

COMMITTEE NAME: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE (ECUS) WITH STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIRS

MEETING DATE & TIME: 31 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)	P Carol Sapp (CoHS, APC Chair)
P Jan Hoffmann Clark (CoAS, RPIPC Chair)	R Kelli Brown (Provost)
R 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
Mary Magoulick (SoCC Chair)
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 3:30 pm 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 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.	The 3 Mar 2017 Executive Committee with Standing Committee Chairs meeting minutes were approved as circulated, so the only additional action required was their posting.	
IV. Reports			
President's Report President Dorman	As President Dorman had extended <i>Regrets</i> and was unable to attend this meeting, there was no President's Report.		
Provost's Report Interim Associate Provost Costas Spirou for Provost Kelli Brown	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Tenure and Promotion</u> decisions were communicated to the faculty recipients, department chairs and college deans. 2. <u>The Georgia Center for Early Language & Literacy</u> preparations are continuing and the Center will begin its work on 1 July 2017. Dr. Linda Bradley has been named interim executive director while a national search is conducted. 3. <u>Department Chairs Retreat</u> sponsored by the Office of the Provost will take place on 14 Apr 2017. 4. <u>The Celebration of Faculty Scholarship</u> is scheduled for 14 Apr 2017. 		
Subcommittee on Nominations (SCoN) Craig Turner for Nicole DeClouette	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Motions</u> SCoN has one motion to submit for university senate consideration at its 21 Apr 2017 organizational meeting. 2. <u>Officers</u> The 2016-17 SCoN officers are Nicole DeClouette (Chair), (No Vice-Chair position) and Craig Turner (Secretary). 3. <u>Slate of Nominees</u> The slate of nominees for the officers and committees of the 2017-2018 university senate was presented for review by SCoN. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Presidential Appointees received. b. Chief Officer Appointees received. c. Staff and Student senators and appointees received. d. There were thirteen nominations for university senate secretary, one for Mike Gleason and twelve for Craig Turner. As Mike Gleason is not an elected faculty senator during 2017-2018, he is not eligible to serve as university senate secretary. This leaves only Craig Turner as nominee. e. There are three candidates who have accepted nominations for Presiding Officer Elect. They are Alex Blazer, Will Hobbs, and J.F. Yao. Each has submitted a statement to support his candidacy for this position. The last time there were multiple candidates for this position was three years ago when both John Swinton and James Winchester accepted nominations. At that time, the Subcommittee on Nominations informed its Presiding Officer Elect nomination by taking a preference poll of the elected faculty senators. Would you like to do a preference poll or make our committee nomination by some other means? A <u>MOTION</u> <i>To inform the committee (SCoN) nomination of Presiding Officer Elect with a preference poll of the elected faculty senators of the 2017-2018 university senate supplying them the statements submitted by the candidates</i> was made, seconded and 		
--	--	--	--

	<p>adopted with no further discussion and no dissenting voice.</p> <p>f. At present, two of the Presiding Officer Elect candidates (Will Hobbs and JF Yao) are nominated to serve on ECUS to represent their academic units (CoHS and CoB, respectively). The remaining Presiding Officer Elect candidate (Alex Blazer) is presently nominated to FAPC. Should Alex Blazer become the nominee of the committee by the preference poll for Presiding Officer Elect, he will be shifted to ECUS. Note that Hedy Fraunhofer is presently listed as a nominee for both SoCC and FAPC. Should Alex Blazer not be the successful nominee for Presiding Officer Elect, Hedy can remain on SoCC and be removed from FAPC and replaced by a faculty volunteer.</p> <p>g. Committee preferences of elected faculty senators and of faculty volunteers were taken into account when Nicole DeClouette and Craig Turner drafted the slate for the 2017-2018 term. Most were placed in their first or second preference but some of the placements were as deep as fifth or sixth preference.</p> <p>h. Besides Presiding Officer Elect, the only other open positions on committees were on SoCC where there were six vacancies. It was noted that SoCC had only two elected faculty senators – Mary Magoulick</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>and Hedy Fraunhofer – anticipating that the current proposed revision to the bylaws (see ECUS report for details) will pass at the 21 Apr 2017 university senate meeting.</p> <p>i. The floor was opened for proposed revisions to the slate.</p> <p>1) Mary Magoulick indicated her willingness to serve on both SoCC and CAPC during 2017-2018 should that be necessary.</p> <p>2) Mary Magoulick, SoCC Chair, noted that at a recent meeting of SOCC, three of its current members indicated their willingness to continue on SoCC for 2017-2018</p> <p>a) Nancy Beasley (Areas A1/C1)</p> <p>b) Natalie King (Area C2)</p> <p>c) Dana Wood (Areas E/B)</p> <p>These nominees were accepted by the committee.</p> <p>This left three vacancies on SoCC</p> <p>d) Science/D1</p> <p>e) Business/Comp Sci/D3</p> <p>f) Library</p> <p>No other proposed changes to the slate of nominations were forthcoming.</p> <p>j. A <u>MOTION</u> <i>To adopt the current slate of nominees as a committee slate authorizing Nicole DeClouette to make any necessary revisions to ensure that the slate is completed and acknowledging that SCoN will inform its Presiding Officer Elect nomination with the elected faculty senator preference poll was made, seconded</i></p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>and adopted with no further discussion and no dissenting voice.</p> <p>4. Report Recent Activity of SCoN Chair Nicole DeClouette is given below and was provided in writing to attendees on behalf of Nicole DeClouette by Craig Turner.</p> <p>a. 2017-18 University Senate</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Nicole DeClouette sent the call for senate volunteers to the Corps of Instruction on 16 Mar 2017 resulting in 25 volunteers. 2) Nicole DeClouette sent the survey for committee preferences to the elected faculty senators on 10 Mar 2017. This survey also invited nominations, including self-nominations for university senate officer positions (presiding officer elect and secretary). <p>b. USGFC Election Procedures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Nominations closed 15 Mar 2017 2) There were no nominees received. 3) Shall SCoN revisit this at the beginning of the 2017-18 university senate term? <i>The answer was a resounding yes with no dissenting voice.</i> 		
<p>Executive Committee of the University Senate (ECUS)</p> <p>Chavonda Mills</p>	<p>1. Motions ECUS has one motion for university senate consideration at its 21 Apr 2017 meeting, a proposed revision to the bylaws, specifically reducing the minimum number of elected faculty senators on SoCC. This motion is slated to receive its second reading having received</p>		

