeting. By the university senate bylaws,			
committee of the whole consideration can			
occur only with a two-thirds majority			

 approval by the university senate. If this not achieved, the proposal will be steered by ECUS (the Executive Committee of the University Senate) to RPIPC (the Resources, Planning and Institutional Policy Committee) for consideration at its 3 Apr 2015 meeting. As a follow-up, an agreement was made to implement this next step plan only if permission to deviate from the usual committee review process is secured from RPIPC Chair Ben McMillan at the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of ECUS with Standing Committee Chairs. 4. Question One more question was raised from the floor regarding the intention to recognize part-time employees. Given the current wording, it was not clear to determine whether only full-time faculty and staff would be recognized. There will be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs. At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs. 	Г		Т	
achieved, the proposal will be steered by ECUS (the Executive Committee of the University Senate) to RPIPC (the Resources, Planning and Institutional Policy Committee) for consideration at its 3 Apr 2015 meeting. As a follow-up, an agreement was made to implement this next step plan only if permission to deviate from the usual committee review process is secured from RPIPC Chair Ben McMillan at the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of ECUS with Standing Committee Chairs. 4. Ouestion One more question was raised from the floor regarding the intention to recognize part-time employees. Given the current wording, it was not clear to determine whether only full-time faculty and staff would be recognized. There will be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 1. At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the				
ECUS (the Executive Committee of the University Senate) to RPIPC (the Resources, Planning and Institutional Policy Committee) for consideration at its 3 Apr 2015 meeting. As a follow-up, an agreement was made to implement this next step plan only if permission to deviate from the usual committee review process is secured from RPIPC Chair Ben McMillan at the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of ECUS with Standing Committee Chairs. 4. Ouestion One more question was raised from the floor regarding the intention to recognize part-time employees. Given the current wording, it was not clear to determine whether only full-time faculty and staff would be recognized. There will be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 1. At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the				
University Senate) to RPIPC (the Resources, Planning and Institutional Policy Committee) for consideration at its 3 Apr 2015 meeting. As a follow-up, an agreement was made to implement this next step plan only if permission to deviate from the usual committee review process is secured from RPIPC Chair Ben McMillan at the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of ECUS with Standing Committee Chairs. 4. Question Question One more question was raised from the floor regarding the intention to recognize part-time employees. Given the current wording, it was not clear to determine whether only full-time faculty and staff would be recognized. There will be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 1. At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the				
Resources, Planning and Institutional Policy Committee) for consideration at its 3 Apr 2015 meeting, As a follow-up, an agreement was made to implement this next step plan only if permission to deviate from the usual committee review process is secured from RPIPC Chair Ben McMillan at the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of ECUS with Standing Committee Chairs. 4. Question One more question was raised from the floor regarding the intention to recognize part-time employees. Given the current wording, it was not clear to determine whether only full-time faculty and staff would be recognized. There will be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 1. At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the		ECUS (the Executive Committee of the		
 Policy Committee) for consideration at its 3 Apr 2015 meeting. As a follow-up, an agreement was made to implement this next step plan only if permission to deviate from the usual committee review process is secured from RPIPC Chair Ben McMillan at the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of ECUS with Standing Committee Chairs. Question One more question was raised from the floor regarding the intention to recognize part-time employees. Given the current wording, it was not clear to determine whether only full-time faculty and staff would be recognized. There will be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 A the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the 		University Senate) to RPIPC (the		
 3 Apr 2015 meeting. As a follow-up, an agreement was made to implement this next step plan only if permission to deviate from the usual committee review process is secured from RPIPC Chair Ben McMillan at the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of ECUS with Standing Committee Chairs. 4. <u>Ouestion</u> One more question was raised from the floor regarding the intention to recognize part-time employees. Given the current wording, it was not clear to determine whether only full-time faculty and staff would be recognized. There will be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 1. At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the 		Resources, Planning and Institutional		
