

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

MEETING DATE & TIME: 31 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)
R	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 2:17pm by Chavonda Mills (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 3 Mar 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.	The minutes of the 3 Mar 2017 Executive Committee meeting were approved as circulated, so the only additional action required was their posting.	
IV. Reports	The following reports were invited.		
Presiding Officer Report	<u>Monthly Meeting of Presiding Officer with Provost</u> for March was cancelled due to		

<p>Chavonda Mills</p>	<p>Provost Brown’s attendance at a conference. The April meeting is scheduled to take place on 17 Apr 2017.</p> <p><u>Followed-up with Dean Sandra Gangstead and Dr. Lisa Griffin</u> regarding deactivation of outdoor education proposal and shared that there is a possibility university senate will consider a motion related to the proposal at its 21 Apr 2017 meeting. Dean Gangstead requested an opportunity to address the university senate if a motion comes to the university senate floor.</p> <p><u>Liberal Arts Council (LAC)</u> representative Cara Smith has requested time to present the LAC implementation plan as an information item to the university senate at its 21 Apr 2017 meeting.</p> <p><u>GC’s OneUSG Connect</u> representative Carol Ward has requested time to address the university senate at its 21 Apr 2017 meeting.</p> <p><i>Note: ECUS Members recommended this report be provided at the organizational meeting of the 2017-2018 university senate.</i></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>Although Nicole DeClouette had extended regrets as she was attending the USG Faculty Council meeting today, she submitted a written report for inclusion in these minutes to report on the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Governance Retreat at Rock Eagle</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Contract</u> was routed from Legal Affairs to the Finance & Administration Office. Nicole emailed Terri Camp at Rock Eagle to let her know to hold our reservation for 15 Aug 2017. 		

	<p>b. <u>Materials</u>. Nicole has 13 binders and Chavonda has 10 binders. Nicole has asked Shea to order:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. 40 blue binders ii. 10 green binders (for ECUS members) iii. 65 sets of dividers iv. Is there anything else that needs to be ordered for the retreat? <i>There were no suggested items.</i> <p>c. <u>Planning Committee</u>: the following individuals have volunteered to serve on the governance retreat planning committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Nicole DeClouette (chair) ii. Chavonda Mills iii. John Swinton iv. Craig Turner <p>Nicole sent out an email request to senators, staff, appointees, students, and volunteers on 29 Mar 2017 calling for volunteers to serve on the planning committee.</p> <p>2. <u>USG Faculty Council</u> is meeting today, 31 Mar 2017, at the USG Office in Atlanta. Nicole is in attendance.</p>		
Secretary Report Craig Turner	Craig Turner indicated that he had nothing to report as University Senate Secretary.		
Library Senator Report Shaundra Walker	Shaundra Walker indicated that she had nothing to report as the Elected Faculty Senator from the Library serving on ECUS.		
V. Information Items Actions/Recommendations			
University Senate Budget Chavonda Mills	<p><u>7 Oct 2016</u></p> <p>1. <u>Balance</u> <i>The balance of the university senate budget (\$5000 allocation annually) is presently holding at \$1711.24.</i></p>		<p><u>7 Oct 2016</u></p> <p>1. <i>Chavonda Mills to explore the viability of the establishment of a</i></p>

2. **Expenditures** *The total cost for the 2016 governance retreat was \$3288.76, breaking down as follows.*
 - a. *Rock Eagle \$2077.00*
 - b. *Printing \$425.90*
 - c. *Supplies and Materials \$412.19*
 - d. *Transportation \$373.67*
3. **Foundation Account** *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.*

4 Nov 2016

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

ECUS Deliberation

- a. **Restrictions** *It was noted that while foundation accounts can be used for food items, one has to be attentive to the set of restrictions on the use of foundation funds. Chavonda Mills was*

foundation account for the university senate and report back (the pros and cons and best practices) to the Executive Committee.

