

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

**MEETING DATE & TIME:** 4 DECEMBER 2015; 2:00 –3:15

**MEETING LOCATION:** 301 PARKS ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

<b>R</b>	Kelli Brown (Provost)	<b>P</b>	Lyndall Muschell (CoE, ECUS Member)
<b>P</b>	Jolene Cole (Library; ECUS Member)	<b>P</b>	Susan Steele (CoHS, ECUS Chair Emeritus)
<b>R</b>	Steve Dorman (University President)	<b>P</b>	John R. Swinton (CoB, ECUS Chair)
<b>P</b>	Chavonda Mills (CoAS, ECUS Vice-Chair)	<b>P</b>	Craig Turner (CoAS, ECUS Secretary)

<b>GUESTS:</b> Costas Spirou (Interim Associate Provost) Wendy Mullen (Provost Fellow)
--

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

<b>AGENDA TOPIC</b>	<b>DISCUSSIONS &amp; CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>ACTION OR RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>FOLLOW-UP</b> {including dates/responsible person, status (pending, ongoing, completed)}
<b>I. Call to order</b>	The meeting was called to order at 2:00pm by John R. Swinton (Chair).		
<b>II. Approval of Agenda</b>	A <u>MOTION</u> to approve the agenda was made and seconded.	The agenda was approved as circulated.	
<b>III. Approval of Minutes</b>	A <u>MOTION</u> to approve the minutes of the 6 Nov 2015 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	The minutes of the 6 Nov 2015 Executive Committee meeting were approved as posted, so no additional action was required.	

	minutes had been posted as circulated to the minutes.gcsu.edu site.		
<b>IV. Reports</b>	The following reports were invited by John R. Swinton.		
<b>Presiding Officer Report</b>  <b>John R. Swinton</b>	<p><b><u>6 Nov 2015</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b><u>University Senate Foundation Account</u></b> <i>Research into existence of University Senate Foundation Account hits snag. Ruth McMullen (Executive Assistant to Vice President) says that fund was probably part of President Leland's Office Heritage Fund. This did not resonate with recent Presiding Officers who were given the impression that this \$500 account was a foundation account. I will continue to dig deeper.</i></li> <li>2. <b><u>AAUP Redbooks</u></b> <i>The ten copies of the 11<sup>th</sup> Edition of the AAUP Redbook were received and are now on reserve in the library. The initial purpose of ordering these books was to make them available to FAPC members to inform deliberation on the proposal to adopt the AAUP Redbook as guiding principles for university policy and procedure.</i></li> <li>3. <b><u>Apportionment</u></b> <i>The apportionment of elected faculty senators to the academic units (colleges and library) was disseminated to the members of the university senate by email.</i></li> <li>4. <b><u>Elections Oversight</u></b> <i>The university senate bylaws charge ECUS with oversight for populating the university senate. Elected</i></li> </ol>		

*faculty senator oversight letters were sent to deans of the academic units (colleges, library) to guide the elections of elected faculty senators to succeed those whose terms are ending in April 2016.*

**4 Dec 2015**

1. **AAUP Redbooks** John R. Swinton confirmed the need to order AAUP Redbooks for the leadership (ECUS members and committee chairs) of the university senate. In this meeting, it was confirmed that at least three copies of the AAUP Redbook should be ordered (Jolene Cole, Chavonda Mills, Craig Turner) and that the count for committee chairs would be confirmed at the 3:30pm 4 Dec 2015 meeting of ECUS with Standing Committee Chairs.
2. **Academic Leadership Council** At the next meeting of the Academic Leadership Council, John R. Swinton is to thank the academic deans for submitting elected faculty senator election procedures for their respective academic unit to the executive committee of the university senate and to remind the deans that we (ECUS) are available to help as questions arise.
3. **University Senate Foundation Account** No new information concerning the University Senate Foundation Account has been obtained. See update from the 6 Nov 2015 ECUS meeting above.

	<p>4. <b><u>University Senate Budget</u></b> The balance of the university senate budget (\$5000 allocation annually) is presently \$2262.03. Recent posted activity includes the expenditure (\$371.30) for the ten AAUP Redbooks purchased to facilitate FAPC deliberation on the AAUP Redbook resolution. Transactions in progress include reimbursement for USGFC (University System of Georgia Faculty Council) meeting expenses (registration, travel, lodging) for our voting member Chavonda Mills and the purchase of the additional copies of the AAUP Redbook to be distributed to university senate leaders. An updated balance will be reported at a future meeting of the Executive Committee.</p>		
<p><b>Past Presiding Officer Report</b></p> <p><b>Susan Steele</b></p>	<p>Susan Steele indicated that she was continuing to prepare a curricular review policy. After multiple attempts, no viable time emerged for a face-to-face meeting of the committee, so each member of the committee had been asked to provide feedback (by email) on the draft no later than 30 Nov 2015. Susan Steele reported that she had received feedback from only one committee member and that she intended to await the end of the semester to process the feedback – both received and forthcoming (if any) – and that she will present the updated draft to ECUS at its next meeting (5 Feb 2016) for steering to a university senate committee.</p>		
<p><b>Presiding Officer Elect Report</b></p>	<p>Chavonda Mills reported on the following.</p> <p>1. <b><u>Election Oversight</u></b></p>		

