

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

MEETING DATE & TIME: 3 MARCH 2017; 2:00 –3:15

MEETING LOCATION: TERRELL HALL, ROOM 114

ATTENDANCE:

MEMBERS	“P” denotes Present, “A” denotes Absent, “R” denotes Regrets
----------------	---

R	Kelli Brown (Provost)	P	Susan Steele (CoHS, ECUS Member)
P	Nicole DeClouette (CoE, ECUS Vice-Chair)	P	John R. Swinton (CoB, ECUS Chair Emeritus)
R	Steve Dorman (University President)	P	Craig Turner (CoAS, ECUS Secretary)
P	Chavonda Mills (CoAS, ECUS Chair)	P	Shaundra Walker (Library, ECUS Member)

GUESTS
Costas Spirou (Interim Associate Provost)

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

AGENDA TOPIC	DISCUSSIONS & CONCLUSIONS	ACTION OR RECOMMENDATIONS	FOLLOW-UP {including dates/responsible person, status (pending, ongoing, completed)}
I. Call to order	The meeting was called to order at 2:03pm by Chavonda Mills (Chair).		
II. Approval of Agenda	A MOTION to approve the agenda was made and seconded.	The agenda was approved as circulated.	
III. Approval of Minutes	A MOTION to approve the minutes of the 3 Feb 2017 meeting of the Executive Committee was made and seconded. A draft of these minutes had been circulated to the meeting attendees via email with no revisions offered. Thus, the minutes had been posted as circulated.	The minutes of the 3 Feb 2017 Executive Committee meeting were approved as posted, so no additional action was required.	
IV. Reports	The following reports were invited.		

<p>Presiding Officer Report</p> <p>Chavonda Mills</p>	<p><u>Monthly Meeting with Provost</u> held on 16 Mar 2017. Among other items, Provost Brown and I discussed senate’s role when considering proposals approved at the college level.</p> <p><u>Met with Dean Sandra Gangstead and Dr. Lisa Griffin</u> regarding deactivation of outdoor education proposal.</p> <p><u>Met with CAPC</u> regarding role of CAPC when considering proposals approved at the college level – referenced university senate bylaws Article I, Section 2.</p>		
<p>Past Presiding Officer Report</p> <p>John R. Swinton</p>	<p>John R. Swinton indicated that he had nothing to report as Past Presiding Officer of the University Senate.</p>		
<p>Presiding Officer Elect Report</p> <p>Nicole DeClouette</p>	<p>Nicole DeClouette reported on the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>The USGFC Spring meeting</u> will be held on 31 Mar 2017 at the University System of Georgia Office in Atlanta. 		
<p>Secretary Report</p> <p>Craig Turner</p>	<p>Craig Turner indicated that he had nothing to report as University Senate Secretary.</p>		
<p>Library Senator Report</p> <p>Shaundra Walker</p>	<p>Shaundra Walker indicated that she had nothing to report as the Elected Faculty Senator from the Library serving on ECUS.</p>		
<p>V. Information Items Actions/Recommendations</p>			
<p>University Senate Budget</p> <p>Chavonda Mills</p>	<p><u>7 Oct 2016</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Balance</u> The balance of the university senate budget (\$5000 allocation annually) is presently holding at \$1711.24. 2. <u>Expenditures</u> The total cost for the 2016 governance retreat was \$3288.76, breaking down as follows. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Rock Eagle \$2077.00 b. Printing \$425.90 		<p><u>7 Oct 2016</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chavonda Mills to explore the viability of the establishment of a foundation account for the university senate and report back (the pros and cons and best

