COMMITTEE NAME: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE (ECUS) WITH STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIRS
MEETING DATE & TIME: 3 MARCH 2017; 3:30 –4:45
MEETING LOCATION: PARKS ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, ROOM 301
ATTENDANCE:

MEMBERS		"P" denotes Present, "A" denotes Absent, "R" denotes Regrets	
P	Alex Blazer (CoAS, FAPC Chair)	R	Carol Sapp (CoHS, APC Chair)
P	Jan Hoffmann Clark (CoAS, RPIPC Chair)	P	Kelli Brown (Provost)
P	Nicole DeClouette (CoE, ECUS Vice-Chair)	P	Susan Steele (CoHS, ECUS Member)
R	Steve Dorman (University President)	P	John R. Swinton (CoB, ECUS Chair Emeritus)
P	Heidi Fowler (CoHS, SAPC Chair)	P	Craig Turner (CoAS, ECUS Secretary)
P	Chavonda Mills (CoAS, ECUS Chair)	P	Shaundra Walker (Library, ECUS Member)
P	Lyndall Muschell (CoE, CAPC Chair)		

GUESTS	
Mike Gleason (APC Vice-Chair)	
Mary Magoulick (SoCC Chair)	
Costas Spirou (Interim Associate Provost)	

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

AGENDA TOPIC	DISCUSSIONS & CONCLUSIONS	ACTION OR RECOMMENDATIONS	FOLLOW-UP {including dates/responsible person, status (pending, ongoing, completed)}
I. Call to Order	The meeting was called to order at 3:31 pm 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 with Standing Committee Chairs* 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 3 Feb 2017 Executive Committee with Standing Committee Chairs meeting minutes were approved as posted, so no additional action was required.	
IV. Reports			
President's Report President Dorman	As President Dorman had extended *Regrets* and was unable to attend this meeting, there was no President's Report.		
Provost's Report Provost Kelli Brown	Provost Brown indicated that she had nothing to report as Provost.		
Executive Committee of the University Senate (ECUS) **Chavonda Mills**	1. **Motions** ECUS has one motion to submit for university senate consideration at its 17 Mar 2017 meeting proposing a revision to the bylaws, specifically reducing the minimum number of elected faculty senators on SoCC from three to two for its first reading. 2. **Officers** The 2016-17 ECUS officers are Chavonda Mills (Chair), Nicole DeClouette (Vice-Chair) and Craig Turner (Secretary). 3. **Meeting** ECUS met on 3 Mar 2017 from 2:00pm to 3:15pm. The following topics were discussed. a. **PO Report to ECUS** As PO (Presiding Officer) of the university senate, I met with CAPC to discuss their recommendation not to approve the deactivation of Outdoor Education. Following a rich discussion, the recommendation from CAPC was that the proposal should be		

	considered by the university senate acting as a committee of the whole.		
	b. **USGFC spring meeting** will be held on 31 Mar 2017. Please contact Nicole DeClouette if you would like to add an item to the agenda.		
	c. **Governance Calendar for 2017-18** was approved by ECUS and will be presented to the full senate as an information item.		
	d. **Proposal to Establish a Foundation Account for University Senate** is under review by the President's Office and will be submitted to Kim Taylor at University Advancement once approved. Monica Starley, special assistant to the President, will serve as an authorized signer for the account along with the current US Presiding Officer.		
	e. **Review of Standing Committee Scope and Duties** will continue at 2017 governance retreat.		
	f. **Certificates** for volunteers will be delivered during the final standing committee chairs meeting on 31 Mar 2017. Outgoing senators and officers will receive their certificates at the final senate meeting on 21 Apr 2017.		
Academic Policy Committee (APC) **Mike Gleason** **for** **Carol Sapp**	1. **Motions** APC has one motion to submit for university senate consideration at its 17 Mar 2017 meeting. See item 3.a. 2. **Officers** The 2016-17 APC officers are Carol Sapp (Chair), Mike Gleason (Vice-Chair) and David McIntryre (Secretary). 3. **Meeting** The Academic Policy Committee met on 3 Mar 2017 from		

2:00pm to 3:15pm. The following topics were discussed.