	<p>its first reading at the 17 Mar 2017 university senate meeting.</p> <p>2. <u>Officers</u> The 2016-17 ECUS officers are Chavonda Mills (Chair), Nicole DeClouette (Vice-Chair) and Craig Turner (Secretary).</p> <p>3. <u>Meeting</u> ECUS met on 31 Mar 2017 from 2:00pm to 3:15pm. The following topics were discussed.</p> <p>a. <u>Governance Calendar for 2017-18</u> will be amended at the request of Dr. Veronica Womack to include “Making Excellence Inclusive Faculty Day” on Mon, 14 Aug 2017.</p> <p>b. <u>Proposal to Establish a Foundation Account for University Senate</u> is under review by Kim Taylor at University Advancement.</p> <p>c. <u>ECUS Standing Committee Scope and Duties</u> was reviewed by the committee. 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. There was also discussion as to the benefit of the recommended committee composition as most</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>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>d. <u>Certificates</u> 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>e. <u>Second USGFC Representative</u> identification efforts will continue during the 2017-18 senate term as a representative has yet to be identified.</p> <p>f. <u>Removal of Oversight of Curriculum from Senate</u> was briefly discussed resulting in an ECUS recommendation to defer further discussion to the 2017 governance retreat as Provost Brown was not present at the ECUS meeting to provide the details of the proposal.</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>g. <u>ECUS recommends Sadie Simmons, GC's Policy Officer,</u> serves as a reviewer of all university policies during development by the university senate to ensure the policy is in compliance with current internal and USG policies.</p>		
<p>Academic Policy Committee (APC) Carol Sapp</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Motions</u> APC has two motions to submit for university senate consideration at its 21 Apr 2017 meeting. See items 3.a and 3.b for details. 2. <u>Officers</u> The 2016-17 APC officers are Carol Sapp (Chair), Mike Gleason (Vice-Chair) and David McIntyre (Secretary). 3. <u>Meeting</u> The Academic Policy Committee met on 31 Mar 2017 from 2:00pm to 3:15pm. The following topics were discussed. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Fire Drills</u> The motion is to add or amend the common syllabus statement for emergency procedures to address fire drills. The proposed statement is <i>Fire drills will be conducted annually. In the event of a fire alarm, students will exit the building in a quick and orderly manner through the nearest hallway exit. Learn the floor plan and exits of the building. Do not use elevators. If you encounter heavy smoke, crawl on the floor so as to gain fresh air. Provide assistance to those who are in need of help without endangering your own life.</i> 		