	<p>c. <i>Supplies and Materials</i> \$412.19 d. <i>Transportation</i> \$373.67</p> <p>3. <u>Foundation Account</u> Chavonda Mills noted that there was presently no foundation account established for the university senate. A suggestion from the floor was that the Presiding Officer (Chavonda Mills) explore the viability of establishing such an account going forward and report back (the pros and cons and best practices) to the Executive Committee. Chavonda Mills agreed to implement this recommendation.</p> <p><u>4 Nov 2016</u></p> <p>1. <u>Balance</u> The balance of the university senate budget (\$5000 allocation annually) is presently holding at \$1711.24.</p> <p>2. <u>Expenditures</u> Pending expenditures are the reimbursements for travel expenses incurred by Nicole DeClouette when she was attending the USGFC meeting.</p> <p>3. <u>Foundation Account</u> Chavonda Mills noted that establishing a foundation account for the university senate was as simple as filing a completed form. There was no minimum balance.</p> <p><u>ECUS Deliberation</u></p> <p>a. <u>Restrictions</u> It was noted that while foundation accounts can be used for food items, one has to be attentive to the set of restrictions on the use of foundation funds. Chavonda Mills was advised to consult with Monica Starley and/or Kathy Waers on these restrictions.</p> <p>b. <u>An Option for SCCP</u> It was noted that establishing a foundations account</p>		<p><i>practices) to the Executive Committee.</i></p> <p><u>4 Nov 2016</u></p> <p>1. Chavonda Mills did explore the viability of the establishment of a foundation account for the university senate and reported back (the pros and cons and best practices) to the Executive Committee.</p> <p>2. Chavonda Mills to consult with Monica Starley and/or Kathy Waers to learn the restrictions on the use of foundation monies.</p> <p>3. Chavonda Mills to take the actions necessary to establish a foundation account for the university senate.</p> <p><u>3 Mar 2017</u></p> <p>1. Chavonda Mills did consult with Monica Starley and/or Kathy Waers to learn the restrictions on the use of foundation monies.</p> <p>2. Chavonda Mills will take the actions necessary to establish a foundation account for the university senate.</p>
--	--	--	--

would allow employees to contribute to this account as part of the State Charitable Contributions Program (SCCP).

- c. **AAUP** One possible use of foundation funds might be to support attendance of events sponsored by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). President Dorman indicated that he was willing to support this type of activity from other resources.
- d. **Enticing Donors** It was advisable to consider the possible ways the dollars in the foundation account would be used to inform its advertising. Perhaps certain uses of the funds would entice potential donors to contribute. The articulation of these particulars were postponed pending knowledge of the aforementioned restrictions.
- e. **Establish a Foundation Account** Those present recommended that Chavonda Mills complete the form and take the actions necessary to establish a university senate foundation account.

2 Dec 2016

- 1. **Balance** The balance of the university senate budget (\$5000 allocation annually) is presently holding at **\$1711.24**.
- 2. **Expenditures** Pending expenditures are the reimbursements for travel expenses incurred by Nicole DeClouette when she was attending the USGFC meeting. Chavonda Mills indicated her intention to check into this as this reimbursement was taking longer than usual.

3. **Foundation Account** Chavonda Mills sought assistance in filling out the form for requesting a foundation account for the university senate. After receiving some guidance, it was suggested that Chavonda Mills consult with foundation personnel for further assistance.

3 Feb 2017

1. **Balance** The balance of the university senate budget (\$5000 allocation annually) is presently holding at **\$1711.24**.
2. **Expenditures** Pending expenditures (\$256.99) are the reimbursements for travel expenses incurred by Nicole DeClouette when she was attending the USGFC meeting. These expenditures were inadvertently charged to Nicole's department budget and this is currently being reconciled.
3. **Foundation Account** Chavonda Mills' efforts to establish a foundation account for the university senate are ongoing.
4. **Possible Uses of Remaining Funds** under exploration are the purchase of
 - a. clickers for university senate votes as proposed by Chavonda Mills and
 - b. office supplies (notebooks, writing implements, paper, copies, etc.) for the 2017 governance retreat as proposed by Nicole DeClouette.If you have other ideas on potential uses of these funds, let us know.

3 Mar 2017

1. **Balance** The balance of the university senate budget (\$5000 allocation annually) is **\$1454.25**.