a. **Motion** The motion is to add or amend required syllabus statements to address the emergency action plan and fire drills. The motion is to add the statement "When possible and necessary, provide assistance to those who are in need of help" to replace the current statement "Assist disabled persons and others if possible without endangering your own life."

b. **Online Teaching Needs** APC postponed further discussion of the subcommittee plans to meet with Jeanne Sewell to discuss online teaching and learning issues to determine how APC might help CTL (Center for Teaching and Learning) facilitate teaching/learning process.

c. **Midterm Grades** Four members of the Student Government Association (SGA) were present at the APC meeting. They reported that SGA had just passed a resolution (which is attached to the 3 Mar 2017 ECUS-SCC minutes as a supporting document) proposing to extend the requirement of midterm grade reporting from courses counting in Areas A-E to require midterm grades reported for all undergraduate courses. APC had an extensive discussion on midterm grades and the interested reader is directed to the 3 Mar 2017 APC minutes for additional detail.

| Curriculum and Assessment Policy Committee (CAPC)

Lyndall Muschell | 1. **Motions** CAPC has three motions to submit for university senate consideration at its 17 Mar 2017 meeting. The topics of these motion are provided below in 3.a.
2. **Officers** The 2016-17 CAPC officers are Lyndall Muschell (Chair), Angel Abney (Vice-Chair) and Josie Doss (Secretary).
3. **Meeting** The Curriculum and Assessment Policy Committee met on 3 Mar 2017 from 2:00pm to 3:15pm. The following topics were discussed.
  a. **Motion** The following Action Item was deliberated and voted upon. The result of this vote, documenting CAPC actions, is given below.
    i. New Program Proposal - M.A.T. in Music Education - received unanimous approval
    ii. Deactivation - M.A. in History - received unanimous approval
    iii. Deactivation - Fiber Arts Minor - received unanimous approval
  Each of the approved items will be submitted as a motion to University Senate for deliberation and a vote.
  b. **Information Items** The following information items were shared with CAPC and will be documented in the CAPC minutes.
    i. New Course Proposals
      1) ENGL 5680 - Hip Hop Literature and Culture - An examination of hip hop literature and culture as extensions of traditional black musical and literary expression. | | |

	2) ENGL 4650 - Hip Hop Literature and Culture - This course will work to situate hip hop literature and culture as extension of larger traditions of African America literature and culture. It will demonstrate how hip hop culture can facilitate a simultaneous engagement of various supposed oppositions, such as black/white, male/female, moral/immoral, and less obviously past/present and body/spirit. In doing so, we will also begin to think about how an examination of hip hop culture and literary production can trouble the tendencies to construct boundaries between high/low and/or musical/literary culture. We will utilize a variety of texts including folklore, novels, film and, of course, sonic texts. 3) WMST 4450 - International Women's Literature - This course will focus on international women writers of literary acclaim. We will read contemporary fiction and non-fiction from women from around the world, who set their work in various cultures and heritages (African,		

American, European, and South Asian). We will consider how gender and culture impact the women's writing and the lives of their characters in addition to each work's literary merits. Poetry, stories, films and other supplemental readings may also be assigned as appropriate. Since this course will be run as a seminar, students should come prepared to discuss the readings each day, and each student must pick one assigned reading/writer to research and present/discuss in depth before the class. Students will be evaluated based on a number of written and oral assignments, including short and long essays, a final exam, writings during class meetings, and (in groups) leading the class (a type of presentation) for part of one day. Students will meet with the professor regarding final essay topics.

4) <u>BIOL 4999, 3999, 2999; ENSC 4999, 3999, 2999; PSYC 4999, 3999, 2999 - Undergraduate Research</u> - One successful model in tracking student involvement in UR is a Zero Credit Hour

Course for Undergraduate Research. Purposes for implementing a zero credit hour course are multifold and include, but are not limited to, (a) providing an accurate count of the number of students engaged in UR as a transformative experience, (b) providing faculty with documented enrollment for their annual individual faculty reviews and T&P portfolios, (c) allowing students who'd like to become involved in research but have financial constraints or don't wish to add additional credit hours to their program an opportunity to do so, and (d) sustaining and supporting the culture of UR at GC.