agreement was made to implement this next step plan only if permission to deviate from the usual committee review process is secured from RPIPC Chair Ben McMillan at the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of ECUS with Standing Committee Chairs. 4. <u>Question</u> One more question was raised from the floor regarding the intention to recognize part-time employees. Given the current wording, it was not clear to determine whether only full-time faculty and staff would be recognized. There will be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 1. At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the		Policy Committee) for consideration at its		
 step plan only if permission to deviate from the usual committee review process is secured from RPIPC Chair Ben McMillan at the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of ECUS with Standing Committee Chairs. Question One more question was raised from the floor regarding the intention to recognize part-time employees. Given the current wording, it was not clear to determine whether only full-time faculty and staff would be recognized. There will be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the 		3 Apr 2015 meeting. As a follow-up, an		
 the usual committee review process is secured from RPIPC Chair Ben McMillan at the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of ECUS with Standing Committee Chairs. 4. Question One more question was raised from the floor regarding the intention to recognize part-time employees. Given the current wording, it was not clear to determine whether only full-time faculty and staff would be recognized. There will be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 Apr 2015 At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the 		agreement was made to implement this next		
 secured from RPIPC Chair Ben McMillan at the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of ECUS with Standing Committee Chairs. 4. <u>Ouestion</u> One more question was raised from the floor regarding the intention to recognize part-time employees. Given the current wording, it was not clear to determine whether only full-time faculty and staff would be recognized. There will be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the 		step plan only if permission to deviate from		
 secured from RPIPC Chair Ben McMillan at the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of ECUS with Standing Committee Chairs. 4. <u>Ouestion</u> One more question was raised from the floor regarding the intention to recognize part-time employees. Given the current wording, it was not clear to determine whether only full-time faculty and staff would be recognized. There will be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the 		the usual committee review process is		
 at the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of ECUS with Standing Committee Chairs. Question One more question was raised from the floor regarding the intention to recognize part-time employees. Given the current wording, it was not clear to determine whether only full-time faculty and staff would be recognized. There will be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the 		-		
Standing Committee Chairs. 4. Question One more question was raised from the floor regarding the intention to recognize part-time employees. Given the current wording, it was not clear to determine whether only full-time faculty and staff would be recognized. There will be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 1. At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the		·		
 4. Question One more question was raised from the floor regarding the intention to recognize part-time employees. Given the current wording, it was not clear to determine whether only full-time faculty and staff would be recognized. There will be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the 				
from the floor regarding the intention to recognize part-time employees. Given the current wording, it was not clear to determine whether only full-time faculty and staff would be recognized. There will be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 I. At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the	4.	-		
 recognize part-time employees. Given the current wording, it was not clear to determine whether only full-time faculty and staff would be recognized. There will be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. <u>3 Apr 2015</u> 1. At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the 				
current wording, it was not clear to determine whether only full-time faculty and staff would be recognized. There will be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 1. At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the				
determine whether only full-time faculty and staff would be recognized. There will be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 1. At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the				
and staff would be recognized. There will be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 1. At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the		0		
be efforts to seek clarification from the proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 1. At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the				
proposers (Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves) prior to further consideration.3 Apr 20151. At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the				
Reeves) prior to further consideration. 3 Apr 2015 1. At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the				
 <u>3 Apr 2015</u> 1. At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the 				
1. At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the		neeves, prior to farmer consideration.		
committee with standing committee chairs, Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the	3.	Apr 2015		
Ben McMillan authorized permission from RPIPC to offer the university senate the	1.	At the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of executive		
RPIPC to offer the university senate the		committee with standing committee chairs,		
		Ben McMillan authorized permission from		
		RPIPC to offer the university senate the		
		option to consider the Service Recognition		
Policy revisions as a <i>committee of the whole</i>				