	<p>2. Expenditure The reimbursement of the attendance expenses of the Fall 2016 USGFC meeting in the amount of \$256.99 incurred by Nicole DeClouette were initially charged to her department budget rather than the university senate budget. This has now been reconciled.</p> <p>3. Foundation Account Chavonda Mills indicated that she had secured the form necessary for establishing a foundation account for the university senate. She sought clarification as to the signature authorities for the account. All present were in agreement that these authorities should be Monica Starley and the current Presiding Officer of the University Senate. Chavonda Mills indicated her intent to pass the form onto the President's Office (Monica Starley) for review and signature and then the next stop would be review by the pertinent foundation personnel.</p>		
<p>VI. Unfinished Business Review of Action & Recommendations, Provide updates (if any) to Follow-up</p>			
<p>Review of Tasks Requiring Follow-up from the 2015- 2016 ECUS Annual Report</p> <p>Chavonda Mills</p>	<p><u>7 Oct 2016</u> <i>A number of items were recommended for consideration by the 2016-2017 ECUS in the committee annual report of the 2015-2016 ECUS. These include (yet may not be limited to) the following.</i></p> <p>1. <u>Faculty Listserv</u> <i>The establishment of a university faculty email list to which any subscriber can post a message has been under consideration. Required is a volunteer to serve as moderator of this list, and this requirement has not yet been met.</i></p>		<p><u>7 Oct 2016</u></p> <p>1. <i>Shaundra Walker to gather contextual information to inform the ongoing GC Story Archivist deliberation.</i></p> <p>2. <i>Chavonda Mills to explore the viability of the establishment of a foundation account for the university senate and report back (the</i></p>

	<p><i>Those present at this meeting felt that the committee action should be a wait-and-see approach. Specifically, to wait and see if one or more individuals step forward to serve as moderator.</i></p> <p>2. <u>Streamline Curricular Routing</u> <i>This matter is already in progress. A work group including Interim Associate Provost Dale Young, University Registrar Kay Anderson, and CAPC Chair Lyndall Muschell has been actively meeting and has been in consultation with ECUS Chair Chavonda Mills. Plans include electronic implementation in coordination with IT personnel.</i></p> <p>3. <u>Regular Review of the PPPM</u> <i>This item is proposing the regular review of the Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual (PPPM). Our current university policy officer, Sadie Simmons, is receptive to any recommendations on this matter. Craig Turner was the only committee member to volunteer to assist in this initiative. He indicated that his thoughts would be to advocate for</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>a. a review of all university senate policy motions (type P motions) to ensure that they are present in their entirety (not just the policy part, but pertinent procedures as adopted as well) in the PPPM, and</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>b. adoption of the university senate policy template as a template for entries in the PPPM going forward.</i></p> <p><i>Those present supported these ideas.</i></p> <p>4. <u>GC Story Archivist</u> <i>This item was on the agenda of each meeting of the 2015-2016 ECUS and was recommended for ongoing</i></p>		<p><i>pros and cons and best practices) to the Executive Committee.</i></p> <p><u>4 Nov 2016</u></p> <p>1. <i>Shaundra Walker did gather contextual information to inform the ongoing GC Story Archivist deliberation.</i></p> <p>2. <i>Chavonda Mills did explore the viability of the establishment of a foundation account for the university senate and report back (the pros and cons and best practices) to the Executive Committee. To see this, look to the budget entry in the list of information items.</i></p> <p>3. <i>Chavonda Mills to pass the template for SCC reports at ECUS-SCC meetings on to the SCCs commencing its implementation at the 2 Dec 2016 ECUS-SCC meeting.</i></p> <p><u>2 Dec 2016</u></p> <p><i>Chavonda Mills did pass the template for SCC reports at ECUS-SCC meetings on to the SCCs.</i></p>
--	--	--	--

consideration by the 2016-2017 ECUS. Shaudra Walker noted the recent hiring of a Digital Archivist and agreed to gather contextual information pertinent to this matter to inform future ECUS deliberation.

5. **Feasibility of Foundation Account for the University Senate** Chavonda Mills noted that there was presently no foundation account established for the university senate. A suggestion from the floor was that the Presiding Officer (Chavonda Mills) explore the viability of establishing such an account going forward and report back (the pros and cons and best practices) to the Executive Committee. Chavonda Mills agreed to implement this recommendation.
6. **How Best to Receive Updates from University Senate Representatives on Task Forces, Committees, and Other Groups** After a brief discussion, the consensus was that a written report included for archiving in the minutes –supplemented at the discretion of the representative with a brief oral report at the university senate meeting – was desirable.
7. **Details in Standing Committee Chair Reports for ECUS-SCC Meetings** After a brief discussion, the consensus was that the oral report of the standing committee chair given at Executive Committee (ECUS) with Standing Committee Chairs (SCC) meetings should generally be a brief overview of the topics discussed at the committee meeting, rather than a detailed specification of the committee deliberation of each topic discussed at the committee meeting.