<p><b>Chavonda Mills</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b><u>Elected Faculty Senators</u></b> To date, ECUS has received elected faculty senator election procedures from all five academic units (CoAS, CoB, CoE, CoHS and Library).</li> <li>b. <b><u>Selected Staff Senators</u></b> On behalf of ECUS, Chavonda Mills contacted Staff Council Chair, Daniel McDonald, on 3 Dec 2015 and shared the relevant university senate bylaws to inform the selection of selected staff senators to serve on the 2016-2017 University Senate.</li> </ul> <p>2. <b><u>At-large Election Procedure</u></b> A draft of the at-large election procedure is ready for ECUS review, with changes to the 2014-15 at-large procedure highlighted in yellow.</p> <p>3. <b><u>ECUS Deliberation</u></b> The deliberation by ECUS on this report was as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b><u>Elected Faculty Procedures</u></b> There was concern expressed that the reality was out of compliance with the reported election procedure in one academic unit. The sentiment was that this was a matter for consideration within the academic unit. It was noted that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. one academic unit included its elected faculty senator election procedure in its bylaws</li> <li>ii. the cited university senate bylaw (II.Section2.A.3) states that the faculty of the academic unit are to set the elected faculty senator election procedure</li> <li>iii. some deans requested a copy of their academic unit elected faculty election procedure from the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
------------------------------	---	--	--

	<p>previous year to inform their action on this matter</p> <p>iv. although the letters to the academic unit deans included the sentence <i>A representative of ECUS will contact you to review relevant university senate bylaws and apportionment information</i>, this had not occurred this year. It was thought that such a consultation might alleviate some of the concerns that were expressed. John R. Swinton was asked to share information on this matter at the next academic leaders meeting and remind the academic deans of the availability of ECUS as a resource.</p> <p>b. <b><u>At-Large Election Procedure</u></b> ECUS deliberation on this matter is documented below under <i>Unfinished Business</i> with the subject <b>At-Large Election</b>.</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>Jolene Cole</b></p>	<p>Jolene Cole indicated that she had nothing to report as Library Senator.</p>		
<p><b>V. Information Items</b> Actions/Recommendations</p>			
<p><b>University Senate Budget</b></p> <p><b>John R. Swinton</b></p>	<p><b><u>4 Sep 2015</u></b> <i>The university senate has an operating budget of \$5000 per annum. The expenses of the 2015 governance retreat (bus transit, retreat print materials, facilities use of Rock Eagle, etc.) have been paid. The current balance is \$2667.30.</i></p>		<p><b><u>4 Sep 2015</u></b> <i>John R. Swinton to check with Monica Starley and other appropriate budget personnel (if necessary) on the existence of a foundation account (\$500) for the university senate.</i></p>

*A question about the existence of a foundations account in the amount of \$500 per annum was posed by the previous two university senate presiding officers (Susan Steele and Lyndall Muschell). ECUS Secretary Craig Turner confirmed that a foundation account (\$500) had been documented in the executive committee minutes for the two previous years. John R. Swinton indicated that Monica Starley had indicated to him that there was no foundation account for the university senate for 2015-2016. John R. Swinton was encouraged to clarify this information with Monica Starley and other appropriate budget personnel (if necessary) as the previous two university senate presiding officers recalled that such an account existed under their terms.*

**6 Nov 2015**

*The balance of the university senate budget (\$5000 allocation annually) is presently holding at 2667.30. The expenditures for AAUP Redbook purchases for both the ten copies on reserve in the library and the proposed copies for ECUS members and standing committee chairs are not yet included.*

**4 Dec 2015**

Although John R. Swinton had followed up on the matter of seeking clarification on the existence of a \$500 foundation account for the university senate, there was no paper trail of its existence. Activity for the university senate budget included the processing of the purchase of AAUP Redbooks – both the ten copies for FAPC review and the yet-to-be-ordered copies for university senate leaders, and the processing of the reimbursement for USGFC

**6 Nov 2015**

*John R. Swinton did check on the foundation account and shared information with Executive Committee members as documented in the Presiding Officer Report of the 6 Nov 2015 ECUS meeting. As is indicated in that report, John R. Swinton to seek additional clarification from relevant university personnel on the existence of a foundation account for University Senate.*