	<p><i>Assemble for a head count on the front lawn of main campus or other designated assembly area.</i></p> <p>b. <u>Midterm Grades</u> In response to the proposed SGA (Student Government Association) Resolution related to midterm grades, APC made the following statement.</p> <p><i>APC fully supports the existing USG Policies regarding midterm feedback from faculty to students. After careful consideration of the SGA resolution as presented, APC recommends the inclusion of a statement on midterm feedback as a common syllabus statement for all GC courses. We seek advice from Kay Anderson, Registrar, for the specific language of this statement.</i></p> <p><u>ECUS-SCC Deliberation</u> Most of those present at the meeting were in support of requiring the following statement, as found in item 11 of the Syllabus Requirements section of the university Policies Procedures and Practices Manual, be required verbatim on all course syllabi: <i>Prior to mid-semester, you will receive feedback on your academic performance in this course.</i> Most</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>indicated that this was common practice in many of the departments.</p> <p>c. <u>Online Teaching Needs</u> Due to time constraints, the third agenda item – the subcommittee report on specific items to suggest to Jeanne Sewell and CTL (Center for Teaching and Learning) staff that would be helpful to faculty in facilitating the teaching and learning processes for online courses – was not addressed during this APC meeting.</p>		
<p>Curriculum and Assessment Policy Committee (CAPC)</p> <p>Lyndall Muschell</p>	<p>1. <u>Motions</u> CAPC has two motions to submit for university senate consideration at its 21 Apr 2017 meeting. The topics of these motion are provided below in 3.a.</p> <p>2. <u>Officers</u> The 2016-17 CAPC officers are Lyndall Muschell (Chair), Angel Abney (Vice-Chair) and Josie Doss (Secretary).</p> <p>3. <u>Meeting</u> The Curriculum and Assessment Policy Committee met on 31 Mar 2017 from 2:00pm to 3:15pm. The following topics were discussed.</p> <p>a. <u>Motions</u> The following Action Items were deliberated and voted upon. The result of these votes, documenting CAPC actions, is given below.</p> <p>i. <u>Additional Delivery Format - MAT in Secondary Education</u> - received unanimous approval</p> <p>ii. <u>Deactivation of the B.S. in Outdoor Education</u> – recommend against by majority vote (more context is provided under new business in this CAPC report)</p>		

