

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

**MEETING DATE & TIME:** 06 OCTOBER 2017; 2:00 –3:15

**MEETING LOCATION:** PARKS ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, ROOM 301

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

<b>P</b>	Alex Blazer (CoAS, ECUS Vice-Chair)	<b>R</b>	Will Hobbs (CoHS, ECUS Member)
<b>P</b>	Kelli Brown (Provost)	<b>R</b>	Chavonda Mills (CoAS, ECUS Chair Emeritus)
<b>P</b>	Jolene Cole (Library, ECUS Member)	<b>P</b>	Craig Turner (CoAS, ECUS Secretary)
<b>P</b>	Nicole DeClouette (CoE, ECUS Chair)	<b>R</b>	J.F. Yao (CoB, ECUS Member)
<b>R</b>	Steve Dorman (University President)		

<b>GUESTS</b>	Qiana Wilson (University Counsel)
---------------	-----------------------------------

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

AGENDA TOPIC	DISCUSSIONS & CONCLUSIONS	ACTION OR RECOMMENDATIONS	FOLLOW-UP {including dates/responsible person, status (pending, ongoing, completed)}
<b>I. Call to order</b>	The meeting was called to order at 2:01pm by Nicole DeClouette (Chair).		
<b>II. Approval of Agenda</b>	A <u>MOTION</u> to approve the agenda was made and seconded.	The agenda was approved as circulated.	
<b>III. Approval of Minutes</b>	A <u>MOTION</u> to approve the minutes of the 1 Sept 2017 meeting of the Executive Committee was made and seconded. A draft of these minutes had been circulated to the meeting attendees via email with no revisions offered. Thus, the minutes had been posted as circulated.	The minutes of the 1 Sep 2017 Executive Committee meeting were approved as posted, so no additional action was required.	

<b>IV. Reports</b>	The following reports were invited.		
<b>Presiding Officer Report</b>  <b>Nicole DeClouette</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b><u>Standing Committee Officer Orientation</u></b> was held on 22 Sep 2017 at 3:30 p.m. in A&amp;S 2-55. Officers in attendance were: Emily Gomez, Brandon Samples, Angela Criscoe, Lyndall Muschell, David Johnson, Craig Turner, Nicole DeClouette, Diana Young, Ashley Taylor, Donna Bennett, Kay Anderson, Angel Abney, Rodica Cazacu, Sarah Handwerker, John Swinton, and Alex Blazer.</li> <li>2. <b><u>Corps of Instruction List</u></b> was received from Academic Affairs on September 15 and forwarded to Alex Blazer, Chair of the Subcommittee on Nominations, to work on apportionment.</li> <li>3. <b><u>Name Change: Department of English</u></b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Provost Brown forwarded a memo from the Interim Chair of the Department of English and Rhetoric, Beauty Bragg, requesting that the department be renamed to the Department of English since Rhetoric faculty have been moved to the Department of Communication effective 1 Jan 2018 as recommended at the 15 Sep 2017 university senate meeting. The requested name changes will go into effect on 1 Jan 2018.</li> <li>b. Following the “Procedure to Establish, Restructure, or Rename an Academic Unit,” (under Step III), the proposer of the academic unit (Beauty Bragg) prepared a request (memo) to be considered by university governance (received by the Presiding Officer on October 4, 2017). “If the request is to rename, then a rationale is sufficient</li> </ol> </li> </ol>		