4 Nov 2016

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

3 Mar 2017

1. *Chavonda Mills did consult with Monica Starley and/or Kathy Waers to learn the restrictions on the use of foundation monies.*
2. *Chavonda Mills will take the actions*

	<p><i>advised to consult with Monica Starley and/or Kathy Waers on these restrictions.</i></p> <p>b. <u>An Option for SCCP</u> <i>It was noted that establishing a foundations account would allow employees to contribute to this account as part of the State Charitable Contributions Program (SCCP).</i></p> <p>c. <u>AAUP</u> <i>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.</i></p> <p>d. <u>Enticing Donors</u> <i>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.</i></p> <p>e. <u>Establish a Foundation Account</u> <i>Those present recommended that Chavonda Mills complete the form and take the actions necessary to establish a university senate foundation account.</i></p> <p><u>2 Dec 2016</u></p> <p>1. <u>Balance</u> <i>The balance of the university senate budget (\$5000 allocation annually) is presently holding at \$1711.24.</i></p> <p>2. <u>Expenditures</u> <i>Pending expenditures are the reimbursements for travel expenses</i></p>		<p><i>necessary to establish a foundation account for the university senate.</i></p> <p><u>31 Mar 2017.</u> Chavonda Mills is taking the actions necessary to establish a foundation account for the university senate.</p>
--	--	--	---

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.*
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.*
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.*

31 Mar 2017

1. **Foundation Account** for university senate is under review by Kim Taylor, University Advancement. Chavonda Mills noted her intent to follow up on this matter and pass it on to Nicole DeClouette if the establishment of the foundation account does not occur during the 2016-2017 university senate term.
2. **Balance** The balance of the university senate budget (\$5000 allocation annually)

	is presently \$1454.25 . Anticipated expenditures include some pertaining to the governance retreat (retreat site deposit and supporting office supplies) and reimbursement of attendance expenditures to Nicole DeClouette for the 31 Mar 2017 USG Faculty Council meeting. If you have recommendations on how these funds should be allocated, contact Chavonda Mills		
VI. Unfinished Business Review of Action & Recommendations, Provide updates (if any) to Follow-up			
Review of Tasks Requiring Follow-up from the 2015- 2016 ECUS Annual Report Chavonda Mills	<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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <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. 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> <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</i> 		<p><u>7 Oct 2016</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Shaundra Walker to gather contextual information to inform the ongoing GC Story Archivist deliberation.</i> <i>Chavonda Mills to explore the viability of the establishment of a foundation account for the university senate and report back (the pros and cons and best practices) to the Executive Committee.</i> <p><u>4 Nov 2016</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Shaundra Walker did gather contextual information to inform the ongoing GC Story Archivist deliberation.</i>

	<p>consultation with ECUS Chair Chavonda Mills. Plans include electronic implementation in coordination with IT personnel.</p> <p>3. <u>Regular Review of the PPPM</u> 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</p> <p>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</p> <p>b. adoption of the university senate policy template as a template for entries in the PPPM going forward.</p> <p>Those present supported these ideas.</p> <p>4. <u>GC Story Archivist</u> This item was on the agenda of each meeting of the 2015-2016 ECUS and was recommended for ongoing consideration by the 2016-2017 ECUS. Shaudra Walker noted the recent hiring of a Digital Archivist and agreed to gather contextual information pertinent to this matter to inform future ECUS deliberation.</p> <p>5. <u>Feasibility of Foundation Account for the University Senate</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)</p>		<p>2. 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.</p> <p>3. 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.</p> <p><u>2 Dec 2016</u> Chavonda Mills did pass the template for SCC reports at ECUS-SCC meetings on to the SCCs.</p>
--	---	--	--

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

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

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

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

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

4 Nov 2016

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

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

	<p><i>digital archivist document events that occur on campus as they are archived. The university historian reviews this documented events as artifacts and might select one or more for inclusion in the history of the university.</i></p> <p><i>All present agreed that this completes ECUS deliberation of a GC Story Archivist</i></p> <p>2. <u>Details in Standing Committee Chair Reports for ECUS-SCC Meetings</u> <i>At the 7 Oct 2016 ECUS meeting, Susan Steele had offered to prepare a template to guide the content of a report by each Standing Committee Chair (SCC) to the participants of the ECUS-SCC meetings. This template is available in the supporting documents attached to these minutes. The first review of the draft was “Brilliant!” and “Inspired!” Others concurred with this assessment. The recommendation of those present was to share the template with the standing committee chairs and for implementation to commence at the 2 Dec 2016 ECUS-SCC meeting. After a bit more discussion, it was agreed that this template – as appropriately modified – will also serve as a guide for the preparation of reports to university senate by university senate representatives serving on university-wide committees, task forces, and other groups.</i></p>		
<p>University Senate Procedures if Proposal under Standing Committee Review is Denied</p> <p>Chavonda Mills Craig Turner</p>	<p><u>2 Dec 2016</u> <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</i></p>		

In Feb 2017, Parsed Into

- Appeals
- Committee Scopes

that matter, and thus in effect prevent the consideration of the matter by the full university senate.