5) THEA 1107 - Electric and Lighting - The third of a three-course certificate program designed specifically to provide students with a basic level of on-set film lighting skills, knowledge and experience with film industry standard organizational structure, professional equipment, and on-set procedures in lighting and electrics.

ii. Certificate Modification - THEA 2007 - On-Set Film Production II -

Credit Hour Change - The Georgia Film Academy of the Board of Regents has asked that THEA 2007 On-Set Film Production II be changed from 12 credits to 6 credits. In accordance with their wishes, we ask on behalf of Georgia College that this credit amount be changed. The 6 credits that this leaves will be fulfilled with other electives which the Georgia Film Academy is creating, such that the overall Film Certificate will still be an 18 credit Certificate as it was originally approved by the Senate at Georgia College.

   iii. <u>Master of Management Information Systems</u>

      1) Change of Course Name - Change the name of MMIS 6296 from Data Base Management to Database Management

      <u>Justification</u> The term data base is no longer accepted in the field as it was years ago when the class was created. The term database is used.

      2) a. Change the catalog description of 6295 to In this course, students learn the fundamentals of IT project management, with a focus on the agile project management framework. Students also learn about issues involved in

the management of the information technology, the overview of communications technology used in various business applications including local area networks, wide area networks, broadband networks, wireless networks, and Internet technologies and protocols.

b. Eliminate 6393 from required classes for MMIS students, replacing this class with an elective

c. Remove 6393 from the list of courses that MMIS students may use to satisfy their degree

Justification We believe the content coverage for project management (MMIS 6393) can be added to MMIS 6295 - IT Infrastructure. This will allow a class content project to also be used as a project management project. We cannot change MMIS 6393 because it is part of the MLSCM program. MMIS students should not be allowed to take 6393 for credit because they are required to take MMIS 6295 (which will now cover most of 6393). The new requirements will be effective Jan. 2017 because MMIS

	6295 will be taught in spring 2017.
	iv. <u>Computer Science Curriculum Changes</u>
	    1) The foreign language requirement will be removed from the CS Major. **Reason**: Most ABET BS in CS programs do not require a foreign language.
	    2) CSCI 3342 Systems and Networking Programming Current Pre-requisite: CSCI 3341 Operating Systems
	Proposed: Pre-requisite CSCI 3341 Operating Systems and CSCI 2350 Programming Language II **Reason**: Programming assignments require knowledge of C/C++ which is taught in CSCI 2350
	    3) CSCI 3211 Assembly Language Current Prerequisite - CSCCI 1302 Proposed: Pre-requisite CSCI 1302 AND Co-requisite CSCI 2350 **Reason**: Knowledge of C/C++ programming is now required which is taught in 2350
	v. <u>Doctor of Nursing Practice</u> - Documentation requested		

revisions to program of study for the Doctor of Nursing Practice Program. This involves the deletion of one course, addition of one new course, modification of eight courses. Modifications include name changes and either addition or reduction of the total number of required clinical hours over the six semesters instead of in the last two semesters of the program. No increase in total credit hours or required clinical hours for the program are being requested.

c. **New Business Items**

    i. At a called meeting (1:15 - 1:45), today, CAPC members met with the Presiding Officer of the University Senate to discuss the committee's votes on the deactivation of the B.S. in Outdoor Education.

    ii. At the request of ECUS, CAPC began a review of the scope of the committee which is currently outlined in the by-laws. Following are points which were discussed:

        1) Listening to concerned constituents (faculty, students, concerned community members, etc.)

        2) Considering greater implications to the university community as a whole

	3) Reviewing, approving, disapproving, and making recommendations 4) Providing a checks and balances system for the process of shared governance iii. CAPC briefly discussed implications and process of the proposed "Appeals" Procedure for Standing Committees.		