	<p>documentation.” The rationale has been provided in the memo.</p> <p>c. The Provost submitted the request to ECUS (received October 4, 2017) (Step IV).</p> <p>d. <b><u>ECUS Deliberation</u></b> (Step V): “ECUS shall facilitate the review by the University Senate. If recommended, it is forwarded to the Provost.”</p> <p>i. Recent practice has been for ECUS to route this to CAPC.</p> <p>ii. Because this is a department level matter (and not curricular), does ECUS need to re-think how the senate will “review” the request?</p> <p>iii. Should this be presented as an informational item coming from ECUS?</p> <p>iv. Should this still be routed through CAPC?</p> <p>v. After some discussion noting that</p> <p>1) if ECUS chooses to facilitate a recommendation by the university senate, then there is a question of being out of compliance with the last sentence of .Section 2 of the university senate bylaws which reads <i>The University Senate strives to be mindful and respectful of matters that are more appropriately handled at the divisional, college, and department levels, but may make recommendations concerning matters within these areas that have broader</i></p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p><i>institutional impact or implications.</i></p> <p>2) if ECUS does not facilitate a recommendation by the university senate, then there is a question of being out of compliance with the last sentence of .the aforementioned Step V cited in item d above of the Procedure to Establish, Restructure, or Rename an Academic Unit.</p> <p>ECUS members present agreed to sponsor the motion recommending the name change where only elected faculty senators will be eligible to vote at the 20 Oct 2017 university senate meeting.</p>		
<p><b>Past Presiding Officer Report</b></p> <p><b>Chavonda Mills</b></p>	<p>As Chavonda Mills had extended regrets and was unable to attend this meeting, there was no Past Presiding Officer report.</p>		
<p><b>Presiding Officer Elect Report</b></p> <p><b>Alex Blazer</b></p>	<p>1. <b><u>Slate of Nominees/ US Representatives</u></b>  Since the 01 Sep 2017 ECUS-SCC, the following changes have been made.</p> <p>a. <b><u>SoCC</u></b> Clif Wilkinson has replaced Dana Wood as Area E Volunteer. This replacement was incorporated into the revised slate of nominees in the university senate September consent agenda.</p> <p>b. <b><u>USGFC</u></b> Following a call for self-nominations from EFS (Elected Faculty Senators) in the first year of their term, Glynnis Haley (EFS, term 05/17 to 04/20) has self-nominated to serve a two-year term as our second USGFC</p>		

representative. It has been suggested that we hold an election by EFS as the USGFC representative is elected to represent university faculty rather than selected and approved by ECUS.

- c. **LAC** Jolene Cole (EFS) has volunteered to serve as the university senate representative on the Liberal Arts Council (LAC).
  - d. **Mandatory Student Fee Committee** Nicole DeClouette (EFS), Evita Shinholster (Staff Council), and Michael Watson (Staff Council) have volunteered to serve on the Mandatory Student Fee Committee. They join Craig Turner (EFS) in representing the university senate (the EFSs) and Staff Council on this committee.
  - e. **ASBAC** Ben McMillan (EFS) has volunteered to serve as the university senate representative on the Administrative Systems and Banner Advisory Committee (ASBAC).
2. **AASCU** Alex Blazer shared a report for an AASCU (American Association of State Colleges and Universities) meeting he attended. This report will be attached to these minutes as a supporting document.
3. **ECUS Deliberation** A question was posed regarding the best way to have university senate representatives to exchange information with members of the university senate. A few options were proposed.
- i. One option proposed was for the university senate representative

	<p>provide a report orally at a meeting of the university senate meeting.</p> <p>ii. Another option proposed was for the university senate representative to use the <a href="mailto:us@gcsu.edu">us@gcsu.edu</a> distribution group to interact with the members of the university senate by email.</p> <p>Either method would provide a channel of communication for the university senate representatives to share information with or request feedback from members of the university senate.</p>		
<b>Secretary Report Craig Turner</b>	Craig Turner indicated that he had nothing to report as University Senate Secretary.		
<b>Library Senator Report Jolene Cole</b>	Jolene Cole indicated that she had nothing to report as Library Senator.		
<b>V. Information Items Actions/Recommendations</b>			
<b>University Senate Budgets Nicole DeClouette</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b><u>Foundation Account</u></b> for university senate is now established and has a balance of \$0.</li> <li>2. <b><u>Balance</u></b> The balance of the university senate budget (\$5000 allocation annually) is presently at <b>\$1601.77</b>. This includes a recent debit of \$53.98 for additional notebooks ordered for the 2017 governance retreat. Anticipated expenditures include reimbursement of attendance expenditures to Alex Blazer for USG Faculty Council meetings during the 2017-18 academic year.</li> </ol>		