	<p>Each of these items will be submitted as a motion to university senate for deliberation and a vote.</p> <p>b. <u>Information Items</u> The following information items were shared with CAPC and will be documented in the CAPC minutes.</p> <p>i. <u>Changes in Existing Programs</u></p> <p>1) <u>Government & Sociology</u> – A modification was made to the Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science. The senior capstone is a 3 hour requirement. The faculty requested the removal of the internship (POLS 4960 Internship and/or Cooperative) as a capstone option.</p> <p>2) <u>BA in English, Literature Concentration: Upper Division Course Requirements</u> – After a review of the upper-division curriculum, the undergraduate Literature Program found limitations with its major requirement categories, both in terms of student exposure to important areas of literary study and in terms of offering a range of courses for degree progress. A proposal was submitted and approved, effective Fall 2018, which exposes students to a better range of literary areas, including national and multicultural literatures, and also</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>affords students a broader range of options for the degree.</p> <p>3) <u>BA in English, Creative Writing Concentration: Changes to the Three Courses</u> – The “Three Courses from the Following” Major Requirement of the BA in English, Creative Writing Concentration must be updated based upon the approval of the new and retitled undergraduate ENGL literature courses, effective Fall 2018.</p> <p>4) <u>Discontinuation of MBA program delivery at Robins Air Force Base (RAFB)</u> – The College of Business will no longer offer the MBA in a face-to-face mode at RAFB. This is a modification of location only; the College of Business will continue to offer the MBA degree. Effective Date: Fall 2017 – no new admits to the face-to-face MBA program at RAFB after fall 2017. Teach-out of currently enrolled and to-be-enrolled students is expected to take at least five semesters</p> <p>5) <u>MMIS</u> – Change the admission waiver policy (GMAT or GRE) from AACSB institution to AACSB and/or ABET institutions</p> <p>6) <u>MSLCM</u> – Change the Waiver policy from 3.5 GPA and</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>AACSB institution to 3.15 GPA and AACSB institution</p> <p>7) <u>MBA</u> – Create a Waiver policy of 3.15 undergraduate GPA and AACSB institution</p> <p>ii. <u>Change in Credit Hour Range</u></p> <p>1) <u>CHEM 2999</u> – The credit hour range was changed from 1-4 credit hours to 0-4 credit hours.</p> <p>2) <u>PHYS 2999</u> – The credit hour range was changed from 1-4 credit hours to 0-4 credit hours.</p> <p>iii. <u>Change in Catalog Description and Academic Profile</u></p> <p>1) <u>ENGL 4440</u> – In order to expose literature students to both modern and contemporary drama, the Literature Program of the Department of English & Rhetoric has made the following changes:</p> <p>a) catalog description of ENGL 4440 Modern Drama from “a study of selected modern plays in English” to “a study of selected modern and/or contemporary plays,” and</p> <p>b) the academic profile of the course such that whenever the phrase “modern drama” appears it is replaced with “modern and/or contemporary drama.”</p> <p>2) ENGL 4446 - In order to expose literature students to both modern and contemporary</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>poetry, the Literature Program of the Department of English & Rhetoric has made the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the catalog description of ENGL 4446 Modern Poetry from “a study of selected modern poetry in English” to “a study of modern and/or contemporary poetry,” and b) the academic profile of the course such that whenever the phrase “modern poetry” appears, it is replaced with “modern and/or contemporary poetry.” <p>3) <u>ENGL 4110</u> – On March 10, 2010, after being approved by the Department of English & Rhetoric and Chair Whitaker as well as the College of Arts & Sciences Curriculum & Instruction Committee and Dean Procter, Provost Jordan approved changing the academic profile of ENGL 4110 Literary Criticism and 5110 Literary Criticism to an in-depth study of one to three critical theories. However, the subsequent catalog description was not amended. The revised catalog description should read: “A focused study of one or two methodologies of literary criticism.”</p> <p>iv. <u>Course Name Change</u></p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>1) <u>ENGL 4555</u> – The Literature Program of the Department of English & Rhetoric has changed the title of ENGL 4555 American Literature 1865 to 1920 to ENGL 4555 American Realism.</p> <p>v. <u>New Courses</u></p> <p>1) <u>BIOL 3810</u> – This course provides an overview to botanical concepts including the biology of the plant cell, energetics (photosynthesis and respiration), plant structure and development, physiology (growth and development, nutrition, water relations), along with a consideration of ecology, systematics, and evolution.</p> <p>2) <u>ENGL 4224</u> – A study of selected works of poetry and prose from the Renaissance period in England, continental Europe, and explorations of the Americas.</p> <p>3) <u>ENGL 4229</u> – A study of dramatic literature from the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods in England.</p> <p>4) <u>ENGL 4450</u> – A study of literature and film by and about women from a global perspective and from perspectives of women’s and gender studies.</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>5) <u>ENGL 4540</u> – A study of selected American literature from 1800-1865.</p> <p>6) <u>ENGL 4660</u> – A study of early twentieth-century American literature</p> <p>7) <u>ENGL 4675</u> – A study of contemporary American literature.</p> <p>8) <u>ENGL 4775</u> – A study of the interconnections between folklore and literature and how they influence each other, from a global perspective.</p> <p>9) <u>ENGL 4810</u> – A study of film and film theory.</p> <p>10) <u>ENGL 4820</u> – A study of selected texts by Jane Austen in comparison with film adaptations of Austen’s work.</p> <p>11) <u>ENGL 4910</u> – Special studies in topics in American literature. This course is repeatable for credit.</p> <p>12) <u>ENGL 4915</u> – Special studies in topics in American literature. This course is repeatable for credit.</p> <p>13) <u>ENGL 4920</u> – Special studies in topics in pre-1800 literature. This course is repeatable for credit.</p> <p>14) <u>ENGL 4925</u> – Special studies in topics in post-1800 literature. This course is repeatable for credit.</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>15) <u>ENGL 4530</u> – A study of selected American literature before 1800.</p> <p>16) <u>THEA 1207</u> – The third of a three-course certificate program designed specifically to provide students with a basic and advanced level of on-set grip rigging skills, knowledge and experience with film industry standard organizational structure, professional equipment, and on-set procedures in grip rigging.</p> <p>17) <u>THEA 1307</u> – The third of a three-course certificate program designed specifically to provide students with a basic level of on-set film set construction skills, knowledge and experience with film industry standard organizational structure, professional equipment, and on-set procedures in set construction</p> <p>c. <u>New Business Items</u></p> <p>i. At the request of ECUS during its 3 Mar 2017 meeting with Standing Committee Chairs, CAPC members discussed bringing a motion to university senate in regards to the deactivation of the B.S. in Outdoor Education. As a result, the motion <i>to recommend against the</i></p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p><i>deactivation of the B.S. in Outdoor Education</i> will be submitted for consideration by the university senate at its 21 Apr 2017 meeting.</p>		
<p>Subcommittee on the Core Curriculum (SoCC)</p> <p>Mary Magoulick</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Motions</u> SoCC has no motions to submit for university senate consideration at its 21 Apr 2017 meeting. 2. <u>Officers</u> The 2016-17 SoCC officers are Mary Magoulick (Chair), Brandon Samples (Vice-Chair) and Kay Anderson (Secretary). 3. <u>Meetings</u> The following summarizes SoCC activity at its recent meetings. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Area B New Sections</u> SoCC approved the following proposals for new sections in Area B in the last month: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>GC2Y</u> Arts & Literacy: Global Journeys with Afterschool by Linda Golson Bradley (Department of Professional Learning and Innovation) ii. <u>GC1Y</u> Documentary Studies by Scott Dillard (Department of English & Rhetoric) iii. <u>GC1Y</u> Monks Gone Wild: Religious Injustice Around the Globe by Matthew Milligan (Department of Philosophy & Liberal Studies) iv. <u>GC1Y</u> Growing up in the USA: What Does Psychological Science Have to Say about Children’s Experiences in the American Context by Dana Wood (Dept. Psych. Science) 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> v. GC2Y Religion and Human Right by Juli Gittinger (Dept. Phil & Liberal Studies) b. Area B Forums SoCC held two forums recently, one a training session for people interested in teaching in Area B, and one a discussion forum for how Area B is taught: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Training Seminar in Teaching an Area B class, Friday, Feb. 24, 1pm, Library 376 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) This will train you how to propose an Area B class. 2) Completed: 15 faculty and 7 SOCC members attended. ii. Discussion Forum on Teaching in Area B, Friday, March 10, 1pm A&S 2-46 & 2-51 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 2) Completed: 10 faculty and 2 SOCC members attended. c. Area B Section Proposals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. SoCC remains ready to receive proposals for new Area B sections through April 7 this semester. Please inform your faculty wishing to teach Area B sections next year of this deadline. ii. SoCC encourages anyone wishing to propose Area B sections to submit your proposals in 		
--	--	--	--