Subcommittee on the Core Curriculum (SoCC)
 	
Mary Magoulick
	1. **Motions** SoCC has no motions to submit for university senate consideration at its 17 Mar 2017 meeting.
	2. **Officers** The 2016-17 SoCC officers are Mary Magoulick (Chair), Brandon Samples (Vice-Chair) and Kay Anderson (Secretary).
	3. **Meetings** The following summarizes SoCC activity at its recent meetings.
	   a. **Area B Section Proposals** SoCC encourages anyone wishing to propose Area B sections to submit your proposals as soon as possible, and at least three weeks before registration begins this semester. Please be aware that the routing process has changed slightly, so that now we must receive three signatures before we can review proposals: the Chair's signature, the Dean's signature, and the Associate Provost's signature. All information about our proposal process is on our website: https://intranet.gcsu.edu/socc
	   b. **Area B Forums** SoCC has two forums planned for this semester, one a training session for people interested in teaching in Area B, and one a		

	discussion forum for how Area B is taught:
	i. <u>Training Seminar</u> in Teaching an Area B class, Friday, Feb. 24, 1pm, Library 376
	   1) This will train you how to propose an Area B class.
	   2) Completed: 15 faculty and 7 SOCC members attended.
	ii. <u>Discussion Forum</u> on Teaching in Area B, Friday, March 10, 1pm A&S 2-46 & 2-51
	   1) This will be an opportunity for past, current and future Area B teachers to meet and discuss teaching methods, concepts, readings, class sessions, assessment, etc.
	c. **Question** Is SoCC to review its composition as a committee and report back its recommendations?
	Answer Yes, please do.		

Faculty Affairs Policy Committee (FAPC) **Alex Blazer**	a. **Motions** FAPC has one motion to submit for consideration by the university senate at its 17 Mar 2017 meeting. The topic of this motion is provided below in 3.a. b. **Officers** The 2016-17 FAPC officers are Alex Blazer (Chair), Tom Toney (Vice-Chair) and David Johnson (Secretary). c. **Meeting** The Faculty Affairs Policy Committee met on 3 Mar 2017 from 2:00pm to 3:15pm and the following items were discussed. a. **Promotion and Tenure Issue** The Committee is sending a motion to university senate proposing the amendment of the		

tenure and promotion policies regarding the ability of faculty members to respond to tenure and promotion recommendations by committees, chairs, and deans. Specifically, the Committee voted unanimously to

1) remove the conditional clauses in the tenure and promotion policies stating that faculty can only respond to a recommendation if the recommendation is against tenure and promotion and

2) change the policy language to faculty member *may* respond to a recommendation within 10 calendar days.

b. **Peer Teaching Evaluation** The peer teaching evaluation work group provided a report and tentative recommendation that the Committee will consider next meeting. The work group envisions a 2017-2018 pilot program in which two faculty from every college will train with CTL (Center for Teaching and Learning) in the fall and those individuals will evaluate new teachers within their first three years of teaching at Georgia College for formative purposes. At the end of spring, there will be an evaluation of the pilot program. At first, the peer teaching evaluation will be in the form of

helping new teachers; at some point it may evolve into helping struggling professors. A question was raised about the two person evaluator teams (one from CTL and one from the department) that were discussed in previous meetings. The Committee will discuss the work group's final recommendation at its next meeting.

c. **Student Opinion Survey** The student opinion survey work group reported useful aspects of student feedback and problems with the current instrument. The work group made two recommendations to the Committee, which are consistent with Dr. Alby's recommendations from our February meeting:

1) use a shorter in-house survey and

2) mandating instructors set aside 10 minutes of class time in the last three weeks of the semester to complete the survey.

A concern was raised about the legal reliability of an in-house survey in faculty performance evaluations. The Committee will discuss the recommendations at its next meeting.

d. **Five-Year Review of Academic Administrators**: Dr. Brown, Provost, talked with the Committee about the Five-Year

	Administrative Review process and shared that it is a long and arduous process that does not include much faculty input, perhaps because of fears of lack of anonymity. Moreover, the review committee's ability to solicit feedback is limited and its questioning might contain bias. Dr. Brown would like feedback from the Committee on the use of an external reviewing company such as Talent Quest and IDEAS that provides a 360 review of administrators seeking anonymous evaluative input from faculty under their supervision, their peers (for instance, other chairs), their deans, and other colleagues with whom the administrator regularly works. This would make the Five-Year Review easier for Academic Affairs to manage, and the evaluations would be more effective, useful, and comprehensive. She would also like to work with the Committee to streamline the process from a year long timetable to a spring evaluation time frame. The Committee will discuss Dr. Brown's proposal. : e. **Scope** The Committee will consider its scope during its next meeting.		