<p><b>VI. Unfinished Business</b>  <b>Review of Action &amp; Recommendations, Provide updates (if any) to Follow-up</b></p>			
<p><b>ECUS Operating Procedures</b>   <b>Nicole DeClouette</b></p>	<p><b><u>01 Sep 2017</u></b>  <i>The committee operating procedures for ECUS had been discussed during its committee session at the 2017 Governance Retreat. At that time, revisions to parts of the 2016-17 ECUS operating procedures were recommended. Specifically,</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i><u>Throughout</u> updating the academic year from 2016-2017 to 2017-2018;</i></li> <li>2. <i><u>Chair Duties</u> reword the advertising university senate and committee meetings to university community item;</i></li> <li>3. <i><u>Communication</u> suppressing the list of officers to whom regrets should be extended;</i></li> <li>4. <i><u>Quorum &amp; Voting</u> A clarification of the voting status of ECUS members.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>Nicole DeClouette had been charged to update these operating procedures for ECUS Review and had circulated a revised draft for ECUS review with the agenda of this meeting. Nicole DeClouette reviewed the proposed revisions that she had drafted for ECUS review since the retreat. Specifically,</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i><u>Throughout</u> updating the academic year from 2016-2017 to 2017-2018. Nicole noted the academic year in the footer was still 2016-17 and required updating to 2017-18.</i></li> <li>2. <i><u>Chair Duties</u> A revision to the sixth bullet was proposed as Ensure committee meeting times and meeting</i></li> </ol>	<p><b><u>01 Sep 2017</u></b>  <i>The ECUS committee operating procedures were unanimously adopted as revised by voice vote with no dissenting vote.</i></p>	<p><b><u>01 Sep 2017</u></b>  <i>Nicole DeClouette shall update the academic year in the footer and add the missing periods then forward the final draft as revised of the 2017-2018 Operating Procedures to Craig Turner for archiving on the university senate websites.</i></p> <p><b><u>06 Oct 2017</u></b>  <i>Nicole DeClouette did update the academic year in the footer and add the missing periods then forward the final draft as revised of the 2017-2018 Operating Procedures to Craig Turner for archiving on the university senate websites.</i></p>

	<p>agenda are advertised on the University Senate website.</p> <p>3. <u>Communication</u> A revision to the second bullet was proposed as Notify the committee chair and secretary to extend regrets prior to scheduled committee meetings.</p> <p>4. <u>Quorum &amp; Voting</u> A revision to the second bullet was proposed as The voting status of each member of ECUS is articulated in the University Senate Bylaws.</p> <p>5. <u>Missing Periods</u> It was noted from the floor that there were some missing periods in the draft (without specification of exact places in the document) and Nicole DeClouette was charged to insert them.</p>		
<p><b>University Senate Composition</b></p> <p><b>Nicole DeClouette</b></p>	<p><b><u>01 Sep 2017</u></b></p> <p>1. Nicole DeClouette noted the source of this issue was the identification of the tension between the number of elected faculty senators and the number of elected faculty senator positions on university senate committees. Recent practice to relieve this tension has been to find an elected faculty senator on SoCC willing to also serve on CAPC to meet the bylaws requirements pertinent to elected faculty senators. At present, Mary Magoulick is serving on both SoCC and CAPC. The interested reader is directed to the 31 Mar 2017 ECUS minutes for more details including ideas that were proposed during 2016-17 for consideration to relieve this tension.</p> <p>2. In light of the current development of the university curriculum committee and the uncertainty of the university curriculum</p>		