	(University System of Georgia Faculty Council) meeting attendance expenses submitted by Chavonda Mills. At present not all of these items had posted to the account, so the current balance was higher than the available funds. An update will be provided at the next meeting of ECUS at which time all these expenditures should have posted.		
<b>VI. Unfinished Business Review of Action &amp; Recommendations, Provide updates (if any) to Follow-up</b>			
<b>Operating Procedures for 2015-2016 Committees</b>	<p><u>2 Oct 2015</u> <i>John R. Swinton reported that each of the university senate committees had filed its operating procedures for 2015-2016.</i></p> <p><u>6 Nov 2015</u> <i>John R. Swinton asked Craig Turner to assist with the posting of operating procedures for the 2015-16 committees. Craig Turner indicated he would be delighted to assist. John R. Swinton indicated that he would supply electronic copies of these operating procedures possibly in consultation with committee chairs.</i></p> <p><u>4 Dec 2015</u> While at the time of the ECUS meeting the operating procedures of CAPC and FAPC had not been received, these operating procedures were received at the 4 Dec 2015 ECUS-SCC meeting. Thus, the 2015-2016 operating</p>		<p><u>6 Nov 2015</u> <i>John R. Swinton and Craig Turner to ensure that the operating procedures of each committee are posted to the university senate website.</i></p> <p><u>4 Dec 2015</u> John R. Swinton and Craig Turner did ensure that the operating procedures of each committee are posted to the university senate website.</p>



	<p>procedures of APC, CAPC, ECUS, FAPC, RPIPC, SAPC, and SoCC are archived to the university senate website.</p>		
<p><b>Appoint Georgia College Story Archivist</b></p> <p><b>John R. Swinton</b></p>	<p><u>4 Sep 2015</u>  <i>At the 2015 Governance Retreat, a proposal to appoint a Georgia College Story Archivist was made. The library representative (Jolene Cole) had indicated the library had some recommendations on this appointment. It was agreed to postpone further deliberation on this appointment to the next ECUS meeting so that the library perspective could inform the appointment.</i></p> <p><u>2 Oct 2015</u>  <i>John R. Swinton summarized the discussion on this matter that took place at earlier ECUS meetings including the governance retreat and the 2 Sep 2015 ECUS meeting. Jolene Cole indicated that with the recent departure of the University Archivist, she had in consultation with Nancy Davis Bray learned that storyteller is a function that will be included in the qualifications desired for the new position for which a search is beginning. It was noted that Dr. Robert J. Wilson III, who is our university historian, had recently retired and would now be serving in only a 49% capacity. Jolene Cole was invited to follow up on this issue to gather more information to report back to ECUS. The plan is to continue to monitor this situation with a goal of seeing a storyteller function come to fruition. A reminder that this emerged from the observation that a storyteller was present in at least one other USG institution.</i></p>		<p><u>4 Sep 2015</u>  <i>John R. Swinton to ensure that this appointment of a Georgia College Story Archivist be considered at a future meeting of ECUS.</i></p> <p><u>2 Oct 2015</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>John R. Swinton did place consideration of the appointment of a Georgia College Story Archivist on the agenda of this meeting of ECUS.</i></li> <li>2. <i>Jolene Cole to consult with appropriate university personnel to gather information to inform further deliberation on this matter at a future ECUS meeting.</i></li> </ol> <p><u>6 Nov 2015</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Jolene Cole did consult with appropriate university personnel to gather information to inform further deliberation on this matter.</i></li> </ol>

	<p><b><u>6 Nov 2015</u></b>  <i>Jolene Cole indicated that she had consulted with university archives and that the search for a position with responsibilities including a university storyteller component is ongoing. As an archivist, the stories would be more likely on historical events (those in the past) and university communications might contribute more directly to telling stories of current events. Jolene Cole indicated she would continue to consult and share information with the committee as it became available. There was general consensus to have this item be a standing item on future ECUS meeting agendas and check in with Jolene at each ECUS meeting to see if there is additional information available.</i></p> <p><b><u>4 Dec 2015</u></b>  Jolene Cole had no new information to report on this matter.</p>		<p>2. <i>Jolene Cole to consult with appropriate university personnel to gather information to inform further deliberation on this matter at a future ECUS meeting.</i></p>
<p><b>Selected Staff Senator Oversight</b></p>	<p><b><u>2 Oct 2015</u></b>  <i>It was noted that the ECUS Calendar and Checklists document lists <b>Share information on election expectations with Staff Council Leadership</b> to be completed in September. At the meeting, the task of drafting these letters was assigned to Subcommittee on Nominations (SCoN) Chair Chavonda Mills.</i>  <i>Note: Following the meeting and during the preparation of these minutes, it was clarified that this was an ECUS function not a SCoN function and so responsibility for ensuring these letters are drafted and sent shifted to ECUS Chair John R. Swinton.</i></p> <p><b><u>6 Nov 2015</u></b></p>		<p><b><u>2 Oct 2015</u></b>  <i>John. R. Swinton to ensure that selected staff senator selection information from the university senate bylaws is shared with the Staff Council Leadership.</i></p> <p><b><u>6 Nov 2015</u></b>  <i>Chavonda Mills to contact Daniel McDonald (Staff Council Chair) to share the relevant university senate bylaws to inform the selection of selected staff senators to serve on the</i></p>