Resources, Planning and Institutional Policy Committee (RPIPC)
 	
Jan Hoffmann Clark
	1. **Motions** RPIPC has one motion to submit for university senate consideration at its 17 Mar 2017 meeting. See 3.b.
	2. **Officers** The 2016-17 RPIPC officers are Jan Hoffmann Clark (Chair), Susan C. Allen (Vice-Chair) and Emily Gomez (Secretary).
	3. **Meetings** The Resources, Planning and Institutional Policy Committee met on 3 Mar 2017 from 2:00pm to 3:15pm and the following items were discussed.
	   a. **Apologies** to all for being absent at the previous University Senate meeting and not providing the RPIPC report to the full senate.
	   b. **Parking (Motion)** RPIPC will try to bring a motion on parking allocation policy to the full senate on 17 Mar 2017 assuming that RPIPC committee members vote electronically within the necessary timeline to approve the proposed motion for consideration.
	   c. **Scope and Composition** RPIPC will put a discussion about its bylaws scope and composition on the 31 March 2017 committee meeting agenda.		

Student Affairs Policy Committee (SAPC) **Heidi Fowler**	1. **Motions** SAPC has no motions to submit for university senate consideration at its 17 Mar 2017 meeting. 2. **Officers** The 2016-17 SAPC officers are Heidi Fowler (Chair), Ben McMillan (Vice-Chair) and Simplice Tchamna-Kouna (Secretary).		

	3. **Meeting** The Student Affairs Policy Committee was scheduled to meet on 3 Mar 2017 from 2:00pm to 3:15pm. a. **No Meeting** SAPC did not have a quorum present for our meeting, therefore we did not meet in an official capacity and thus SAPC has nothing to report.		

Subcommittee on Nominations (SCoN)
 	
Nicole DeClouette
	1. **Motions** SCoN has no motions to submit for university senate consideration at its 17 Mar 2017 meeting.
	2. **Officers** The 2016-17 SCoN officers are Nicole DeClouette (Chair), (No Vice-Chair position) and Craig Turner (Secretary).
	3. **Report** Recent Activity of SCoN Chair Nicole DeClouette and the SCoN is provided below.
	   a. **At-large Election Results** Diana Young was elected.
	     i. Diana Young received 60.38% of the votes
	     ii. Rob Sumowski received 39.62% of the votes
	   b. **Staff** I received the names from the Staff Council Chair on 2 Mar 2017:
	     i. <u>Selected Staff Senators</u>
	       Evita Shinholster (RPIPC)
	       Hayley Dingess (RPIPC)
	       Courtney Manson (RPIPC)
	       Wanda Johnson (SAPC)
	     ii. <u>Committee Seats</u>
	       Bill Doerr (RPIPC)
	       Brenda Deal (SAPC)
	   c. **Students** I emailed Mike Muller the relevant University Senate Bylaws for Student Government Association on 3		

	Mar 2017 .The names are due to ECUS by 31 Mar 2017.
	d. **Surveys**
	   i. I will be sending the request to the Corps of Instruction to complete a committee interest survey to express a willingness to serve on a university senate committee..
	   ii. I will be sending the survey committee preference survey to elected faculty senators
	   iii. Are there any nominations for the Presiding Officer Elect position? No nominations were made.
	e. **USGFC Election Procedures**
	   i. Nominations opened 1 Mar 2017 and will close 15 Mar 2017
	   ii. Voting opens 22 Mar 2017 and closes 29 Mar 2017
	   iii. Results will be announced to the senate no later than 5 Apr 2017		