	<p><i>committee's impact on the continuation of CAPC and SoCC, a recommendation to postpone consideration of this issue until there is more certainty – which is anticipated by January 2018 – was offered from the floor. There was no dissenting voice to this recommended course of action.</i></p> <p>3. <i>There were brief conversation threads indicating that CAPC would almost certainly persist to review, develop and amend curricular policy and curricular assessment, the latter being the A of CAPC (Curriculum and Assessment Policy Committee).</i></p>		
<p><b>Appeals Process for Decisions of University Senate Committees</b></p> <p><b>Nicole DeClouette</b></p>	<p><b><u>01 Sep 2017</u></b></p> <p><i>Nicole DeClouette reminded those present that as part of his narrative response to Motion 1617.CAPC.020.C, President Dorman stated Finally, I charge the ECUS of the University Senate to consider an appeals process whereby decisions made by the various committees of the University Senate may be considered for appeal.</i></p> <p><i>This appeals process had been discussed at the 2017 Governance Retreat with the conclusion that there already exist channels of appeal. This retreat session had been co-facilitated by Nicole DeClouette and Chavonda Mills. Nicole DeClouette provided a synopsis of the findings of the session.</i></p> <p>1. <i>The university senate bylaws already provide a process by which three university senators can bring items to ECUS for steering to a committee and possibly result in consideration by the university senate as a committee of the whole. (See University Senate Bylaws IV.Section1)</i></p>		<p><b><u>01 Sep 2017</u></b></p> <p><i>Nicole DeClouette to draft language of this appeals process in consultation with the University Senate Parliamentarian John Sirmans for inclusion in university senate bylaws as well as review and offer recommended revisions (if any) to the language pertaining to the consent agenda routinely included on university senate agendas.</i></p> <p><b><u>06 Oct 2017</u></b></p> <p><i>Nicole DeClouette had coordinated with John Sirmans to prepare draft language but there was an insufficient amount of time during the meeting to review the draft.</i></p>

2. *All votes coming out of committees be reported; this includes recommendations for a proposal and recommendations against a proposal.*

i. *Recommendation for a proposal will come to the university senate floor either as a formal motion or as an informational item on the consent agenda.*

ii. *Recommendation against a proposal will come to the university senate floor on the consent agenda. A single university senator may remove an item from the consent agenda to be considered separately.*

iii. *This way each vote will be recorded and will provide a way for the university senate to advise the President.*

*A proposal from the floor was made that Nicole DeClouette consult with University Senate Parliamentarian John Sirmans to draft language articulating the appeals process for inclusion in the university senate bylaws as well as review and offer recommended revisions (if any) to the language pertaining to the consent agenda routinely included on university senate agendas. Those present endorsed this proposal with no dissenting voice.*

*Finally, it was noted this information would be shared with standing committee chairs at the ECUS-SCC meeting immediately following this meeting inviting and incorporating their feedback.*

**6 Oct 2017**

	<p>Due to the shortness of time, copies of the draft appeal process prepared by Nicole DeClouette and John Sirmans were disseminated to those present with deliberation on the draft postponed to a future ECUS-SCC meeting.</p>		
<p><b>University Senate Bylaws</b> <b>Nicole DeClouette</b></p>	<p><b><u>01 Sep 2017</u></b> <i>Nicole DeClouette reminded those present that as part of his narrative response to Motion 1617.CAPC.020.C, President Dorman stated With this decision, I also charge the current presiding officer of the University Senate for Fall 2017 and the former presiding officer (2016-17) to meet with the University General Counsel during the summer and prepare for the University Senate reading at its first meeting during the retreat this August, a bylaws of the University Senate that fully aligns with the higher order documents: BOR Policy and Institutional Statutes, paying special attention to the role of the University Senate in curricular matters as prescribed by the higher order documents.</i> <i>University Counsel Qiana Wilson was present to field questions on a draft of proposed university senate bylaws revisions – including narrative to indicate the rationale pertaining to the compliance with higher order documents – that Qiana Wilson had prepared which Nicole DeClouette had circulated prior to the meeting with the meeting agenda.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>On page 6, pertaining to CAPC Scope, it was noted that the curricular review function of CAPC was still present in the draft. After some discussion, the proposal supported by those present with no dissenting voice was to replace In addition to its policy recommending function, this committee shall be</i></li> </ul>		<p><b><u>01 Sep 2017</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Will Hobbs to draft alternative wording to policy-recommending or policy-making and forward it to Qiana Wilson.</i></li> <li>2. <i>Craig Turner was charged to draft language addressing voting restrictions on academic matters and forward it to Qiana Wilson.</i></li> <li>3. <i>Nicole DeClouette to provide clear deadlines for feedback when the draft is disseminated to all university senate committee members for review.</i></li> <li>4. <i>Nicole DeClouette to ensure the first reading can occur at the 20 Oct 2016 university senate meeting.</i></li> </ol> <p><b><u>06 Oct 2017</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Will Hobbs did draft alternative wording to policy-recommending or policy-making and</i></li> </ol>