	<p><i>After a brief discussion, it was determined that the Staff Council Leadership (Chair Daniel McDonald) has not been contacted regarding selection of selected staff senators for the 2016-2017 University Senate. Chavonda Mills offered to contact Staff Council Chair Daniel McDonald and share the relevant university senate bylaws. Her offer was accepted.</i></p> <p><b><u>4 Dec 2016</u></b>  In her Presiding Officer Elect Report, Chavonda Mills noted that she had shared relevant university senate bylaws with Staff Council Chair Daniel McDonald to inform the selection of selected staff senators for the 2016-2017 University Senate.</p>		<p>2016-2017 University Senate.</p> <p><b><u>4 Dec 2016</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Chavonda Mills did contact Daniel McDonald (Staff Council Chair) to share the relevant university senate bylaws to inform the selection of selected staff senators to serve on the 2016-2017 University Senate.</li> <li>2. John. R. Swinton did ensure that selected staff senator selection information from the university senate bylaws is shared with the Staff Council Leadership.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Policy/Procedure on Applying for and Garnering Academic Department Status (or other relevant status changes)</b></p> <p><b>John R. Swinton</b></p>	<p><b><u>4 Sep 2015 (Creation of New Department)</u></b>  <i>One of the supporting documents articulated support from College of Arts and Sciences Dean Ken Procter of a proposal from Program Coordinator Sunita Manian of a proposed designation change of the Philosophy and Liberal Studies program to the Department of Philosophy and Liberal Studies. This program already has an administrative assistant and it is proposed that the coordinator title become department chair. This was shared as an information item.</i></p>		<p><b><u>2 Oct 2015</u></b>  <i>John R. Swinton to place this matter on the tentative agenda of a future ECUS or ECUS-SCC meeting once the document that Costas Spirou is preparing is available.</i></p> <p><b><u>6 Nov 2015</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. John R. Swinton to seek individuals interested in assisting with the drafting of the procedure.</li> </ol>

*There was a philosophical discussion on the lack of an existing policy/procedure for a group requesting or garnering status as an academic department. In some cases, the cost of department status may require allocation of resources (such as funding for a department chair position and/or an administrative assistant position and/or an operating budget, etc.). That was not the case in the current proposal. While there was a concern of the lack of a policy/procedure for requesting or garnering academic department status, there was no formal recommendation regarding the establishment of such a policy/procedure. It was noted that there is an existing task force authorized by President Dorman working on taxonomy and nomenclature and bringing consistency to the naming of units on campus such as division, department, etc. and noting that this task force may not be considering policy/procedure for the establishment of such units.*

**2 Oct 2015**

*A proposal to steer the development of a policy/procedure on applying for and garnering academic department status which was discussed (see above) at the previous meeting to the appropriate standing committee was made. Provost Brown indicated that Interim Associate Provost Costas Spirou is pulling together into a document the current practice on this matter and related matters.*

2. *John R. Swinton to assign a committee to prepare parallel policy.*

**4 Dec 2015**

John R. Swinton did place this matter on the tentative agenda of this ECUS meeting.

*There was general agreement to postpone the steering of this matter until such time as it can be informed by the aforementioned document that is in preparation.*

**6 Nov 2015**

1. **Prior to the Meeting** *Interim Associate Provost Costas Spirou had supplied a document that provided a starting point for discussion on a procedure to request and garner academic department status or rename an academic department. This document had been circulated by John R. Swinton with the tentative agenda of the meeting. This document is attached as a supporting document to these minutes.*
2. **Context** *Interim Associate Provost Costas Spirou provided the following contextual information.*
  - a. *This initiative was triggered by the recent information item received by ECUS that PALS (Philosophy and Liberal Studies) garnered academic department status in the College of Arts and Sciences.*
  - b. *The main points of the draft were highlighted to note that (1) it was a procedure for renaming a department or requesting academic department status (2) initially a conversation among the department, dean and provost on viability and rationale of the proposed revision (name change or*

*request for academic department status) would take place (see Steps I and II in the supporting document) (3) there was guidance on the content of a proposal (see Step III in the supporting document) (4) the proposal should be considered by a committee of the university senate and APC, CAPC or FAPC is proposed yet perhaps (after a conversation with Craig Turner prior to this meeting) it would be more appropriate to route the proposal to this group (ECUS) and have ECUS steer the proposal to the relevant university senate committee (see Step IV in the supporting document) (5) the remaining steps involve review by the Provost and a decision made by the University President (see Steps V and following in the supporting document) (6) the goal was to inject transparency into the process and to provide a means by which an individual or individuals that are considering making such requests (to rename an academic department or request academic department status) can be educated on how to do so. In short, the document is designed to guide and assist proposers.*