4 Nov 2016

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

Question How does this differ from our university historian role? Answer: The digital archivist document events that occur on campus as they are archived. The university historian reviews this documented events as artifacts and might select one or more for inclusion in the history of the university.

All present agreed that this completes ECUS deliberation of a GC Story Archivist

2. **Details in Standing Committee Chair Reports for ECUS-SCC Meetings** At the 7 Oct 2016 ECUS meeting, Susan Steele had offered to prepare a template to guide the content of a report by each Standing Committee Chair (SCC) to the participants of the ECUS-SCC meetings. This template is available in the supporting documents attached to these minutes. The first review of the draft was “Brilliant!” and “Inspired!” Others concurred with this assessment. The recommendation of those present was to share the template with the standing committee chairs and for implementation to commence at the 2 Dec 2016 ECUS-SCC meeting. After a bit more discussion, it was agreed that this template – as appropriately modified – will also serve as a guide for the preparation of

	<p><i>reports to university senate by university senate representatives serving on university-wide committees, task forces, and other groups.</i></p>		
<p>University Senate Procedures if Proposal under Standing Committee Review is Denied</p> <p>Chavonda Mills Craig Turner</p> <p>In Feb 2017, Parsed Into</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appeals • Committee Scopes 	<p><u>2 Dec 2016</u></p> <p><i>A question seeking clarification on the process of university senate consideration of a matter was received. Specifically, the question asked whether a standing committee (APC, CAPC, FAPC, RPIPC, SAPC) disapproving a matter would end university senate consideration of that matter, and thus in effect prevent the consideration of the matter by the full university senate.</i></p> <p><i>It was noted that the pertinent university senate bylaw was</i></p> <p><i>IV. Section 1. Committee Business.</i> <i>The regular operations of the University Senate shall follow a committee review procedure. The University Senate by a two-thirds majority vote may suspend committee review of a specific matter and act as a committee of the whole. In all other cases, the University Senate shall submit all matters of substance for study, recommendations, and/or action by a committee prior to definitive action being taken by the University Senate. Standing committee business may be initiated by any member of the committee, by the Executive Committee of the University Senate, by the University President, or by a written request to the Executive Committee signed by at least three Senators.</i></p> <p><i>While this bylaw does not explicitly address whether disapproval of the standing committee ends the consideration of a matter by the university senate, the practice has been for the</i></p>		

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

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

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

END NOTE

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

- | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) <i>While the official standing of a recently emerging curricular flowchart document is uncertain, it offers guidance pertinent to the question. Specifically, in the subtitle above the flowchart, it reads A denial at any approval point either stops this process or moves it to an appeal. Those present did not find particular details on venues of appeal articulated in this curricular document.</i>2) <i>What is the role of standing committees in reviewing a proposal emerging from a department and/or college? Matters that emerge from these sources are often curricular, but this issue was broadened to all standing committees not simply CAPC. There is a need to attempt to remove the gray areas in the committee charges and perhaps to codify the role of the standing committee more clearly and specifically. As one example, should CAPC be reviewing the merits of a curricular proposal or simply ensuring the proposal has been adequately considered at the department and college levels with good practice in shared governance? At present, the university senate bylaws are silent on guidance in these matters and so there are some gray areas in current committee charges. ECUS subcommittee consisting of Chavonda Mills, Shaundra Walker and Craig Turner was formed and this subcommittee was charged to review committee charges in the university senate bylaws. Some felt removal of all gray areas would be easier said than done.</i>3) <i>The absence of an appeal process may also be a point of tension. ECUS subcommittee</i> | | |
|--|--|--|--|

consisting of Interim Provost Spirou, John Swinton, and Craig Turner was formed and this subcommittee was charged to draft language for appeal processes. Initially this might be considered with respect to the curricular flowchart that recently emerged as well as for decisions of the standing committees of the university senate.