	<p><i>responsible for reviewing and approving proposals to create or deactivate certificates, concentrations, degree programs, and minors, as well as the periodic review of general education requirements and learning outcomes. This committee also provides advice, as appropriate, on procedural matters relating to curriculum and academic assessment.</i></p> <p><i>with</i></p> <p><i>In addition to its policy recommending function, this committee shall also provide advice, as appropriate, on procedural matters relating to curriculum and academic assessment.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>○ A clarification was requested regarding whether CAPC would retain this curricular review function as the details (charge, composition, etc.) of the university curriculum committee are being developed.</i></li> <li><i>○ President Dorman noted that Provost Brown could name a group (possibly CAPC) as the university curriculum committee in proxy until such time as the university curriculum committee is launched.</i></li> <li><i>○ An observation from the floor noted that current bylaws of the university senate are in force – which would include the curricular review function of CAPC – until a bylaws revision is recommended by the university senate and approved by the University President.</i></li> </ul>		<p>forwarded it to Qiana Wilson.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Craig Turner did draft language addressing voting restrictions on academic matters and forwarded it to Qiana Wilson.</li> <li>3. Nicole DeClouette did provide clear deadlines for feedback when the draft is disseminated to all university senate committee members for review.</li> <li>4. Nicole DeClouette did ensure the first reading can occur at the 20 Oct 2016 university senate meeting</li> </ol>
--	---	--	---

- *On page 5, a clarification of the rationale for autonomy of IRB and intellectual property committees was requested as this autonomy was the justification for striking intellectual property, human subjects and research from the APC scope. The clarification offered was that there were various federal and state laws as well as BoR policies that were the justification, among them the cited 45 CFR 46.*
- *An editorial suggestion emerged from the floor to replace be concerned with with review and recommend in scopes of APC, CAPC, FAPC, RPIPC, SAPC.*
- *On page 1, a clarification for the rationale of striking The University Senate is endowed with all the legislative powers and authority of the University Faculty was requested. The rationale offered was the concern of the universal (all) endowment of legislative powers from university faculty to university senate.*
- *On page 1, it was noted that policy-making was proposed to be replaced by policy-recommending and it was thought that alternative wording might be considered. While all agreed that regardless of the wording, all actions of university senate are subject to approval of the university president, there was some desire to find alternative wording. When no specific alternative from the floor was immediately forthcoming, Will Hobbs agreed to draft some alternative wording and send it to Qiana Wilson.*

- *It was noted from the floor that a restriction of voting on academic matters to faculty was not among the proposed revisions. Conversation points included*
  - *whether to restrict voting to corps of instruction faculty or elected faculty senators on such matters (noting some presidential appointees are corps of instruction faculty and not elected faculty senators) with no clear consensus for which to adopt*
  - *how to define academic matters, with a proposal being the six areas from the AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities and not exclusively defined as motions sponsored by academic committees (APC, CAPC, FAPC). the primary interest being to ensure academic matters emerging from the university senate floor (transcending such motions) be included*

*As no satisfactory language emerged from the floor, Craig Turner was charged to draft language addressing voting restrictions on academic matters and forward it to Qiana Wilson.*

**Next Steps**

- *It was noted that at the governance retreat, there was a promise made to circulate a draft of proposed bylaws revisions to all members of all university senate committees providing them an opportunity to review the draft and offer feedback.*