Recognition of Volunteers on University Senate Committees Susan Steele	matter. 27 Feb 2015 Susan Steele had circulated a draft survey for volunteers serving on university senate committees. These volunteers include any member serving on a university senate committee who is not simultaneously serving on the university senate. The survey intent is to gather information on the preferences of these volunteers in receiving a wearable token of appreciation to parallel the university senate pin received by university senators. There were no suggested edits to the draft survey and Susan Steele indicated she would implement	27 Feb 2015 Susan Steele to implement the volunteer survey regarding wearable tokens of appreciation for service on university senate committees. 3 Apr 2015 Susan Steele did implement the volunteer survey regarding wearable tokens of appreciation for service on university senate committees.
	 at its 27 Mar 2015 meeting (foregoing the usual committee review process). 2. The question clarifying the intent to recognize part-time employees was brought to the attention of Crystal Reeves and language was modified to more clearly articulate the eligibility for service recognition. 3. The interested reader is invited to read the minutes of the 27 Mar 2015 meeting of the university senate to see the deliberation details. In short, the university senate elected to act as a <i>committee of the whole</i> and adopted the proposed revisions. 4. This information brings closure to the 2014-2015 ECUS consideration of this 	

	<u>3 Apr 2015</u>	
	Susan Steele had provided the responses to this	
	survey via email to the members prior to the	
	meeting. The virtually unanimous response	
	was that no token of appreciation was deemed	
	necessary. The members of the executive	
	committee agreed that this brought resolution	
	to this consideration and agreed to not establish	
	the practice of awarding wearable tokens of	
	appreciation to volunteers at this time noting	
	this proposal could always be revisited in the	
	future. This discussion brings closure to the	
	2014-2015 ECUS consideration of this matter.	
University Senate	<u>23 Jan 2015</u>	<u>23 Jan 2015</u>
Recognitions	While university senate recognitions include	Susan Steele to ensure that
	pins for new university senators (awarded only	certificates of recognition
Susan Steele	once to an individual at the commencement of	are prepared for 2014-15.
	their first term of service as a university	2 4 2015
	senator) and certificates to recognize the	<u>3 Apr 2015</u> Susan Steele did ensure
	completion of a term of service as university senator, committee member, or officer, the	that certificates of
	conversation focused on the certificates. In	recognition were prepared
	particular, Susan Steele sought guidance on	for 2014-15.
	the logistics of certificate preparation from	101 2011 13.
	Lyndall Muschell who had ensured the	
	preparation of certificates in 2013-14. The	
	main points were that the office of the president	
	had supplies (paper stock) and printing	
	facilities while the graduate assistant had	
	assisted with the preparation of the text for	
	inclusion on the certificates using a mail-	
	merge last year. Lyndall Muschell indicated	

	that she could share the documentation and	
	any template she had from last year.	
	2 4 2015	
	<u>3 Apr 2015</u>	
	Susan Steele reported that certificates of	
	recognition were prepared by Carter Shadden	
	under her guidance and are now awaiting a	
	signature by President Dorman. Some of the	
	certificates will be distributed at the 24 Apr	
	2015 meeting of university senate. Any that	
	can't be distributed at that meeting will be hand	
	delivered to the recipients. This discussion	
	brings closure to the 2014-2015 ECUS	
	consideration of this matter.	
2015-2016	23 Jan 2015	<u>23 Jan 2015</u>
Governance Calendar	Susan Steele noted that the preparation of the	1. Craig Turner to
	governance calendar was an executive	prepare a draft of the
Susan Steele	committee function and invited a volunteer to	2015-16 governance
	serve as point for its preparation. Craig Turner	calendar for review by
	volunteered. All present were agreeable to this	members of the
	appointment.	executive committee.
	There were concerns about the reception of	2. Susan Steele to obtain
	regrets for university senate meetings in which	from President
	it was stated that a college, department or	Dorman a date for the
	other unit meeting was the reason for the	state of the university
	regrets. This was deemed to be unfortunate.	address for inclusion
	There was a desire to have as part of the	on the 2015-16
	campus culture the ideal that those scheduling	governance calendar.
	meetings involving individuals participating in	3. Susan Steele to seek
	shared governance (serving on the university	support from both
	senate and/or its committees) should strive to	President Dorman and
	select meeting times that do not conflict with	Provost Brown to
	meetings of university senate or its committees.	encourage the campus
	A suggestion to seek support from the	meeting planners to try
	university president and provost in promoting	to avoid scheduling
	this cultural practice was made and all present	meetings that would
	were in favor of doing this.	introduce conflicts for
	nere in javor of doing into.	introduce conjucts jor