	<p>compliance with the deadline above. 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 (<u>requires unify credentials to login</u>)</p> <p>d. <u>SoCC Bylaws Review</u> SoCC discussed bylaws pertaining to its composition, scope, etc. and would like more time to consider these bylaws. One comment is that we often feel pressed to review proposals at the last minute so they can be listed for registration (which might even have already started). Sometimes we are required to pass proposals pending revisions to meet the high demand for more sections (this is not ideal). We discussed the processes that require quick turnarounds, but some people are still dissatisfied with the pressure we routinely face to approve proposals quickly.</p> <p>e. <u>Area B Section Allocation</u> As a point of information, Interim Associate Provost Spirou indicated that at a recent Deans Council meeting, there was an inventory of the number of Area B sections necessary to satisfy student need and the allocation of the</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>specific number of Area B sections that each academic unit (colleges and library) will be responsible to deliver has been made. While the details of implementation are deferred to the academic units, expectations on the number of sections each academic unit is responsible to deliver is now clearly specified. This may have academic units adopting a more proactive approach to Area B section proposals and reduce the number of last minute proposals.</p>		
<p>Faculty Affairs Policy Committee (FAPC) Alex Blazer</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Motions</u> FAPC has no motions to submit for consideration by the university senate at its 21 Apr 2017 meeting. 2. <u>Officers</u> The 2016-17 FAPC officers are Alex Blazer (Chair), Tom Toney (Vice-Chair) and David Johnson (Secretary). 3. <u>Meeting</u> The Faculty Affairs Policy Committee met on 31 Mar 2017 from 2:00pm to 3:15pm and the following items were discussed. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Scope</u> The Committee reviewed its scope in the university senate bylaws and does not recommend changes. b. <u>Probationary Credit</u> Following up on a faculty question, the Committee discussed how Chairs have the discretion to advocate (or not) for probationary credit toward tenure and promotion with their Deans during the negotiation process when hiring faculty into their departments. 		

	<p>c. <u>Peer Teaching Evaluation</u> The Peer Teaching Evaluation Work Group recommended a Peer Teaching Evaluation Pilot Program. The Committee asked questions and raised concerns about who should perform evaluations, who should be evaluated, and whether the evaluations should be mandatory. The Committee agreed that it should be formative and shared only with the faculty member who was evaluated. The Committee was divided on whether the evaluation should be mandatory or voluntary. The Committee was divided on the issue of who should be evaluated (all faculty, full-time faculty, pre-tenure tenure-track faculty, faculty in their first three years of teaching, or faculty in their first three years of teaching at Georgia College?). The Committee was divided on the issue of who should be an evaluator (should there be a single evaluator? should the single evaluator be from department, the college, or CTL (Center for Teaching and Learning)? should there be two person evaluation teams consisting of one member of the department and one member of CTL?). The Committee decided to postpone recommending the</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>Pilot Program at this time in a vote of six for postponement and three against.</p> <p>d. <u>Evaluation of Administrators</u> In the week after our 3 Mar 2017 meeting, the Committee discussed the ideas presented by the Provost. The Committee is interested in working with the Provost's Office to revise the Five-Year Administrative Review policy. The Committee has questions about preserving the in-house Review Team, and it fully supports streamlining the time table, updating the way evaluations are gathered, and making the process less burdensome.</p> <p>e. <u>Student Opinion Surveys</u> The Committee did not have time to discuss the Work Group recommendation; therefore we will recommend in the 2016-2017 FAPC annual report that the 2017-2018 FAPC take up consideration of this recommendation.</p>		
<p>Resources, Planning and Institutional Policy Committee (RPIPC)</p> <p>Jan Hoffmann Clark</p>	<p>1. <u>Motions</u> RPIPC has one motion to submit for university senate consideration at its 21 Apr 2017 meeting. See 3.a.</p> <p>2. <u>Officers</u> The 2016-17 RPIPC officers are Jan Hoffmann Clark (Chair), Susan C. Allen (Vice-Chair) and Emily Gomez (Secretary).</p> <p>3. <u>Meetings</u> The Resources, Planning and Institutional Policy Committee met on 31</p>		

Mar 2017 from 2:00pm to 3:15pm and the following items were discussed.