- *Given the charge of President Dorman to address these revisions at the first meeting of University Senate (scheduled for 15 Sep 2017), this review seemed implausible.*
- *President Dorman noted that he was satisfied that due diligence is being applied to the preparation of the draft and granted permission to postpone the first reading of the proposed bylaws revisions to the 20 Oct 2017 university senate meeting allowing time for a review as promised during the retreat.*
- *There were recommendations from the floor that Nicole DeClouette provide clear deadlines for feedback when the draft is disseminated to all university senate committee members for review to ensure the first reading can occur at the 20 Oct 2016 university senate meeting.*
- *Finally, it was noted that this draft including proposed revisions would be informed with further deliberation and consultation with standing committee chairs at the ECUS-SCC meeting immediately following this meeting.*

**06 Oct 2017**

1. **Summary New Draft** Qiana Wilson, University Counsel, presented the most recent draft of proposed bylaws and statutes revisions to bring these into compliance with the higher order documents.
  - a. Statutes Article IV Section 1 is revised with language mimicking in part the USG Faculty Council language in BoR policy.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. <u>Statutes Article IV Section 3</u> is revised with the addition of <i>so long as the University Senate remains mindful of the autonomy of the individual unit and the recommendations are related to the students' educational process.</i></li> <li>c. <u>Statutes Article IV Section 4</u> (veto) is revised with veto replaced by <i>not to accept.</i></li> <li>d. <u>Only Faculty Vote on Academic Matters</u> language drafted by Craig Turner informed by email consultation with ECUS was proposed for insertion as II.Section1.A.1.a of the university senate bylaws.</li> <li>e. <u>Statutes Article IV, Section V</u> (revisions) provided an opinion that statutes may need further refinement or a change in the statutes revision process to properly recognize the authorities of the university president.</li> </ul> <p>2. <b><u>ECUS-SCC Deliberation</u></b> Captured here are the takeaways of the conversation points of the deliberation, certainly not a transcript of every statement made. The items here correspond to the items in 1 above – i.e 2.a details deliberation about 1.a, 2.b details deliberation about 1.b, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. This proposal triggered questions that were discussed with no clear consensus language emerging such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What is the difference between policy and rules and regulations? &lt;They are essentially the same&gt;</li> <li>ii. What is the compliance issue with the policy-making assembly? &lt;Some on campus interpret that to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--



	<p>reference all policy including department/unit policy.&gt; &lt;Authority for making policy resides with the university president, the university senate can only recommend policies subject to the approval of the university president.&gt;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. This proposal triggered a question that was discussed with no clear consensus language emerging. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What is the meaning of the phrase students' educational process?</li> </ul> </li> <li>c. This proposal received no significant discussion as new language was not considered in the order in which it appeared in the table of proposed revisions.</li> <li>d. This proposal triggered questions that were discussed at length with no clear consensus language emerging such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Should Presidential Appointees who are members of the corps of instruction be allowed to vote as university senators on academic matters?</li> <li>ii. Does "academic matters" include curriculum?</li> <li>iii. Is curriculum within the scope of the university senate? The narrative response of President Dorman to 1617.CAPC.020.C answered this with a definitive no. Some interpreting courses of study in BoR policy 3.2.4 as curriculum say yes.</li> <li>iv. Should "research" be removed?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>v. If we start removing things from the list of academic matters, should we no longer cite the AAUP Redbook?</li> <li>e. This proposal received no significant discussion as new language was not considered in the order in which it appeared in the table of proposed revisions.</li> <li>f. As the deliberation came to a close, consensus had not been reached on the points discussed above.</li> <li>g. It was noted that the deliberation would continue with the standing committee chairs at the 3:30pm 6 Oct 2017 ECUS-SCC meeting immediately following this meeting.</li> <li>h. Those present were invited to send any additional suggestions and comments via email to Qiana Wilson, University Counsel.</li> </ul>		
<b>VII. New Business</b> Actions/Recommendations			
<b>Elected Faculty Senator Election Oversight</b>  <b>Nicole DeClouette (Sep)</b> <b>Alex Blazer (Oct)</b>	<p><b><u>01 Sep 2017</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Nicole DeClouette indicated that she has requested the Corps of Instruction list from the Office of Academic Affairs by contacting the Provost by email. According to the university senate bylaws, this list is to be supplied to ECUS by 15 Sep.</i></li> <li>2. <i>Once received, Nicole DeClouette will forward this list to Alex Blazer (Chair of the Subcommittee on Nominations) to prepare a draft of the apportionment for ECUS review. This apportionment review would ideally take place at the 6 Oct 2017 ECUS meeting.</i></li> </ol> <p><b><u>06 Oct 2017</u></b></p>		