V. Information Items Actions/Recommendations			
University Senate Budget Chavonda Mills	1. **Balance** The balance of the university senate budget ($5000 allocation annually) is presently **$1454.25**		
Revisions to Committee Composition **Chavonda Mills**	*2 Dec 2016* *Chavonda Mills reminded the standing committee chairs of the request for review of committee composition. Chairs were asked to report whether or not changes were proposed. If so, they were reminded that ECUS is willing to assist in updating pertinent bylaws. To date, ECUS and FAPC have responded with no proposed changes to its composition. Yet to hear from are APC, CAPC, RPIPC, SAPC, SCoN and SoCC. Chairs of these committees*	*2 Dec 2016* *It was noted that this information will inform proposed revisions to the composition of the university senate. With current committee compositions, there is a need for at least one additional elected faculty senator to avoid the need of requesting that an elected faculty senator from SoCC serve on a second committee.*	*2 Dec 2016* *Chavonda Mills to ensure that composition revisions of the university senate and its committees be an agenda item at a future ECUS-SCC meeting.* *3 Feb 2017* *Chavonda Mills did ensure that composition revisions*

	were invited to submit this information by email to Chavonda Mills. **3 Feb 2017** *An update was given to note that to date, APC, CAPC, ECUS, FAPC and SAPC have responded with no proposed changes to its composition. Yet to hear from are RPIPC, SCoN and SoCC. Jan Clark, RPIPC Chair, indicated a need to clarify current RPIPC composition prior to responding on behalf of RPIPC. Due to the shortness of time, this clarification would be made outside this meeting.* **3 Mar 2017** There was no new information on this item and thus still awaiting information from RPIPC, SoCC, and SCoN.		*of the university senate and its committees be an agenda item at a future ECUS-SCC meeting*
VII. New Business Actions/Recommendations			
Steering of Items to Committees **Chavonda Mills**	At the time of this meeting, there were no items that required steering to a committee.		
Annual Committee Reports Due Date and Template **The Due Date was Considered 3 Feb 2017 Nicole DeClouette** **The Template was Considered 3 March 2017 Chavonda Mills**	**3 Feb 2017** *Nicole DeClouette noted that the customary practice is to propose the same relative due date for committee annual reports as the previous year to seed the conversation. This meant a proposed due date of Wed 26 Apr 2017 so that the committee annual reports could be considered at the organizational meetings of committees scheduled for 2:00pm on Fri 28 Apr 2017.* *This proposed due date was met with some resistance and a counterproposal of Wed 3*		**3 Feb 2017** *Chavonda Mills to ensure that the template of committee annual reports receive consideration at a future ECUS-SCC meeting.* **3 Mar 2017** Chavonda Mills did ensure that the template of committee annual reports

	May 2017 emerged from the deliberation. This due date was adopted with no dissenting voice by those present. *Note: During the preparation of these minutes, it is being noted that the template of the annual reports did not receive formal review and approval as called for in university senate bylaws.* **3 Mar 2017** Chavonda Mills noted that the university senate bylaws require annual review of the template for annual reports of committees by standing committee chairs and the members of the executive committee. A **MOTION** *to adopt the existing template with no revisions* was made, seconded and adopted with no discussion and no dissenting voice.		receive consideration at a future ECUS-SCC meeting.
Standing Committee Scopes Review **Craig Turner**	*3 Feb 2017* *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.* *Clarification was sought regarding the charge to the standing committees and brief deliberation (reiterating the language above) provided that clarification.* **3 Mar 2017** This item was not on the 3 Mar 2017 meeting agenda.		
"Appeals" Procedure for Standing Committee Decisions **John R. Swinton**	*3 Feb 2017* *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*		*3 Feb 2017* *Chavonda Mills to ensure that "appeals" of standing committee decisions receive consideration at a future ECUS-SCC meeting.* **3 Mar 2017** Chavonda Mills did ensure that "appeals" of standing committee decisions receive consideration at a future ECUS-SCC meeting.

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. *The work group's proposed handling of the recommendations against stimulated further discussion from the floor. Points of discussion included the following:* • *One perspective was that this allows the university senate to overturn committee recommendations against.* • *A contrasting perspective was that the proposed change in practice would have university senate review both types (for or against) of committee recommendations.* *These two perspectives were reiterated during the continuing deliberation which culminated with no consensus on the work group's proposed handling of recommendation against. One refinement of the statement concerning the University President's role was offered during the deliberation.* • *If the work group proposal on the handling of 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.

Due to the shortness of time, it was recommended that this deliberation continue at a future ECUS-SCC meeting.

3 Mar 2017
A refined proposal was offered to treat a committee recommendation for and a committee recommendation against in a consistent manner unlike what had been proposed at the previous meeting. To be specific, rather than have recommendations against result in an item going to the consent agenda and a recommendation for go into the online motion database, it was proposed that both types of recommendations be entered into the online motion database. The rationale offered was to be consistent in the treatment of either type (for or against) of committee recommendation.