The selection of a date for the 2015-2016 state	participants in meeting
of the university presidential address had been	of university senate or
requested and it was noted that historically this	its committees.
date is determined by the university president	
and simply advertised (listed) on the	27 Feb 2015
governance calendar.	1. Craig Turner did
governance calendar.	prepare a draft of the
27 Feb 2015	2015-16 governance
1. <u>Circulated Drafts</u> A draft of the 2015-16	calendar for review by
<i>Governance Calendar had been circulated</i>	members of the
to the members of the Executive Committee	executive committee.
0	2. Susan Steele did obtain
via email prior to the meeting for their	
review. A number of dates to be advertised	from President Dorman
on the calendar had come in after that draft	a date for the state of the
had been circulated. Thus a new draft	university address for
(DRAFT 2) was circulated at the meeting	inclusion on the 2015-
with the most recently received dates	16 governance
included. These recently received dates	calendar.
included week of welcome events (new	
faculty orientation, Board of Regent	<u>3 Apr 2015</u>
meeting dates for only August, governance	1. Susan Steele did seek
retreat, department meeting time, college	support from both
meeting time, assessment day meetings,	President Dorman and
welcome back faculty breakfast, freshman	Provost Brown to
convocation, and discussions of common	encourage the campus
reader), faculty contract start/end dates,	meeting planners to try
the state of the university address and	to avoid scheduling
reception date, and the service recognition	meetings that would
ceremony date. Craig Turner summarized	introduce conflicts for
these revisions to the committee members.	participants in meeting
2. <u>Comparison</u> Craig Turner provided a	of university senate or
comparison between the draft 2015-16	its committees.
governance calendar and the 2014-15	
governance calendar. The 2015-16	
calendar had 7 meetings each of university	
senate, university senate committees, and	
ECUS with standing committee chairs	

ECUS with standing committee chairs 3 April 2015 ECUS Meeting Minutes (FINAL DRAFT)

n		
	while the 2013-14 calendar had only six. As	
	proposed, the organizational meetings of	
	the 2016-17 university senate and its	
	committees were separated by a calendar	
	week rather than occurring on the same	
	Friday as will be done this year. In the	
	proposed draft, there are designated	
	Department meetings rather than having	
	only College meetings as is currently the	
	case – this particular request had been	
	made from the floor at the 13 Feb 2015	
	meeting of the university senate. Note:	
	While not explicitly noted at during the	
	meeting, during the preparation of these	
	minutes it is also noted that as requested	
	from the floor of the 13 Feb 2015 meeting	
	of the university senate, the governance	
	retreat and common book meetings do not	
	conflict.	
	3. <u>Action</u> A recommendation to remove the	
	August Board of Regents meeting dates	
	from this calendar was proposed and	
	agreeable to those present noting that the	
	Board of Regents meeting dates have not	
	been included on this calendar historically.	
	The draft 2015-2016 Governance Calendar	
	was then adopted as amended.	
	was men daopted as amendea.	
	3 Apr 2015	
	Since the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of ECUS, the	
	2015-2016 governance calendar has been	
	posted to the university senate websites – both	
	at the green page <u>http://us.gcsu.edu</u> and	
	http://senate.gcsu.edu by Craig Turner. In	
	addition, Craig Turner advertised its	
	availability by email to ECUS members and to	
	the members of the 2014-2015 university	
	the memoers of the 2011 2015 university	

	annote on 2 Man 2015 with an equip contact to	
	senate on 2 Mar 2015 with encouragement to	
	distribute the information of this availability	
	with others as the recipients deemed	
	appropriate. This update brings closure to the	
	2014-2015 ECUS consideration of this matter.	
Electronic Presence of the	<u>3 Oct 2014</u>	
University Senate	David Smith and Kelly Rickman of Enterprise	
	Applications are revising the electronic	
Craig Turner	presence of the university senate. Craig Turner	
	is the university senate liaison for this	
	initiative. David Smith, Kelly Rickman and	
	Craig Turner met with Dr. Bryan Marshall, a	
	faculty member in the College of Business who	
	is the system administrator of the server that	
	hosts the online senator database. Given the	
	recent crash of this server which resulted in	
	two years of lost data (this lost data has been	
	re-entered), the discussion focused on	
	migrating the online senator database to a	
	server maintained by Enterprise Applications.	
	Bryan Marshall was both receptive and	
	supportive of this migration. While there are a	
	number of details that must be attended to prior	
	to the actual migration, this migration is in	
	progress.	
	14 Nov 2014	
	Craig Turner indicated that he had received	
	the following information from David Smith	
	and Kelly Rickman regarding the status of the	
	recasting of the electronic presence of the	
	university senate.	
	1. David Smith reported that the	
	<i>T. David Smith reported that the migration of the data from the online</i>	
	<u> </u>	
	senator database has been completed	
	and is now housed on his personal	