- a. **Parking (Motion)** RPIPC members voted to submit a Policy Motion on Parking Allocation to the University Senate.
- b. **Scope and Composition** RPIPC reviewed its composition and scope in the university senate bylaws per ECUS' instructions and voted to recommend that the three selected staff members be changed to two selected staff members and the CIO as the third staff member. In addition, the committee recommended adding "sustainability" to the list of "institutional support functions of the university functions (e.g. technology, parking)".
- c. **ECUS-SCC Deliberation** A couple of questions were offered from the floor regarding the parking allocation policy.
Q1 What is the parking allocation policy? The interested reader is directed to Motion 1617.RPIPC.001.P for the details of this allocation policy. The main response was that it is formalizing a confirmation of a set of parking guidelines for the 2006 parking policy. The policy was read into the record.

Parking in the heart of the main campus is primarily set aside for faculty and staff, although a premium should not be charged for these spaces. These groups have the greatest need to be

	<p><i>closest to the academic and administrative buildings on campus, and accommodation should be made to permit employees to leave campus for work-related trips and yet be able to find parking when they return without costing the state additional money by spending time looking for parking. Employees should have an option to park in more remote areas if they wish to pay a lower fee for doing so, and “basic” parking should be provided at no cost for employees who make below a minimum pay grade.</i></p> <p>d. Q2 Is there a specific numeric value to quantify the minimum pay grade? At present, there is not. We will strive to identify a number to provide an operational definition of minimum pay grade.</p>		
<p>Student Affairs Policy Committee (SAPC)</p> <p>Heidi Fowler</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Motions</u> SAPC has no motions to submit for university senate consideration at its 21 Apr 2017 meeting. 2. <u>Officers</u> The 2016-17 SAPC officers are Heidi Fowler (Chair), Ben McMillan (Vice-Chair) and Simplice Tchamna-Kouna (Secretary). 3. <u>Meeting</u> The Student Affairs Policy Committee met on 31 Mar 2017 from 2:00pm to 3:15pm and the following items were discussed. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Academic Calendar Proposals</u> 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>Drop Date</u> Extend the withdrawal date another week (or two). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In most classes, it is difficult to have a mid-term (if only two tests are given in the class) by the withdrawal date. 2) Giving an extra week (or two) would allow students to have more performance feedback to make the decision to withdraw from the course. ii. <u>Dead Day(s)</u> Changing the academic calendar to allow for at least one “dead” day before finals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) We currently have a final day of class on Monday and start finals immediately on Tuesday. This practice forces faculty to either stop the introduction of new material or make students cram for a single night before finals. 2) Either issue is not healthy. b. <u>Consult Registrar</u> Kay Anderson’s responses to requests for guidance on these proposals were reported to SAPC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>Drop Date</u> The drop date needs to be after midterm (system policy) but before we start registration for the next term. Depending on the structure of the term, it is usually the 40th day of class (Spring) and the 41st day of class (Fall). ii. <u>Dead Day(s)</u> The dead day is an issue because we have 15 meeting 		
--	--	--	--

	<p>times for each day of the week in order to meet our accreditation and credit hour requirements. In the Fall, we lose a Monday for Labor Day and make it up the day before finals start. In the Spring, we lose one Monday for MLK day and make it up the week of finals.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Those are mandatory holidays – the only flex-time we have are Fall break and Thanksgiving break or Spring Break. 2) Students would have to give up a day of these breaks in order to get a “dead” day or begin classes earlier in the year. <p>c. Next Steps SAPC agreed to explore these options, gather more information and decide via email whether to bring a motion before University Senate (21 Apr 2017) or table the agenda items for the following academic year since the academic calendars will not be revisited until Spring 2018.</p>		
<p>V. Information Items Actions/Recommendations</p>			
<p>University Senate Budget Chavonda Mills</p>	<p>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</p>		

	how these funds should be allocated, contact Chavonda Mills.		
Annual Reports Chavonda Mills	Chavonda Mills reminded standing committee chairs of the due date (Wed 3 May 2017) and template for committee annual reports. Resources pertinent to annual reports are available on the Green Page at http://us.gcsu.edu/Archive_Indices/Annual_Reports_Archive.htm		
Revisions to Committee Composition Chavonda Mills	<p><u>2 Dec 2016</u> <i>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 were invited to submit this information by email to Chavonda Mills.</i></p> <p><u>3 Feb 2017</u> <i>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.</i></p> <p><u>3 Mar 2017</u></p>	<p><u>2 Dec 2016</u> <i>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.</i></p>	<p><u>2 Dec 2016</u> <i>Chavonda Mills to ensure that composition revisions of the university senate and its committees be an agenda item at a future ECUS-SCC meeting.</i></p> <p><u>3 Feb 2017</u> <i>Chavonda Mills did ensure that composition revisions of the university senate and its committees be an agenda item at a future ECUS-SCC meeting</i></p>