	<p>In preparation for upcoming elected faculty senator elections, Alex Blazer provided ECUS with drafts of the apportionment spreadsheet and letters to deans as well as two Corps of Instruction lists (one with Administrators listed as their own “college” of Administration and one with Administrators listed within their home departments). The apportionment of Senators is the same with both classifications of Administrators. The major change from last year’s apportionment is that CoAS has decreased 1 Senator to 17 and CoB has increased 1 Senator to 6.</p> <p>ECUS members present agreed to the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To use the corps of instruction list with the administrators listed within their home department and to adopt the corresponding apportionment of elected faculty senators to the academic units (colleges and library)</li> <li>2. Alex Blazer is authorized to get letters and their appendices to the deans of the academic units (colleges and library) to guide elected faculty senator elections for the elected faculty senators to be elected with 2018-2021 terms of service.</li> </ol>		
<p><b>VIII. Next Meeting</b> (Tentative Agenda, Calendar)</p>			
<p><b>1. Calendar</b></p>	<p>20 Oct 2017 @ 3:30pm Univ. Senate A&amp;S 2-72 03 Nov 2017 @ 2:00pm ECUS Parks 301 03 Nov 2017 @ 3:30pm ECUS-SCC Parks 301</p>		
<p><b>2. Tentative Agenda</b></p>	<p>Some of the deliberation today may have generated tentative agenda items for future ECUS and ECUS-SCC meetings.</p>	<p>Postponed items for this meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appeal Process</li> <li>• Second USGFC Rep &amp; Budget</li> <li>• 2018-19 Governance Calendar</li> </ul>	<p>Nicole DeClouette to ensure that such items (if any) are added to agenda of a future meeting of ECUS or ECUS-SCC.</p>

<b>IX. Adjournment</b>	As there was no further business to consider, a <u>MOTION</u> to adjourn the meeting was made and seconded.	The motion to adjourn was approved and the meeting adjourned at 3:23 pm.	
------------------------	---	--	--

**Distribution:**

First; To Committee Membership for Review

Second: Posted to the Minutes Website

**Approved by:** \_\_\_\_\_

Committee Chairperson (Including this Approval by chair at committee discretion)

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

**COMMITTEE OFFICERS:** NICOLE DECLOUETTE (CHAIR), ALEX BLAZER (VICE-CHAIR), CRAIG TURNER (SECRETARY)

**ACADEMIC YEAR:** 2017-2018

**AGGREGATE MEMBER ATTENDANCE AT COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THE ACADEMIC YEAR:**

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

Acronyms	EFS = Elected Faculty Senator; CoAS = College of Arts and Sciences, CoB = College of Business; CoE = College of Education; CoHS = College of Health Sciences							Present	Regrets	Absent
	9/1/2017	10/6/2017	11/3/2017	12/1/2017	2/2/2018	3/2/2018	3/30/2018			
Alex Blazer <i>EFS; CoAS; ECUS Vice-Chair</i>	P	P						2	0	0
Kelli Brown <i>Provost</i>	P	P						2	0	0
Jolene Cole <i>EFS; Library; ECUS Member</i>	R	P						1	1	0
Nicole DeClouette <i>EFS; CoE; ECUS Chair</i>	P	P						2	0	0
Steve Dorman <i>University President</i>	P	R						1	1	0
Will Hobbs <i>EFS; CoHS; ECUS Member</i>	P	R						1	1	0
Chavonda Mills <i>EFS; CoAS; ECUS Chair Emeritus</i>	P	R						1	1	0
Craig Turner <i>EFS; CoAS; ECUS Secretary</i>	P	P						2	0	0
J.F. Yao <i>EFS; CoB; ECUS Member</i>	R	R						0	2	0

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