0	
	computer as well as backed up in
	another location.
	2. Kelly Rickman reported that the
	development of the front end of the
	online senator database – to request the
	various reports and to support access
	to these data by the user – is
	progressing and not yet complete.
	3. Kelly Rickman reported that the file
	repository is now complete and
	functional.
	4. David Smith has requested university
	server space for the recast of the
	university senate electronic presence.
	This request is presently under
	consideration.
	23 Jan 2015
	Note: This report was not given orally at the
	meeting due to time constraints and inserted
	during the preparation of these minutes.
	1. David Smith and Kelly Rickman of
	Enterprise Applications (under the
	leadership of James Carlisle) are the staff
	who are implementing the modifications to
	the electronic presence of the university
	senate.
	2. Progress is being made – though there are
	other projects requiring attention and taking
	priority from time to time.
	3. The latest action of note was the migration
	of the online senator database from a
	college of business server to a server
	maintained by the university information
	technology staff. This will be a more
	convenient place for this information and is
	a stop-gap measure while the new version of
μ	

the online senator database is in	
preparation. The links to the online senator	
database have been updated on both the	
green page (us.gcsu.edu) as well as the	
senate.gcsu.edu sites and this migration	
should be seamless to any browser of the	
university senate web presence.	
27 Feb 2015	
In consultation with David Smith of Enterprise	
Applications, the update on the electronic	
presence of the university senate was	
"Unfortunately, we have not made any	
progress on the university senate site worth	
reporting. We have all been pulled into helping	
the IT departments various initiatives for fall	
2015. "	
3 Apr 2015	
In consultation with David Smith of Enterprise	
Applications, the text of the update on the	
electronic presence of the university senate is	
provided here.	
Kelly (Rickman) has been able to knock a few	
issues off the list.	
instance seemely up anter and pointers	
• Pages migrated from senate.gcsu.edu	
to new site	
• Organized and Imported senator term	
record data (Needs some manual	
cleaning. There were some fields that	
could not be imported directly, and	
some of the data has inconsistent	
formatting)	
• Created searchable senator directory	
with pictures: (using placeholder	

images. I still need to copy over the
photos from the old system and map
them to the correct users):
https://eadev1.gcsu.edu/senate-
members/picture-directory
• Updated searchable senator directory
(table with no pictures):
https://eadev1.gcsu.edu/senate-
members/table-directory
• Created "Senator Profile" display that
lists Senator info and shows all terms
served (When you click on a senator in
the directory you see their profile
page): https://eadev1.gcsu.edu/senate-
member/kay-anderson
Thanks for keeping in touch
This update brings closure to the 2014-2015
ECUS consideration of this matter.