It was noted that the pertinent university senate bylaw was

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

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

by the university senate. So at present, in some cases the disapproval of a standing committee MIGHT be the final consideration (and thus effectively end consideration) of a matter by the university senate.

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

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

END NOTE

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

1) While the official standing of a recently emerging curricular flowchart document is uncertain, it offers guidance pertinent to the question. Specifically, in the subtitle above the flowchart, it reads A denial at any approval point either stops this process or moves it to an appeal. Those present did not find particular details on venues of appeal articulated in this curricular document.

- | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>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></p> <p>3) <i>The absence of an appeal process may also be a point of tension. ECUS subcommittee consisting of Interim Provost Spirou, John Swinton, and Craig Turner was formed and this subcommittee was charged to draft language for appeal processes. Initially this might be considered with respect to the curricular flowchart that recently emerged as well as for decisions of the standing committees of the university senate.</i></p> <p>4) <i>In the consideration of curricular matters, faculty have primacy in the curricular</i></p> | | |
|--|---|--|--|

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

1. **Committee Scopes:** *Craig Turner indicated there was no new information on this item.*
2. **Appeal Process** *Three brief conversation points were addressed.*
 - 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*

	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>c. It was agreed to continue deliberation at the ECUS-SCC meeting at 3:30pm on 3 Mar 2017.</i></p> <p><u>31 Mar 2017</u> The only point of deliberation on this item (“appeals”) was noting that a language change to the university senate bylaws (articulating more explicitly duties of committees) may be an appropriate way to proceed. It was noted that deliberation would continue at the governance retreat.</p>		
<p>Governance Calendar 2017-2018</p> <p>Chavonda Mills</p>	<p><u>2 Dec 2016</u> <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> <p><i>Chavonda Mills recommended continuation of recent practice, specifically that</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>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</i> 		

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 2017, 3 Aug 2017 or 4 Aug 2017 and thus can be removed from 16 Aug 2017.

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.

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.

*A **MOTION** 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.*

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.

31 Mar 2017

Chavonda Mills noted that she had received a request from Veronica Womack to add an Inclusive Excellence Day on Mon 14 Aug 2017 to the 2017-2018 Governance Calendar. The anticipation was a format comparable to the existing assessment day.

Question: Will attendance be required of faculty? The response was that this would be comparable to the President's Welcome Back Breakfast and Assessment Day and the faculty would be encouraged to attend. Some noted their departments or colleges might require attendance.

*A **MOTION** to add an Inclusive Excellence Day on Mon 14 Aug 2017 to the 2017-2018 Governance Calendar requesting guidance on the exact text from Veronica Womack was made, seconded and adopted with no dissenting voice.*

<p>Policy Updates</p> <p>Chavonda Mills</p>	<p><u>2 Dec 2016</u></p> <p><u>Issue</u> <i>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.</i></p> <p><u>Proposal</u> <i>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.</i></p> <p><u>3 Feb 2017</u></p> <p><i>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.)</i></p> <p><i>Those present were still in favor of the further consideration of this proposal (of establishing</i></p>		
---	---	--	--

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.

	<p><u>31 Mar 2017</u> Chavonda Mills noted that a compromise proposal had come to her attention since the 3 Mar 2017 ECUS meeting. This proposal was to require each proposed policy to be reviewed by the Policy Officer of the University (presently Sadie Simmons) prior to submission to the online motion database. It was noted that this Policy Officer might choose to consult with other university personnel to inform the review of the policy. Those present recommended continuing this deliberation with the offering of this proposal to the standing committee chairs at the 31 Mar 2017 ECUS-SCC meeting.</p>		
<p>University Senate Composition Chavonda Mills</p>	<p><u>3 Mar 2017</u> <i>Chavonda Mills shared some information on proposals that had come to her attention regarding the composition of the university senate.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>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.</i> <i>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</i> 		

CAPC. Ideas that were considered to relieve this tension included

- 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 received no significant support and was quickly dismissed.
- 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.