- 4) In the consideration of curricular matters, faculty have primacy in the curricular content and the pedagogical delivery of this content and administrators have the responsibility to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in the resource management in the delivery of curriculum. At times there is a tension between these.*
- 5) There is always room for more clarity in existing governance documents, and the recent issue has brought this to light. It is hoped that we can move forward together and bring additional clarity to our shared governance processes including the university senate bylaws and recently emerging curricular flowchart.*

3 Feb 2017

Appeal Process *John R. Swinton was reporting on behalf of the ECUS work group – membership of John R. Swinton, Costas Spirou, and Craig Turner – charged to consider an appeal process for standing committee decisions.*

- The work group reviewed the recently emerging curricular flow chart that was presented by CAPC at the 7 Oct 2016 ECUS with Standing Committee Chairs meeting. Although the subtitle of this document reads A denial at any approval*

point either stops this process or moves it to an appeal there is no articulation of appeals in the flow chart. The work group thinks this curricular flow chart may require further revision to address this observation.

- *The work group had spent most of its deliberation time considering an appeal process for standing committee decisions, ultimately elected to recommend against an appeal process. The work group was at a loss to identify an appellate body believing that neither ECUS nor the University Senate should serve in such a capacity.*
- *Rather than recommend the opportunity for appeal, the work group proposed that all committee recommendations – of both for and against proposals – be brought before the university senate.*
 - *The work group proposed that recommendations for a proposal would continue (as in current practice) to be considered by the university senate as formal motions entered into the online motion database.*
 - *The work group proposed that recommendations against a proposal be realized as items on the consent agenda. This would allow any member of the university senate to draw such an item from the consent agenda for either clarification or further review and deliberation by the university senate which could include formalizing parliamentary actions on the recommendations against as motions (amend, commit, adopt, etc.). In either case, these matters (recommendations*

against) would be acted on formally by the University President. At present, the University President does not act formally on committee recommendations against and such proposals effectively die in committee.

- If the work group proposal on the handling of a committee recommendation against were adopted, the University President would have to act on any committee recommendation against similar to acting on any committee recommendation for, and there would be a clear record of the University President's actions vis-à-vis the recommendation of the committee. If the University President were to choose a course of action contrary to the position taken by the committee (which might be formalized as a veto), such action may require an explanation to the USG Board of Regents. As our process now works, the University President does not officially get notified of a committee's recommendation against a proposal as an action item. Therefore, the University President does not have to acknowledge being advised against moving forward with the proposal.

Those present recommended that this report be provided at and that deliberation continue at the 3 Feb 2017 ECUS-SCC meeting.

Standing Committee Scopes Craig Turner was reporting on behalf of the ECUS work group – membership of Shaundra Walker, Chavonda

Mills, and Craig Turner – charged to review committee scopes.

- *At present, the bylaws have two sections for each standing committee (APC, CAPC, FAPC, RPIPC, SAPC): composition and scope. The committee scopes include articulation of the advisory function of the committee and a list of the topics considered by the committee to inform steering of items. What is missing is formalizing the duties of the committee.*
- *The work group proposes that the scope section remain to include the topic list and that a duties section be added.*
- *The work group proposes that the duties section include the advisory role sentence presently in the scope as well as language regarding the review of proposals within the scope culminating in the making of recommendation for or against these proposals to the university senate.*
- *The work group proposes that each standing committee (APC, CAPC, FAPC, RPIPC, SAPC) review its scope and draft a revised scope and new duties section in consideration of the aforementioned work group recommendations. These drafts by the committee would be further reviewed at the 2017 governance retreat. This may result in formal recommendations for revisions to the university senate bylaws pertaining to standing committees*
Those present recommended that this report be provided at and that deliberation continue at the 3 Feb 2017 ECUS-SCC meeting.

3 Mar 2017

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Committee Scopes</u>: Craig Turner indicated there was no new information on this item. 2. <u>Appeal Process</u> Three brief conversation points were addressed. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. A proposal that recommendations for or against by committees should be entered into the online motion database and treated uniformly was an idea worthy of sharing with ECUS-SCC at its 3 Mar 2017 meeting. b. The observation that ECUS is not appropriate as an appellate body was reiterated and it was also noted that at present there was no judicial branch of governance at Georgia College making consideration of assigning it as an appellate body moot. c. It was agreed to continue deliberation at the ECUS-SCC meeting at 3:30pm on 3 Mar 2017. 		
<p>Review of Standing Committee Compositions</p> <p>Chavonda Mills</p>	<p>When this topic was brought up, consideration was postponed to the 3 Mar 2017 ECUS-SCC meeting where deliberation on this topic had been documented to this point. The interested reader is directed to the 3 Mar 2017 ECUS-SCC minutes for the details.</p>		
<p>Governance Calendar 2017-2018</p> <p>Chavonda Mills</p>	<p><u>2 Dec 2016</u></p> <p><i>Chavonda Mills noted that one of the annually recurring ECUS tasks is the preparation of the governance calendar, and that the university senate bylaws call for completion by 1 April. Recent practice has been</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>to inform the drafting of the calendar with a consultation of the university senate at its February meeting, and</i> • <i>to have the university senate officers serve as the ECUS subcommittee to draft the calendar for ECUS review.</i> 		