At-Large Elected Faculty	3 Oct 2014	<u>3 Oct 2014</u>
Senator Election	<i>The implementation of at-large elected faculty</i>	John Swinton to draft a
Senator Election	senator elections is an ECUS function. The	at-large election proces
	relevant university senate bylaw is provided	for ECUS review at a
	below.	future meeting.
	below.	juture meeting.
	John Swinton agreed to serve as point person	<u>23 Jan 2015</u>
	for the at-large election to be held during the	1. John Swinton did drag
	2014-2015 academic year. In particular, he	an at-large electio
	will draft an at-large election process for	process for ECU
	ECUS review at a future meeting.	review.
		2. John Swinton to tak
	II.Section2.A.4 . At-Large. The Executive	point and ensure the a
	Committee shall determine an election	large election proces
	procedure and conduct the elections for each	is implemented.
	of the at-large elected faculty senator positions	·····
	subject to the eligibility criteria and term of	27 Feb 2015
	service specified in II.Section1.A.2 and the	1. John Swinton did tai
	voting eligibility criteria specified in	point and is ensuring
	II.Section2.A.1. The results of such elections	that the at-larg
	shall be announced to the University	election process
	Community no later than March 1.	being implemented of
	Community no taler than March 1.	0 1
	22.4. 2015	was reported in th
	<u>23 Jan 2015</u>	Presiding Officer Ele
	The draft of the at-large election process that	report included in the
	was prepared by John Swinton was reviewed	minutes.
	by those present. In particular, this included	
	review of the timeline (including nominations,	
	eligibility confirmation, voting, reporting of	
	the election results) as well as tiebreaker and	
	replacement language. The draft was endorsed	
	(as presented) by all who were present. The	
	process charges the Chair of the Subcommittee	
	on Nominations (John Swinton) to coordinate	
	the implementation of the at-large election	
	process.	
	·	

	3 Apr 2015	
	Chavonda Mills was elected as the at-large	
	elected faculty senator with 2015-2018 term of	
	service. This update brings closure to the 2014-	
	2015 ECUS consideration of this matter.	
Internal Audit of Policies,	<u>14 Nov 2014</u>	
Procedures and Practices	John R. Swinton and Craig Turner reported on	
Manual (PPPM) and the	the ongoing internal audit of the PPPM and the	
University Senate Online	University Senate Online Motion Database by	
Motion Database	Julia Hann. In short, the report was that such	
	an internal audit had been made and a meeting	
Susan Steele	of Julia Hann, Provost Kelli Brown, Associate	
John R. Swinton	Provost Tom Ormond, Matthew Buchanan,	
Craig Turner	Susan Steele, John R. Swinton, and Craig	
	Turner had been scheduled for Wed 10 Dec	
	2014 at 3:00PM. At the meeting, more details	
	will be shared and these details will	
	subsequently be shared at a future meeting of	
	Executive Committee. The preliminary	
	information that had been provided by Julia	
	Hann via email was distributed to Benjamin	
	Davis and Lyndall Muschell to keep them in the	
	information loop.	
	27 Feb 2015	
	As a follow-up to the 10 Dec 2014 meeting	
	mentioned above in the deliberation of this	
	item, Julia Hann prepared a final draft report	
	and invited feedback (corrections, editions)	
	and endorsement of the report (possibly as	
	amended) from the executive committee. Susan	
	Steele had circulated this draft report with the	
	agenda. The following conversation points	
	were raised during the committee review of this	
	draft.	

	What are the senate manuals being
	referenced in the draft? Might those by
	the university senate bylaws or the
	checklists (motion flow or proposal
	submission)?
	• Follow through for implementation
	with Enterprise Applications and the
	DoIT (Department of Instructional
	Technology) as the development of the
	university senate electronic presence
	(including a new version of the online
	motion database) is implemented will
	be a critical component of activity to
	support this initiative.
	How does one find the official policy on
	X (any topic)?
	• The PPPM (Policies, Procedures and
	Practices Manual) is partitioned into
	three areas of content (academic
	affairs, business operations, human
	resources) Key questions include
	• How do policies that are both
	recommended by university
	senate and approved by the
	university president get into the
	PPPM?
	\circ Shouldn't the implementer be
	selected as a position and not as
	the person holding a position?
	(e.g. Assign as implementer the
	Chief Academic Officer rather
	than the person holding that
	position. That way the
	individual holding the position
	will be able to access all
μ	