3. **Discussion** *The following were the points of conversation.*

- |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. <i>Item (4) in the contextual information above (replacing APC or FAPC or CAPC with ECUS in Step IV) was agreeable to those present.</i></li><li>b. <i>A question from the floor was “Where is the consideration of anticipated students enrolled?” and it was noted that this aspect fit within at least one of <b>Cost</b> or <b>Student Service</b> in Step III.</i></li><li>c. <i>A suggestion to place this in the policy template format of the university senate was offered. It was noted that the current document contained only procedure and not policy. The response was that there should be an overarching policy that might be simply to follow the proposed procedure under discussion. Susan Steele volunteered to assist in the drafting of the policy and formatting in compliance with the policy template.</i></li><li>d. <i>The renaming of an academic department is sometimes guided by accreditation bodies or nomenclature changes within a discipline and in this case a streamlined proposal might be appropriate (not requiring all the information requested in Step III). While some of those present agreed with this perspective, there was no formal vote of the group on this nuance. Some noted that the proposer could abbreviate the responses and</i></li></ul> |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|

	<p><i>focus on the rationale being to comply with accreditation or nomenclature change.</i></p> <p><i>e. A suggestion to add a restructuring option (to the rename or establish a department options already present) to accommodate a split of a department into two or more departments was offered from the floor. Most of those present agreed that this option was a reasonable addition.</i></p> <p><i>f. Clarification questions were posed to tease out the nature of the review of individuals and committees.</i></p> <p><i>i. Could a proposal continue through the process without garnering approval of the dean?</i></p> <p><i>ii. Was the university senate approving or recommending? That is, could the lack of support from the university senate prevent a proposal from reaching the University President?</i></p> <p><i>One perspective was that the University President made the decision and that all lower level reviews were recommendations to inform this decision. While some of those present agreed with this perspective, there was no formal vote of the group on this nuance.</i></p> <p><i>g. A concern about reviewer reliability was offered indicating that as different</i></p>		
--	--	--	--



*deans may have different perspectives, the stringency of reviews may not be consistent – some being more stringent and some being less stringent. While some of those present agreed with this perspective, there was no formal vote of the group on this nuance.*

*h. The question of who could initiate a request was posed from the floor. The answer was faculty. Perhaps this could be more explicitly stated in the proposal.*

*i. Interim Provost Costas Spirou expressed his appreciation for the suggestions and rich discussion.*

*4. **Next Steps** As the committee deliberation concluded, Presiding Officer John R. Swinton proposed the following next steps.*

*a. All present were invited to share with Costas Spirou any other suggestions that may emerge if they continue to review the document.*

*b. Assign a committee to prepare parallel policy. Susan Steele was the only volunteer for this committee.*

*c. Review the combined policy and procedure at the next ECUS meeting and route to a standing committee (APC, CAPC, FAPC, SAPC, RPIP) for review.*