Concern was expressed that this took power away from the committees. Present practice permits committees to come to a recommend against position on an item under review and in effect the item dies in committee. With this

proposal to treat both recommendations (for or against) the same, the committee recommendations against could be overturned by university senate. An observation that recommendations for an item by a committee could presently be overturned by university senate but in practice rarely are. Would there be any reason to expect that recommendations against would be more regularly overturned?

An idea to pilot this practice with CAPC as the piloting committee was to have CAPC review the Outdoor Education Deactivation Proposal once more and bring its recommendation (for or against) to the university senate as a motion entered into the online database. A question of whether there were other ways to bring this item to the university senate was raised. A response was that there could be consideration of the matter as a committee of the whole with a two-thirds majority vote to bypass the usual committee review and act as a committee of the whole as had been done to establish the consent agenda. While there was some support for implementing the committee of the whole option, ultimately the pilot option persisted.

One other conversation point noted that the usual review by committee process of the university senate was attempting to get the item to be considered by the experts on the pertinent committee. A contrasting point of view was noting that just because a committee considers an item, it is not necessarily becoming an expert on the item. Some felt that the committee members who reviewed an

	item would have the most expertise to present the item to the university senate. Others noted that particularly in the context of curricular proposals, there are often discipline experts (department chairs, program coordinators, department faculty) present at the university senate meeting to field questions from the floor of the university senate that could not be adequately answered by the reviewing committee of the university senate. As time was short and there was no consensus on this matter, further consideration was postponed to the 31 Mar 2017 ECUS-SCC meeting.		
Policy Oversight Committee **Chavonda Mills**	***2 Dec 2016 (as part of the ECUS report)*** ***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) polices, processes, and procedures. Recommended as committee members were the Policy/ Compliance Officer and representatives from the*		*2 Dec 2016* *Chavonda Mills to ensure that prior to implementation of a policy committee, the proposal of such a policy committee be brought back to ECUS-SCC for further discussion.* **3 Mar 2017** 1. Chavonda Mills did ensure that prior to implementation of a policy committee, the proposal of such a policy committee be brought back to ECUS-SCC for further discussion. 2. Chavonda Mills to ensure that prior to implementation of a

	following: Legal Affairs, Human Resources, Academic Affairs, and Finance and Administration. This committee might also draft policies. *__ECUS-SCC Deliberation__ There were concerns vocalized about the formation of such a committee and its role. Those concerned felt that the proposed members of this policy committee could be brought in for consultation as needed when policies were being developed by a standing committee (APC, CAPC, FAPC, RPIPC, SAPC). Another concern was including the drafting of policy as a charge to this proposed committee as university policy is within the domain of the university senate. A request was made of Chavonda Mills that prior to implementation of this policy committee, this proposal be brought back to ECUS-SCC for further discussion. Chavonda Mills assured those concerned that this would be done.* **3 Mar 2017** Due to shortness of time at the 3 Feb 2017 ECUS-SCC meeting, this item was postponed to this (3 Mar 2017) ECUS-SCC meeting. Chavonda Mills noted that the Emergency Procedures item that has been under consideration by the Academic Policy Committee was another example of a policy (a required syllabus statement) that would benefit from a policy oversight committee, in this instance a consultation with Anna Lumpkin, Emergency Preparedness and Communications Manager.	policy committee, the proposal of such a policy committee be brought back to ECUS-SCC for further discussion.

	The proposed function of the policy oversight committee was to review draft policies during development by one of the policy-recommending committees (APC, CAPC, FAPC, RPIPC, SAPC) and ensure compliance with state and federal law, compliance with USG / BoR policy and procedure, and feasibility at the university. The proposed membership of this committee was Sadie Simmons (Compliance/Policy Officer) as well as representatives from the following: Legal Affairs, Human Resources, Academic Affairs, and Finance and Administration. There was confusion expressed as to why this needed formalization as a committee and why it could not be implemented by simply calling these individuals into committee meetings. One response was that there is no reason that it couldn't be done that way, yet historically this has not naturally happened so ECUS was proposing more intentionality. This was still not compelling to some who were present at this meeting. Due to the shortness of time, further deliberation on this matter was postponed to the 31 Mar 2017 ECUS-SCC meeting.		