Chavonda Mills recommended continuation of recent practice, specifically that

- *the current university senate officers (Presiding Officer Chavonda Mills, Presiding Officer Elect Nicole DeClouette, Secretary Craig Turner) serve as the ECUS subcommittee to draft the 2017-2018 Governance Calendar for review by ECUS at its 3 Feb 2017 meeting, and*
- *review of the draft calendar by the university senate at its 17 Feb 2017 meeting.*

All who were present at this meeting supported this recommendation.

3 Feb 2017

Craig Turner reported on behalf of the work group (Chavonda Mills, Nicole DeClouette, Craig Turner) that a draft of the 2017-2018 Governance Calendar had been circulated with the meeting agenda. This draft included

- *the designated governance meetings (department, college, university senate committees, executive committee with standing committee chairs, university senate) for the common meeting blocks (2:00p – 3:15p and 3:30p – 4:45p) on Fridays. These placements were done quite similarly to the 2016-2017 governance calendar adjusting for a change in relative position of the February State of the University Address.*
- *a note to indicate the inclusion of graduate council meetings is being explored by Chavonda Mills who is consulting with Costas Spirou*

- *other events historically advertised on the calendar – coded in red type in the current draft – are under review in the office of academic affairs, these events include assessment meetings, new faculty orientation sessions, first year convocation, common reader discussions, faculty contract start/end dates, and celebration of faculty/ staff excellence.*

Costas Spirou acknowledged that consultation of the addition of the graduate council dates was ongoing and that Lori Westbrook would be emailing Craig Turner regarding the events coded in red.

No proposed changes to the common meeting block designations were offered from those present and all present were in agreement that the draft calendar would undergo reviews by

- *standing committee chairs at the ECUS-SCC meeting on 3 Feb 2017*
- *university senators at the university senate meeting on 17 Feb 2017*

Finally it was noted that university senate bylaws call for completion of this calendar no later than 1 April.

Note: During the preparation of these minutes, the ECUS secretary notes that review by the deans and department chairs of academic units (colleges and library) is ongoing and being facilitated by Provost Brown.

3 Mar 2017

Chavonda Mills reported that the only pending unresolved matter on the DRAFT 2017-2018 Governance Calendar had been resolved. The Human Resources session for New Faculty Orientation will occur during one of the half day sessions slated for 1 Aug 2017, 2 Aug

	<p>2017, 3 Aug 2017 or 4 Aug 2017 and thus can be removed from 16 Aug 2017.</p> <p>On behalf of Provost Brown, Interim Associate Provost Costas Spirou confirmed that there was not any substantive feedback that required further consideration received from the review of the 2017-2018 Governance Calendar by deans and department chairs.</p> <p>Chavonda Mills noted that the DRAFT 2017-2018 Governance Calendar was ready for consideration to adopt by ECUS for publication to the university senate website.</p> <p>A <u>MOTION</u> to adopt the DRAFT 2016-2017 Governance Calendar as amended (cull Human Resources session from 16 Aug 2017) for publication to the university senate website was made, seconded and approved with no further discussion and no dissenting voice.</p> <p>Chavonda Mills noted her intent to share the final 2017-2018 Governance Calendar with the university senate as an information item at its 17 Mar 2017 meeting.</p>		
--	---	--	--

Policy Updates

Chavonda Mills

2 Dec 2016

Issue ECUS considered a query regarding the process for ensuring existing university policies are in compliance with USG/BoR policy when USG/BoR policies are updated. ECUS noted that the University Compliance/ Policy Officer (presently Sadie Simmons) is the responsible party for ensuring policy compliance and recommends this officer notify the university senate of USG/BoR policy changes. University Senate will present these USG/BoR policy updates as information items as no deliberation is necessary unless it is to contest the policy change.