*These proposed steps met with no resistance from those present.*

**4 Dec 2015**

1. **At the Meeting** Interim Associate Provost Costas Spirou supplied, to those present at the meeting, hard copies of the latest draft of procedures to establish, restructure, or rename an academic department.
2. **Context** Interim Associate Provost Costas Spirou provided the following contextual information.
  - a. This initiative was triggered by the recent information item received by ECUS that PALS (Philosophy and Liberal Studies) garnered academic department status in the College of Arts and Sciences.
  - b. As suggested by ECUS on 6 Nov 2015
    - i. The draft now includes the option to propose the restructuring of a department in addition to establishing and renaming.
    - ii. The draft now includes a streamlining of the documentation necessary to support a proposal to rename an academic unit. This streamlining requires only a rationale rather than a full proposal. Renaming is usually not a substantive change and often made to comply with discipline-based or accreditation-based nomenclature.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iii. The reference to APC or FAPC or CAPC in Step IV has been replaced by a reference to ECUS.</li> <li>c. Costas Spirou reported consulting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at length with Craig Turner and that this consultation had been quite helpful in refining the current draft</li> <li>ii. with deans who had recommended no further revisions</li> <li>iii. with chairs who provided mixed feedback, some indicating the process seemed overly complicated and unnecessary while others found no concerns with the process as proposed</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. <b><u>Discussion</u></b> The following were the points of conversation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b><u>Is a Programs an Academic Unit?</u></b> Interim Associate Provost Costas Spirou noted the broadening of the definition of the term academic unit to include program, department, school or college and this definition had been explicitly added since 6 Nov 2015. Some of the department chairs reviewing the draft had wondered if a program should be considered an academic unit. This question was posed to those present at the meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. One comment was recalling the formal definition of program being given in an institutional document.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>Upon further consideration, it was thought to be the aforementioned curricular policy document that is still in preparation.</p> <p>ii. One perspective was that a program could be culled from the illustrative examples of academic units as the transformation of a program to a department could be handled as the establishment of a department and the migration of a program from an existing department to another department could be accommodated by a restructuring. This perspective did not garner sufficient traction to affect a change.</p> <p>iii. Ultimately, there was consensus among those present that there was not a problem with leaving program in the illustrative example list of academic units, mostly due to the fact that there was no compelling justification for it being removed from this list.</p> <p>b. <b><u>Editorial Suggestions</u></b> Discussion continued with the following editorial suggestions to the document</p> <p>i. To parallel the construction of Step V, a suggestion to replace <i>The Provost</i> with <i>If recommended, the Provost</i> in Step IV was offered and supported by those present. This</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>modification would allow the possibility that the proposal is not forwarded by the Provost to ECUS in the event a viable proposal is not constructed by the proposer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>ii. Similarly, in Step II, a suggestion to replace <i>The Provost</i> with <i>If deemed appropriate, the Provost</i> was offered and supported by those present. This modification would allow the consideration of a proposal to terminate in Step II if it was not deemed appropriate.</li><li>iii. A question of <i>In Step V, what is the action of the University Senate? Is it an endorsement, an approval, etc.?</i> Discussion continued and this question was never definitively answered, although a suggestion to replace in Step V <i>The request is reviewed</i> with <i>The Executive Committee facilitates the review</i> was offered and supported by those present.</li><li>iv. An observation that the current Step VI of the action by the university senate being routed to the Provost, rather than the University President, was not in compliance with university senate bylaws where motions of the University Senate are forwarded to the University President. This</li></ul>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>observation did not garner sufficient traction to affect change. <i>During the preparation of these minutes, it is noted that the relevant university senate bylaws include I.Section1.D dealing with the University President taking actions of accept or veto on an action of the University Senate and I.Section2 in which the University Senate serves in an advisory role to the administration. Depending on the nature of the review by the University Senate in Step V, this review may be considered an advisory action to the administration and in particular the Provost. Further discussion may be advisable to consider this nuance.</i></p> <p>c. <b>Appreciation</b> Interim Provost Costas Spirou expressed his appreciation for the suggestions and rich discussion.</p>		
<p><b>Elected Faculty Senator Oversight</b></p>	<p><u>2 Oct 2015</u>  <i>It was noted that the ECUS Calendar and Checklists document lists <b>Share information on election expectations in academic units (colleges and library) with a letter to college deans and the university librarian</b> as a recurring annual ECUS function to be completed in September. Given the reapportionment of a seat shifting from College of Education (CoE) to College of Arts</i></p>		<p><u>2 Oct 2015</u>  <i>John. R. Swinton to ensure that elected faculty senator oversight letters (with the typical supporting documents) are sent to the college deans and university librarian.</i></p> <p><u>6 Nov 2015</u></p>

	<p><i>and Sciences, a quick check was made to see if at least one CoE elected faculty senator had a term ending in 2016 (finding it was the case). At the meeting, the task of drafting these letters was assigned to Subcommittee on Nominations (SCoN) Chair Chavonda Mills.</i></p> <p><i>Note: Following the meeting and during the preparation of these minutes, it was clarified that this was an ECUS function not a SCoN function and so responsibility for ensuring these letters are drafted and sent shifted to ECUS Chair John R. Swinton.</i></p> <p><b><u>6 Nov 2015</u></b>  <i>Ultimately, Chavonda Mills sent the letters with appropriate appendices to the deans of the academic units (colleges and library) after providing ECUS members the opportunity to review the draft letters and appendices.</i></p> <p><b><u>4 Dec 2015</u></b>  As noted by Chavonda Mills in her Presiding Officer Elect Report, the elected faculty senator election procedures have been received from each academic unit. Election results are due no later than 1 Feb 2016.</p>		<p><i>John. R. Swinton did ensure that elected faculty senator oversight letters (with the typical supporting documents) were sent to the college deans and university librarian.</i></p>
<p><b>At-Large Election</b></p>	<p><b><u>6 Nov 2015</u></b>  <i>It was noted that a recurring ECUS function is to administer the at-large election of an elected faculty senator and that this election must be implemented during February and completed by March 1. Chavonda Mills accepted the invitation to draft an at-large election procedure for ECUS review. John R. Swinton offered to share the at-large election materials from 2014-2015 with Chavonda, an offer which she quickly accepted.</i></p>		<p><b><u>6 Nov 2015</u></b>  <i>Chavonda Mills to draft an at-large election procedure for ECUS review.</i></p> <p><b><u>4 Dec 2015</u></b>  Chavonda Mills did draft an at-large election procedure for ECUS review.</p>