31 Mar 2017

Chavonda Mills noted the ongoing tension between the number of elected faculty senators and the number of elected faculty senator positions on committees. While the proposed

	<p>bylaws revisions (reducing the minimum number of elected faculty senators on SoCC from three to two) will partially relieve this tension, it will not eliminate it.</p> <p>Some ways to eliminate this tension are to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Add one or more elected faculty senator positions to the university senate. 2) Reduce the minimum number of elected faculty senators required on standing committees (APC, CAPC, FAPC, RPIPC, SAPC) <p>It was noted that item 2 was not explicitly included in the request (made earlier in this academic year) for committees to review the composition language in the university senate bylaws.</p> <p>It was also noted that a proposal that is pertinent to university senate composition is to designate a university senate position to be filled exclusively by a lecturer or a senior lecturer.</p> <p>The deliberation on this agenda item (university senate composition) is expected to continue at the governance retreat.</p>		
<p>Certificates of Recognition</p> <p>Chavonda Mills</p>	<p><u>3 Mar 2017</u></p> <p><i>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</i></p>		

	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><u>31 Mar 2017</u> Certificates for committee officers who were not also university senators as well as volunteers and appointees were delivered to standing committee chairs for distribution on 31 Mar 2017. Outgoing senators and leaders (committee officers and university senate officers who are also serving on the university senate as well as ECUS members) will receive their certificates at the final meeting of the 2016-2017 university senate, which will occur on 21 Apr 2017.</p>		
<p>ECUS Annual Report</p> <p>Chavonda Mills</p>	<p><u>3 Mar 2017</u> <i>Chavonda Mills agreed to draft the ECUS annual report for committee review.</i></p> <p><u>31 Mar 2017</u> Chavonda Mills noted her intention to draft the ECUS annual report and circulate the draft for committee review at least a week before its due date. The due date is Wed 3 May 2017..</p>		
<p>VII. New Business Actions/Recommendations</p>			
<p>ECUS Composition</p> <p>Chavonda Mills</p>	<p>The committee discussed the recommendation that elected faculty senator membership of ECUS be only university senate officers and standing committee chairs. Two concerns about the implementation of this change were dominance by CoAS as majority of standing committee chairs reside in that college, and the perception of the committee serving as a “superior” committee to standing committees.</p>		

	<p>There was also discussion as to the benefit of the recommended committee composition as most ECUS members present saw none. There was a brief discussion regarding ECUS' functioning as a steering and advisory committee as opposed to making executive decisions. Those present at the ECUS meeting recommended that ECUS should continue to operate in its current form as it appears to have worked well since the inception of the university senate.</p>		
<p>USG Faculty Council Second Representative</p> <p>Chavonda Mills</p>	<p>Chavonda Mills noted that the call for nominations to the elected faculty senator seat on the USG Faculty Council was unanswered, i.e. there were no nominations. She sought committee guidance on next steps. It was recommended that another call for nominations be issues during the 2017-2018 university senate term. This recommendation was adopted with no dissenting voice.</p>		
<p>Removal of Oversight of Curriculum from Senate</p> <p>Chavonda Mills</p>	<p>Chavonda Mills noted that at the 3 Mar 2017 ECUS-SCC meeting, Provost Brown had requested that this item be added to the agenda of the next ECUS meeting. The first question was an inquiry for the specific details of this proposal. As Provost Brown had extended regrets for this meeting and was not in attendance and no one in the room was able to provide any information to answer this question, a recommendation was made to postpone consideration of this proposal to the 2017 governance retreat. This recommendation was adopted with no dissenting voice.</p>		
<p>VIII. Next Meeting (Tentative Agenda, Calendar)</p>			
<p>1. Calendar</p>	<p>21 Apr 2017 @ 2:00pm Univ. Senate A&S 2-72</p>		

	21 Apr 2017 @ 3:30pm Organizational meeting of the 2017-2018 University Senate in A&S 2-72 28 Apr 2017 @ 2:00pm Organizational meetings of committees of the 2017-2018 University Senate		
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 recommendations to the 2017-2018 ECUS as items in the 2016-2017 ECUS annual report.
IX. Adjournment	As there was no further business to consider, a <u>MOTION</u> 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	R		0	3	0
Nicole DeClouette <i>EFS; CoE; ECUS Vice-Chair</i>	N/A	P	P	R	P	P	R		4	2	0
Steve Dorman <i>University President</i>	N/A	R	P	P	P	R	R		3	3	0
Chavonda Mills <i>EFS; CoAS; ECUS Chair</i>	N/A	P	P	P	R	P	P		5	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	P		4	2	0
John R. Swinton <i>EFS; CoB; ECUS Chair Emeritus</i>	N/A	P	P	P	P	P	P		6	0	0
Craig Turner <i>EFS; CoAS; ECUS Secretary</i>	N/A	P	P	P	P	P	P		6	0	0
Shaundra Walker <i>EFS; Library; ECUS Member</i>	N/A	P	P	P	P	P	P		6	0	0

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