Proposal ECUS proposed formation of a policy oversight committee to ensure proposed policies are in compliance with external (USG/BoR) as well as existing internal (GC) policies, processes, and procedures. Recommended as committee members were the Policy/ Compliance Officer and representatives from the following: Legal Affairs, Human Resources, Academic Affairs, and Finance and Administration. This committee might also draft policies.

3 Feb 2017

Nicole DeClouette seeded the conversation by summarizing prior ECUS deliberation (see above). When the policy oversight committee was proposed to standing committee chairs on 2 Dec 2016, the reception was not enthusiastic and time had run short at that meeting to fully discuss the matter (The interested reader is directed to the 2 Dec 2016 ECUS-SCC minutes for details.)

Those present were still in favor of the further consideration of this proposal (of establishing

a policy oversight committee) noting that the perspectives of

- *legal review*
- *review for consistency with USG/BoR policy and*
- *review for viability at Georgia College*

would serve to strengthen policy statements and should be performed during the university senate standing committee review of policies, specifically prior to consideration by the university senate.

Recent motions that may have benefitted from such a review include

- *1516.SAPC.002.O adding gender identity and expression to the nondiscrimination statement of the university which was informed by university counsel review from a federal compliance perspective during University President review*
- *1516.FAPC.001.P Faculty and Administrative Emeritus Status and Benefits Policy which ultimately was not recommended by university senate due to a proposed benefit of free parking to emeritus individuals not being viable*

Those present recommended continuing this deliberation with standing committee chairs at the 3 Feb 2017 ECUS-SCC meeting.

3 Mar 2017

Chavonda Mills noted the Emergency Procedures motion under consideration by APC was another item for which consultation with a policy committee may be pertinent.

Those present recommended continuing this deliberation with standing committee chairs at the 3 Mar 2017 ECUS-SCC meeting.

VII. New Business Actions/Recommendations			
University Senate Composition Chavonda Mills	<p>Chavonda Mills shared some information on proposals that had come to her attention regarding the composition of the university senate.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One proposal was to sunset and discontinue SoCC due to its activity being perceived to be significantly less lately than historically. There was pushback to this proposal and a recommendation not to propose the sunset of SoCC was proposed, seconded and adopted. The rationale for this is that the amount of activity for any committee waxes and wanes and that is not a sufficient reason to sunset the committee. 2. The identification of the tension between the number of elected faculty senators and the number of elected faculty senator positions was noted with recent practice being to find an elected faculty senator on SoCC willing to also serve on CAPC to meet the bylaws requirements pertinent to elected faculty senators. At present, Mary Magoulick is serving on both SoCC and CAPC. Ideas that were considered to relieve this tension included <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the addition of an at-large elected faculty senator that would be open only to lecturers and senior lecturers. As this would require some bylaws changes to the eligibility requirements for all elected faculty senator, it was proposed, seconded and adopted that this matter receive further consideration at the 2017 Governance Retreat. b. that the university senate be reduced in size from fifty to forty. This proposal 		