	motions for which the position	
	is assigned as implementer.)	
	• What does implementation	
	mean? Shouldn't there be	
	guidance offered from the	
	university president on what	
	actions comprise the	
	implementation of a motion?	
	Following this discussion, the draft report from	
	Julia Hann was endorsed (with no revisions)	
	by those who were present.	
	2.4. 2015	
	<u>3 Apr 2015</u>	
	A recommendation for the 2015-2016 ECUS to	
	follow up on this item was added to the 2014-	
	2015 ECUS committee annual report. This	
	action brings closure to the 2014-2015 ECUS	
	consideration of this matter.	 22.1. 2015
(S)election/Appointee of	<u>23 Jan 2015</u>	<u>23 Jan 2015</u>
University Senators	It was noted that the executive committee has	1. John Swinton to remind
Oversight	the responsibility of oversight of the selection	deans of elected faculty
	and election of university senators for the	senator results due.
John R. Swinton	2015-16 university senate. This includes the	2. John Swinton to work
	elected faculty senator elections of academic	with staff council
	units (results due by 1 Feb 2015), the selection	leadership to ensure the
	of staff senators (due by 1 Mar 2015), the	naming of selected staff
	selection of student senators (due by 31 Mar	senators for the 2015-16
	2015), and presidential appointees (due by 7	university senate.
	Apr 2015). Lyndall Muschell asked John	3. John Swinton to work
	Swinton to contact the new dean of the college	with the leaders of the
	of education, who just started 1 Jan 2015, to	student government
	bring him up to speed on the elected faculty	association to ensure
	senator elections expectations. John Swinton	the naming of selected
	agreed to follow-up with deans and remind	student senators for the
	each that the elected faculty senator election results are due no later than 1 Feb 2015. John	2015-16 university
1	resuits are due no tater than 1 Feb 2015. John	senate.

	Swinton also agreed to follow up with staff council and student government association. <u>3 Apr 2015</u> As SCoN Chair, John R. Swinton is taking point to ensure that the slate of nominees for the officers and committees of the 2015-2016 university senate is completed for 2015-2016 university senate consideration at its 1 May 2015 organizational meeting. This update brings closure to the 2014-2015 ECUS consideration of this matter.	 27 Feb 2015 John Swinton did remind deans of elected faculty senator results due. 3 Apr 2015 John Swinton did work with staff council leadership to ensure the naming of selected staff senators for the 2015-16 university senate. John Swinton did work with the leaders of the student government association to ensure the naming of selected student senators for the 2015-16 university senate.
University Senate Retreat	<u>23 Jan 2015</u>	<u>23 Jan 2015</u>
Susan Steele	 <u>Chair</u> Susan Steele noted that it was time to begin work on planning the 2015 governance retreat. It was noted that the previous three governance retreat committees were chaired by the presiding officer elect. In light of this information, John Swinton agreed to chair the 2015 governance retreat planning committee. Both Susan Steele and Lyndall Muschell agreed to share their notes as previous planners. <u>Invitees</u> There was agreement to continue the practice of inviting all members of the 	 John Swinton to chair the planning committee of the 2015 governance retreat. Craig Turner to pencil in (on the governance calendar for 2015-16) the governance retreat on the Tuesday prior to the first day of fall 2015 classes. 27 Feb 2015

n 		
	2015-16 university senate and/or its	1. Craig Turner did
	committees to attend the retreat.	pencil in (on the
3.	Cancel or Continue While the attendance	governance calendar
	for 2014 was low and a suggestion to	for 2015-16) the
	consider discontinuing the governance	governance retreat on
	retreat was briefly entertained, it was	the Tuesday prior to the
	ultimately recommended by all present to	first day of fall 2015
	continue to have a governance retreat.	classes.
	Among the reasons for doing so were: it is	2. John Swinton chairs
	a valuable tone-setting event that is a good	this committee and did
	fresh start to the university senate year and	provide an update as
	encourages participants to commit to	found in the Presiding
	service on the university senate and/or its	Officer Elect Report in
	committees.	these minutes.
4.	<u>Scheduling</u> In recent years, the retreat has	
	been scheduled during the week prior to the	
	first day of fall classes and scheduled to not	
	coincide with the university assessment	
	day. The suggestion was to consider the	
	Tuesday prior to the first day of fall 2015	
	classes. Craig Turner was asked to pencil	
	the retreat in on this date on the 2015-16	
	governance calendar.	
5.	0	
	retreat has been Rock Eagle. A thorough	
	search was made for venues a couple years	
	back and while other sites that could	
	accommodate a group of our size were	
	identified, none were as affordable as Rock	
	Eagle. The West Complex, while viable, is	
	perceived to have the drawback of people	
	popping in and out throughout the day due	
	its proximity to the main campus. While the	
	venue for the 2015 retreat is decidedly not	
	yet selected, Rock Eagle is a frontrunner for	
	the site at this time.	
	me sue ai mis ume.	