	<p><b><u>4 Dec 2015</u></b>  Chavonda Mills invited Craig Turner to provide context on the proposed changes and he accepted this invitation. Most of the updates involved the timeline and mimicked the timeline used during 2014-15. The quote of University Senate Bylaw II.Section1.A.2 was corrected to cite thirty-seven (37) faculty members rather than the errant thirty-six (36) cited in 2014-15. The only other modification was to reword a sentence referencing apportionment and the corps of instruction list to cull the reference to the academic year and refer to the most recent versions so that this sentence would not require an annual update. Historically the two main points of conversation are the longstanding tie-breaker procedure (dating back to 2005-2006) of <i>a blind draw</i> and the even longer standing replacement procedure (dating back to 2004-2005) of the <i>Miss America Rule</i>. The <i>Miss America Rule</i> is where the first-runner up, second runner up, etc. would be invited (in order) to complete the term of service should the elected at-large senator be unable to complete the three year term of service. Following this contextual presentation, the at-large procedure was adopted as presented.</p>		
<p><b>Governance Calendar for 2016-2017</b></p>	<p><b><u>6 Nov 2015</u></b>  <i>It was noted that a recurring ECUS function is to prepare a governance calendar (in this case for 2016-2017) by April 1. Craig Turner, John</i></p>	<p>It</p>	<p><b><u>6 Nov 2015</u></b>  <i>Craig Turner, John R. Swinton, and Chavonda Mills to ensure that a draft of the 2016-17 governance</i></p>



*R. Swinton and Chavonda Mills indicated their interest in assisting with the preparation of a draft of the 2016-2017 governance calendar for ECUS review.*

**4 Dec 2015**

Concerns regarding the Governance Calendar were raised from the floor during the 20 Nov 2015 meeting of the university senate. The interested reader is directed to those minutes for details. At the conclusion of this open discussion at the 20 Nov 2015 university senate meeting, John R. Swinton had promised to ensure that the university senate has an opportunity during the spring 2016 semester to review and offer feedback on the draft governance calendar for 2016-2017.

ECUS deliberation on this topic was to consider the timeline for the development of the 2016-2017 governance calendar to ensure time for university senate review. The university senate bylaws call for a 1 April completion date. It was agreed that the governance calendar drafting committee (John R. Swinton, Chavonda Mills, and Craig Turner) would strive to complete a draft of the calendar to allow the university senate time to review the draft during at least one of its 22 Jan 2016 and 19 Feb 2016 meetings.

During the conversation, there was a reminder that the governance calendar was initially (in

*calendar is prepared for ECUS review.*

**4 Dec 2015**

John R. Swinton to ensure that this matter receives consideration at a future ECUS and/or ECUS-SCC meeting.

	<p>2005-2006) a meeting priority calendar and claimed to indicate the meeting which would have priority for a common meeting time. At some point (specifically 2006-2007) the calendar was streamlined to include only governance (department, college, college committee, university senate, and university senate committee) meetings and became known at the governance calendar. There was an agreement to consider returning to the meeting priority calendar nomenclature at a future meeting of the Executive Committee.</p> <p>A question from the floor - <i>What is the action the University Senate would take on the calendar?</i> - stimulated further deliberation. The possibilities for university senate action that were offered for consideration included (1) to review and advise the governance calendar development committee (2) to endorse the governance calendar as a resolution (3) to formalize the governance calendar as a motion. While no formal vote was taken, the option that garnered the most vocal support was option (2) endorsing the governance calendar as a resolution. It was agreed to continue the consideration of this matter at a future meeting of the Executive Committee.</p>		
<p><b>AAUP Redbooks for University Senate Leaders</b></p>	<p><b><u>6 Nov 2015</u></b>  <i>Recent practice has been to consider annually the purchase of AAUP Redbooks for the university senate leadership. This leadership group includes all members of ECUS and</i></p>		

	<p><i>committee chairs. While a suggestion was to consider buying copies of the books to loan to university senate leaders during their terms of service, it was ultimately agreed that the book should be a token of appreciation to be kept by the individuals serving in these leadership positions. The ECUS members present agreed to allocate funds from the university senate budget to purchase 11<sup>th</sup> Edition AAUP Redbooks for all ECUS members and committee chairs (APC, CAPC, FAPC, RPIPC, SoCC, SAPC). John R. Swinton took a poll and found out that most members of ECUS already had the most current edition (11<sup>th</sup>) of the AAUP Redbook and noted that only two books (for Chavonda Mills and Jolene Cole) would need to be ordered for ECUS members.</i></p> <p><b><u>4 Dec 2015</u></b></p> <p>John R. Swinton confirmed the AAUP Redbook (11<sup>th</sup> Edition) count for part of the university senate leadership – in particular ECUS members. Three books (Jolene Cole, Chavonda Mills, Craig Turner) were needed. Confirmation of the number needed for other leaders (university senate committee chairs) would occur at the 4 Dec 2015 meeting of the Executive Committee with Standing Committee Chairs.</p>		
<p><b>VII. New Business</b> Actions/Recommendations</p>			