	<p><i>There was no new information on this item and thus still awaiting information from RPIPC, SoCC, and SCoN.</i></p> <p><u>31 Mar 2017</u> Information from RPIPC and SoCC are included in their respective reports in these minutes. SCoN has not proposed revisions to its composition.</p>		
VI. Unfinished Business Review of Action & Recommendations, Provide updates (if any) to Follow-up			
Standing Committee Scopes Review Craig Turner	<p><u>3 Feb 2017</u> <i>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.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>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.</i> • <i>The work group proposes that the scope section remain to include the topic list and that a duties section be added.</i> • <i>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</i> 		

	<p><i>recommendation for or against these proposals to the university senate.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>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.</i> <p><i>Clarification was sought regarding the charge to the standing committees and brief deliberation (reiterating the language above) provided that clarification.</i></p> <p><u>3 Mar 2017</u> <i>This item was not on the 3 Mar 2017 meeting agenda.</i></p> <p><u>31 Mar 2017</u> <i>This item was not on the 31 Mar 2017 meeting agenda.</i></p>		
<p>“Appeals” Procedure for Standing Committee Decisions</p> <p>John R. Swinton</p>	<p><u>3 Feb 2017</u> <i>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.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>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</i> 		<p><u>3 Feb 2017</u> <i>Chavonda Mills to ensure that “appeals” of standing committee decisions receive consideration at a future ECUS-SCC meeting.</i></p> <p><u>3 Mar 2017</u> <i>Chavonda Mills did ensure that “appeals” of standing committee decisions receive</i></p>

	<p><i>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.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>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.</i> • <i>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.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>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.</i> ○ <i>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</i> 		<p><i>consideration at a future ECUS-SCC meeting.</i></p>
--	--	--	---

	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>The work group's proposed handling of the recommendations against stimulated further discussion from the floor. Points of discussion included the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• One perspective was that this allows the university senate to overturn committee recommendations against.</i> <i>• A contrasting perspective was that the proposed change in practice would have university senate review both types (for or against) of committee recommendations.</i> <p><i>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.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• 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</i> 		
--	--	--	--

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.

31 Mar 2017

The main point on this item was that one role of the university senate was to exercise its advisory function to the University President. It was noted that one indisputable way to exercise this advisory function was for the university senate to formally take action on a motion in the online motion database in a manner consistent with the parliamentary authority (Robert's Rules) of the university senate. When deliberation on an item "dies" in committee (APC, CAPC, FAPC, RPIP, SAPC), the university senate is not as readily

	<p>able to exercise its advisory function (unless it elects to act as a committee of the whole by a two-thirds majority vote). The CAPC motion pertaining to the Outdoor Education program will allow university senate to exercise its advisory function. Appreciation was expressed to CAPC for formalizing this recommendation as a motion to be entered into the online motion database.</p>		
<p>Policy Oversight Committee Chavonda Mills</p>	<p><u>2 Dec 2016 (as part of the ECUS report)</u> <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> <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) polices, 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>2 Dec 2016</u> <i>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.</i> <u>3 Mar 2017</u> 1. <i>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.</i> 2. <i>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.</i></p>

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.

The proposed function of the policy oversight committee was to review draft policies during development by one of the policy-

31 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.

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.