	<u>3 Apr 2015</u>	
	As Governance Retreat Planning Committee Chair, John R. Swinton has routinely been	
	providing updates as part of his Presiding	
	Officer Elect (POE) report to ECUS. See his	
	POE report above for the latest updates on the	
	retreat planning. This brings closure to the	
	2014-2015 ECUS consideration of this matter.	
VII. New Business		
Actions/Recommendations		

Unimumita Carata Dalat	Queen Cteals married to a secondate (1	
University Senate Budget	Susan Steele provided an update on the	
	university senate budget as part of her	
	Presiding Officer report to ECUS. See this	
	report in these minutes (above) for the latest	
	information on this topic.	
2014-2015 ECUS Annual	Susan Steele distributed a first draft of the	
Report	committee annual report for the 2014-2015	
	ECUS to its membership prior to this meeting.	
Susan Steele	Craig Turner had responded to the entire	
	membership with some suggested editorial	
	revisions. The suggested revisions were	
	accepted by those present and the following	
	were conversation points:	
	• In the Executive Summary, the second	
	bulleted item under Tasks Requiring	
	Follow-up the phrase all search	
	committees was amended to all	
	appropriate search committees	
	• In the Executive Summary, the second	
	to the last bulleted item under	
	Recurring Activities of ECUS the	
	members of the governance retreat	
	committee should include Macon	
	McGinley, Lyndall Muschell, Barbara	
	Roquemore, Susan Steele, and Craig	
	Turner with committee chair John R.	
	Swinton.	
	Susan Steele indicated she would provide	
	ECUS another draft of the report prior to its due	
	date (of Mon 27 Apr 2015) to provide the	
	membership another opportunity to review the	
	committee annual report and provide feedback	
	and editorial suggestions.	
VIII. Next Meeting		
(Tentative Agenda,		
Calendar)		

1. Calendar	24 Apr 2015 @ 3:30pm Univ. Senate A&S 2-72		
	1 May 2015 @ 2:00pm Organizational Meetings of		
	the 2015-2016 University Senate and its committees		
2. Tentative Agenda	Some of the deliberation today may have		Susan Steele will ensure
	generated tentative agenda items for future		that such items (if any) are
	ECUS and ECUS-SCC meetings.		communicated to John R.
			Swinton (possibly via the
			2014-2015 ECUS Annual
			Report) so that they might
			be (if necessary) added to
			agendas of the appropriate
			ECUS and/or ECUS-SCC
			meetings.
IX. Adjournment	As there was no further business to consider, a	The motion to adjourn was	
	MOTION to adjourn the meeting was made and	approved and the meeting	
	seconded	adjourned at 3:15 pm.	

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:** SUSAN STEELE (CHAIR), JOHN SWINTON (VICE-CHAIR) CRAIG TURNER (SECRETARY) **ACADEMIC YEAR:** 2014-2015

AGGREGATE MEMBER ATTENDANCE AT COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THE ACADEMIC YEAR: "P" denotes Present, "A" denotes Absent, "R" denotes Regrets

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		08-22-14	10-03-14	11-14-14	01-23-15	02-27-15	04-03-15	Present	Regrets	Absent
Kelli Brown Provost		Р	R	R	R	Р	Р	3	3	0
Ben Davis EFS; Library		Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	6	0	0
Steve Dorman University Pres	sident	R	R	R	R	R	R	0	6	0
Lyndall Musch EFS; CoE; EC	ell US Chair Emeritus	Р	Р	Р	Р	R	Р	5	1	0
Susan Steele EFS; CoHS; E	CUS Chair	Р	Р	R	Р	Р	Р	5	1	0
John Swinton EFS; CoB; EC	US Vice-Chair	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	6	0	0
Craig Turner EFS; CoAS; EC	CUS Secretary	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	6	0	0