<p><b>Adjunct (Courtesy) Faculty Procedure</b></p> <p><b>Provost Fellow Wendy Mullen</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b><u>At the Meeting</u></b> Provost Fellow Wendy Mullen supplied, to each individual present at the meeting, a hard copy of two two-sided pages pertaining to Courtesy Adjunct Faculty Status. The materials included procedures, an application form and the Board of Regents Policies that explicitly referenced or were related to this status.</li> <li>2. <b><u>Context</u></b> Provost Fellow Wendy Mullen provided the following contextual information. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The development of this document was triggered by a recent request, made by a college dean directed to Provost Brown, to apply this status to an individual.</li> <li>b. As can be seen in the documentation, Courtesy Adjunct Faculty Status <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. is an honorary appointment</li> <li>ii. has no benefits, specifically no compensation, no faculty rank, no faculty status, no technology access, no parking permit, no BobcatID card, no eligibility for promotion or tenure, no employee benefits, no teaching duties (note that an individual could simultaneously have teaching duties yet such teaching duties would be negotiated independently of the awarding of this status), no voting rights, no input into college decisions.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>iii. has a proposed application with approval by department chair, dean and provost required.</p> <p>3. <b><u>Discussion</u></b> The following were the points of conversation.</p> <p>a. <b><u>Appointment Other USG Institution</u></b>  A question from the floor <i>How does this relate to faculty working at another USG institution?</i> to which the response was <i>It doesn't, it's not the same.</i></p> <p>b. <b><u>Visiting Professor</u></b> A question from the floor <i>How does this relate to faculty working as a visiting professor at another institution?</i> to which the response was <i>It doesn't, it's not the same.</i></p> <p>c. <b><u>Who Can Nominate?</u></b> A question from the floor <i>Who can nominate a candidate for courtesy adjunct faculty status?</i> to which the response was <i>While the consideration of a candidate flows through the department chair, dean, and provost, any faculty member can nominate an individual for this status.</i> There was general consensus to make this possibility explicit in the document.</p> <p>d. <b><u>Editorial Suggestions</u></b> Discussion continued with the following editorial suggestions to the document.</p> <p>i. To incorporate explicit language to articulate that any faculty member could nominate an individual to</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>receive courtesy adjunct faculty status.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>ii. To incorporate language where the department chair consideration of the candidate should be made in consultation with the department faculty and/or the dean consideration of the candidate should be in consultation with the academic unit (college, library) faculty. The goal is to promote transparency in the awarding of this status. Ideally, an individual would not receive courtesy adjunct faculty status without the faculty in the academic unit (department, school, college, library) being consulted and being given the opportunity to assist in the review of the candidate.</li><li>iii. To reformat the proposal into the university senate policy template format. In particular, this would require the inclusion of links to the pertinent Board of Regents policies cited in the pages circulated by Wendy Mullen. After a brief discussion, it was agreed that responsibility for this reformatting would be placed on the university senate committee to which this matter is steered. See the <b>Steered</b> item below.</li></ul>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>e. <b><u>Appreciation</u></b> Provost Fellow Wendy Mullen expressed her appreciation for the suggestions and rich discussion.</p> <p>f. <b><u>Steered</u></b> This matter was steered to FAPC (Faculty Affairs Policy Committee) for further review and development including formatting in compliance with university senate policy template being sure to reference the Board of Regents policies that explicitly cite or are related to courtesy adjunct faculty status.</p>		
<b>VIII. Next Meeting</b> (Tentative Agenda, Calendar)			
<b>1. Calendar</b>	<p>22 Jan 2016 @ 3:30pm Univ. Senate in A&amp;S 2-72</p> <p>5 Feb 2016 @ 2:00pm ECUS in 301 Parks</p> <p>5 Feb 2016 @ 3:30pm ECUS-SCC in 301 Parks</p>		
<b>2. Tentative Agenda</b>	Some of the deliberation today may have generated tentative agenda items for future ECUS and ECUS-SCC meetings.		John R. Swinton to ensure that such items (if any) are added to agendas of an ECUS and/or ECUS-SCC meeting in the future.
<b>IX. Adjournment</b>	As there was no further business to consider, a <b><u>MOTION</u></b> to adjourn the meeting was made and seconded.	The motion to adjourn was approved and the meeting adjourned at 3:18 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:** JOHN R. SWINTON (CHAIR), CHAVONDA MILLS (VICE-CHAIR), CRAIG TURNER (SECRETARY)

**ACADEMIC YEAR:** 2015-2016

**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	09-04-15	10-02-15	11-06-15	12-04-15	02-05-15	03-04-15	04-01-15	Present	Regrets
Kelli Brown <i>Provost</i>	R	P	P	R				2	2	0
Jolene Cole <i>EFS; Library, ECUS Member</i>	R	P	P	P				3	1	0
Steve Dorman <i>University President</i>	P	R	R	R				1	3	0
Chavonda Mills <i>EFS; CoAS; ECUS Vice-Chair</i>	P	P	P	P				4	0	0
Lyndall Muschell <i>EFS; CoE; ECUS Member</i>	P	P	P	P				4	0	0
Susan Steele <i>EFS; CoHS; ECUS Chair Emeritus</i>	P	P	P	P				4	0	0
John R. Swinton <i>EFS; CoB; ECUS Chair</i>	P	P	P	P				4	0	0
Craig Turner <i>EFS; CoAS; ECUS Secretary</i>	P	P	P	P				4	0	0