University Senate Agenda and Minutes Review	1. **Tentative Agenda 17 Mar 2017**: Based on the committee reports at this meeting
	  a. **Motions** There will be up to seven motions on the agenda of this meeting of the university senate, specifically
	    i. APC (1)
	      1) Required Syllabus Statement
	    ii. CAPC (3)
		The motion (circulate minutes) was approved.	1. Chavonda Mills to draft the tentative agenda of the university senate meeting.
			2. Motions to be entered into the online motion database by APC (1),

			CAPC (3), ECUS (1), FAPC (1), RPIPC (1).

	1) New Program Proposal - M.A.T. in Music Education
	2) Deactivation - M.A. in History
	3) Deactivation - Fiber Arts Minor
	  iii. ECUS (1)
	    1) Bylaws Revision
	  iv. FAPC (1)
	    1) Promotion and Tenure Issue
	  v. RPIPC (1)
	    1) Parking Policy
	b. **Reports** Administrative reports and committee reports will also be agenda items.
	2. **University Senate Minutes Review**: A **MOTION** *that the DRAFT minutes of the 17 Feb 2017 meeting of the 2016-2017 university senate be circulated for university senator review* was made and seconded.
			3. Craig Turner to circulate the DRAFT of the university senate meeting minutes to university senators for review.

VIII. Next Meeting (Tentative Agenda, Calendar)			
1. Calendar	17 Mar 2017 @ 2:00pm 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 4:57 pm. *Note that there was a motions to extend the meeting, for up to fifteen minutes, allowing the meeting to adjourn as late as 5:00pm.*	

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) WITH STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIRS
COMMITTEE OFFICERS: CHAVONDA MILLS (CHAIR), NICOLE DECLOUETTE (VICE-CHAIR), CRAIG TURNER (SECRETARY)
ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-2017
AGGREGATE ATTENDANCE RECORD FOR MEETINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIRS
"P" denotes Present, "A" denotes Absent, "R" denotes Regrets and "N/A" denotes Not Applicable.
Note: 2 Sep 2016 meeting canceled due to University officially closing (tropical storm)

Acronyms		EFS = Elected Faculty Senator; CoAS = College of Arts & Sciences, CoB = College of Business; CoE = College of Education; CoHS = College of Health Sciences									
Meeting Dates		09-02-16	10-07-16	11-04-16	12-02-16	02-03-17	03-03-17	03-31-17	Present	Regrets	Absent
Nicole DeClouette *EFS; CoE; ECUS Vice-Chair*		N/A	P	P	R	P	P		4	1	0
Steve Dorman *University President*		N/A	R	R	R	R	R		0	5	0
Chavonda Mills *EFS; CoAS; ECUS Chair*		N/A	P	P	P	R	P		4	1	0
Kelli Brown *Provost*		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	R	P		1	1	0
Costas Spirou *Interim Provost*		N/A	P	P	P	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	0	0
Susan Steele *EFS; CoHS; ECUS Member*		N/A	P	P	R	R	P		3	2	0
John R. Swinton *EFS; CoB; ECUS Chair Emeritus*		N/A	P	P	P	P	P		5	0	0
Craig Turner *EFS; CoAS; ECUS Secretary*		N/A	P	P	P	P	P		5	0	0
Shaundra Walker *EFS; Library; ECUS Member*		N/A	P	P	P	P	P		5	0	0
Carol Sapp *EFS; CoHS APC Chair*		N/A	R	P	P	P	R		3	2	0
Lyndall Muschell *EFS; CoE; CAPC Chair*		N/A	P	P	P	P	P		5	0	0
Alex Blazer *EFS; CoAS; FAPC Chair*		N/A	P	R	P	P	P		4	1	0
Jan Hoffmann Clark *EFS; CoAS, RPIPC Chair*		N/A	P	P	P	P	P		5	0	0
Heidi Fowler *EFS; CoHS, SAPC Chair*		N/A	P	P	P	P	P		5	0	0

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