	<p>received no significant support and was quickly dismissed.</p> <p>c. that the minimum number of elected faculty .senators on SoCC be reduced from three to two. It was noted that this was in compliance with the bylaw requiring a minimum of two university senators on a permanent subcommittee. A MOTION to propose that the minimum number of elected faculty .senators on SoCC be reduced from three to two as a bylaws non-editorial revision motion to the university senate was made, seconded and adopted with no dissenting voice. Chavonda Mills agreed to draft the motion and enter it into the online motion database for committee review.</p>		
<p>Certificates of Recognition</p> <p>Chavonda Mills</p>	<p>Chavonda Mills noted her intent to have the certificates for nonsenators serving on committees delivered to the 31 Mar 2017 committee meetings and other certificates for leaders (officers and ECUS members) and outgoing senators (those completing their term of service in April 2017) distributed at the 21 Apr 2017 university senate meeting. It was noted that the online databases have a recognition report to identify those individuals to whom a certificate should be awarded. Chavonda Mills noted that Shea Council will assist in the preparation of these recognition certificates.</p>		
<p>2017-2018 University Senate</p> <p>Nicole DeClouette</p>	<p>A review of the status of the preparations for the 2017-2018 university senate was provided by Nicole DeClouette.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elected Faculty Senators (37) all done • Selected Staff Senators (4) and Staff Council Appointees (2) in progress. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selected Student Senators (2) and Student Government Association Appointees (2) in progress. • Committee preference survey to elected faculty senators in preparation. • Committee volunteer survey to corps of instruction in preparation. • Nominees for university senate officers will be informed by elected faculty senator committee preference survey. • Presidential Appointees (5) in progress. • Chief Officer Appointees (6) in progress • The identification of nominees for university senate representatives to serve on university-wide committees deferred to Fall 2017. • Identifying voting proxies (if needed) and facilitators for officer voting at the organizational meetings of university senate committees was deferred to 31 Mar 2017 meeting of ECUS. 		
<p>Governance Retreat</p> <p>Nicole DeClouette</p>	<p>a. <u>Contract.</u> The contract was sent to Legal Affairs on 2 March 2017. Once it is returned to me, I will sign it and send it to Shea Council to request the \$200 deposit.</p> <p>b. <u>Materials.</u> There are 13 binders left over from last year. I will ask Shea to order 50 more of the small binders and 10 of the larger binders for ECUS members. I will also ask her to order 65 sets of dividers. Is there anything else that needs to be ordered for the retreat? It was noted that there were more notebooks in the supplies so that it was likely fewer would need to be ordered. Nicole DeClouette agreed to take notebook inventory before placing the order.</p> <p>c. <u>Retreat Planning Committee Members:</u> Nicole DeClouette (committee chair),</p>		

	others? Chavonda Mills, John Swinton, and Craig Turner volunteered to serve on the governance retreat planning committee.		
ECUS Annual Report	Chavonda Mills agreed to draft the ECUS annual report for committee review.		
Chavonda Mills			
VIII. Next Meeting (Tentative Agenda, Calendar)			
1. Calendar	17 Mar 2017 @ 3:30pm Univ. Senate A&S 2-72 31 Mar 2017 @ 2:00pm ECUS in 301 Parks 31 Mar 2017 @ 3:30pm ECUS-SCC in 301 Parks		
2. Tentative Agenda	Some of the deliberation today may have generated tentative agenda items for future ECUS and ECUS-SCC meetings.		Chavonda Mills to ensure that such items (if any) are added to agendas of an ECUS and/or ECUS-SCC meeting in the future.
IX. Adjournment	As there was no further business to consider, a MOTION to adjourn the meeting was made and seconded.	The motion to adjourn was approved and the meeting 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: CHAVONDA MILLS (CHAIR), NICOLE DECLOUETTE (VICE-CHAIR), CRAIG TURNER (SECRETARY)

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-2017

AGGREGATE MEMBER ATTENDANCE AT COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THE ACADEMIC YEAR:

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

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

Acronyms	EFS = Elected Faculty Senator; CoAS = College of Arts & Sciences, CoB = College of Business; CoE = College of Education; CoHS = College of Health Sciences										
	Meeting Dates	09-02-16	10-07-16	11-04-16	12-02-16	02-03-17	03-03-17	03-31-17	Present	Regrets	Absent
Kelli Brown <i>Provost</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	R	R			0	2	0
Nicole DeClouette <i>EFS; CoE; ECUS Vice-Chair</i>	N/A	P	P	R	P	P			4	1	0
Steve Dorman <i>University President</i>	N/A	R	P	P	P	R			3	2	0
Chavonda Mills <i>EFS; CoAS; ECUS Chair</i>	N/A	P	P	P	R	P			4	1	0
Costas Spirou <i>Interim Provost</i>	N/A	P	P	P	N/A	N/A	N/A		3	0	0
Susan Steele <i>EFS; CoHS; ECUS Member</i>	N/A	P	P	R	R	P			3	2	0
John R. Swinton <i>EFS; CoB; ECUS Chair Emeritus</i>	N/A	P	P	P	P	P			5	0	0
Craig Turner <i>EFS; CoAS; ECUS Secretary</i>	N/A	P	P	P	P	P			5	0	0
Shaundra Walker <i>EFS; Library; ECUS Member</i>	N/A	P	P	P	P	P			5	0	0

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