31 Mar 2017

Chavonda Mills noted that a compromise proposal had come to her attention since the 3 Mar 2017 ECUS-SCC 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. The proposal was adopted with no dissenting voice.		
VII. New Business Actions/Recommendations			
Steering of Items to Committees	At the time of this meeting, there were no items that required steering to a committee.		
Chavonda Mills			
ECUS Composition Chavonda Mills	<p>Chavonda Mills noted there was a proposed revision of the composition of Executive Committee of University Senate (ECUS), specifically that ECUS consist of the University President, the Provost, the University Senate Officers (Presiding Officer, Presiding Officer Elect, Secretary) and the Standing Committee Chairs (Chairs of APC, CAPC, FAPC, RPIPC, and SAPC).</p> <p>Rationale offered in support of this proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More efficient (if this proposal were adopted, ECUS could meet just once in a manner consistent with the current ECUS-SCC meeting and would not need to meet separately) • This is a streamlining of university senate • This would permit the communication to be more direct from committees to ECUS via the committee chairs • The committee chair position might be more enticing if it includes a seat on ECUS. <p>Concerns offered pertaining to this proposal</p>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This may reduce the likelihood that the smaller academic units (CoB, CoE, CoHS, Library) would have at least one representative on ECUS. • This might promote a perception that ECUS is above (superior to) the other committees. <p>Questions</p> <p>Why is ECUS presently comprised with at least one elected faculty senator from each academic unit (colleges, library)? Primarily due to it being a faculty advisory body to the University President. This ensures each academic unit is represented when the advisory function is exercised.</p> <p>Is the modifier Executive in the name Executive Committee consistent with the functions of ECUS? Possibly not, but it would be better to revise the name to match the function than to modify the function to match the name. The committee name emerged by mimicking the bylaws of Georgia State University at the birth of the university senate.</p> <p>There was also a brief conversation thread regarding the appropriateness of proportional representation of academic units on ECUS with some proposing the model now is ideal while others were of the opinion that CoAS is typically not represented proportionately on ECUS.</p> <p>The only consensus that emerged was to recommend continuing deliberation on this</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>proposal at the 2017 governance retreat as the retreat theme will be university senate composition and review of bylaws pertaining to committees (scope, composition, duties). There was no consensus on any of the content of the deliberation.</p>		
<p>University Senate Composition</p> <p>Chavonda Mills</p>	<p>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 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. This proposal has been mentioned in past ECUS meetings yet to date has not been formulated in a sufficiently coherent manner</p>		

	<p>to be formally proposed for consideration by the university senate.</p> <p>The only consensus that emerged was to recommend continuing deliberation on these matters at the 2017 governance retreat as the retreat theme will be university senate composition and review of bylaws pertaining to committees (scope, composition, duties). There was no consensus on any of the content of the deliberation.</p>		
<p>University Senate Agenda and Minutes Review</p>	<p>1. Tentative Agenda 21 Apr 2017: Based on the committee reports at this meeting</p> <p>a. Motions There will be up to seven motions on the agendas of these meetings of the university senate, specifically</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. APC (1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Fire Drill Syllabus Statement 2) Midterm Syllabus Statement ii. CAPC (3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Additional Delivery Format - M.A.T. in Secondary Education 2) Against the Deactivation of the Outdoor Education Program iii. ECUS (1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Bylaws Revision iv. RPIPC (1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Parking Allocation Policy v. SCoN (1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Slate of Nominees at the organizational meeting of the 2017-2018 university senate. <p>b. Reports Administrative reports and committee reports will also be agenda items.</p>	<p>The motion (circulate minutes) was approved as amended. One correction (ECUS Presenter) was made during email review.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chavonda Mills to draft the tentative agenda of these university senate meetings. 2. Motions to be entered into the online motion database by APC (2), CAPC (2), ECUS (1), RPIPC (1), SCoN (1). 3. Craig Turner to circulate the DRAFT of the university senate meeting minutes to university senators for review.

	2. University Senate Minutes Review: A MOTION that the DRAFT minutes of the 17 Mar 2017 meeting of the 2016-2017 university senate be circulated for university senator review was made and seconded.		
VIII. Next Meeting (Tentative Agenda, Calendar)			
1. Calendar	21 Apr 2017 @ 2:00pm Univ. Senate A&S 2-72 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 MOTION to adjourn the meeting was made and seconded.	The motion to adjourn was approved and the meeting adjourned at 4:59 pm. <i>Note that there was a motion to extend the meeting, for up to fifteen minutes, allowing the meeting to adjourn as late as 5:00pm.</i>	

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 DEClOUPETTE (VICE-CHAIR), CRAIG TURNER (SECRETARY)

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-2017 *Note: 2 Sep 2016 meeting canceled due to University officially closing (tropical storm)*

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.

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 <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	R	R	R	R	R	0	6	0	
Chavonda Mills <i>EFS; CoAS; ECUS Chair</i>	N/A	P	P	P	R	P	P	5	1	0	
Kelli Brown <i>Provost</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	R	P	R	1	2	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	
Carol Sapp <i>EFS; CoHS APC Chair</i>	N/A	R	P	P	P	R	P	4	2	0	
Lyndall Muschell <i>EFS; CoE; CAPC Chair</i>	N/A	P	P	P	P	P	P	6	0	0	
Alex Blazer <i>EFS; CoAS; FAPC Chair</i>	N/A	P	R	P	P	P	P	5	1	0	
Jan Hoffmann Clark <i>EFS; CoAS, RPIPC Chair</i>	N/A	P	P	P	P	P	P	6	0	0	
Heidi Fowler <i>EFS; CoHS, SAPC Chair</i>	N/A	P	P	P	P	P	P	6	0	0	

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