

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

**MEETING DATE & TIME:** 5 FEBRUARY 2016; 2:00 –3:15

**MEETING LOCATION:** 301 PARKS ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

<b>R</b>	Kelli Brown (Provost)	<b>P</b>	Lyndall Muschell (CoE, ECUS Member)
<b>R</b>	Jolene Cole (Library; ECUS Member)	<b>P</b>	Susan Steele (CoHS, ECUS Chair Emeritus)
<b>R</b>	Steve Dorman (University President)	<b>P</b>	John R. Swinton (CoB, ECUS Chair)
<b>P</b>	Chavonda Mills (CoAS, ECUS Vice-Chair)	<b>P</b>	Craig Turner (CoAS, ECUS Secretary)

<p><b>GUESTS:</b>          Netta Ben-Hashal (Selected Student Senator)          Juawn Jackson (Student Government Association President)          Jeanne Sewell (Interim Director, IDEAS)          Shea Council (Executive Assistant, Center for Student Success)          Costas Spirou (Interim Associate Provost)</p>
--

<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)}
<b>I. Call to order</b>	The meeting was called to order at 2:00pm by John R. Swinton (Chair).		
<b>II. Approval of Agenda</b>	A <b><u>MOTION</u></b> to approve the agenda was made and seconded.	The agenda was approved as circulated.	
<b>III. Approval of Minutes</b>	A <b><u>MOTION</u></b> to approve the minutes of the 4 Dec 2015 meeting of the Executive Committee was made and seconded. A draft of these minutes	The minutes of the 4 Dec 2015 Executive Committee meeting	

	had been circulated to the meeting attendees via email with one revision offered (correct the college attribution for John R. Swinton to CoB in the Members section). Thus, the minutes had been posted as circulated with this correction to the minutes.gcsu.edu site.	were approved as posted, so no additional action was required.	
<b>IV. Reports</b>	The following reports were invited by John R. Swinton.		
<b>Presiding Officer Report</b>  <b>John R. Swinton</b>	<p><b><u>5 Feb 2016</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b><u>Administrative Support</u></b> John R. Swinton introduced Shea Council, the new administrative assistant to University Senate.</li> <li>2. <b><u>Risk Assessment Survey</u></b> John R. Swinton informed ECUS of a request from Julia Hann for him to represent University Senate for Internal Audit Risk Assessment. He shared the survey and invited feedback by email within the next week to inform his responses to the questions when he is interviewed by Julia Hann.</li> <li>3. <b><u>Bookstore Innovation Group</u></b> John R. Swinton informed ECUS of his willingness to serve as the faculty leadership representative on the Bookstore Innovation Group.</li> <li>4. <b><u>Academic Leadership Council</u></b> John R. Swinton reported that he had sent an email to academic deans to comply with the following request excerpted from the Presiding Officer Report of the 4 Dec 2015 ECUS meeting minutes.</li> </ol>		

	<p><u><b>Academic Leadership Council</b></u> At the next meeting of the Academic Leadership Council, John R. Swinton is to thank the academic deans for submitting elected faculty senator election procedures for their respective academic unit to the executive committee of the university senate and to remind the deans that we (ECUS) are available to help as questions arise.</p>		
<p><b>Past Presiding Officer Report</b></p> <p><b>Susan Steele</b></p>	<p>Susan Steele indicated that she had nothing to report as Past Presiding Officer.</p>		
<p><b>Presiding Officer Elect Report</b></p> <p><b>Chavonda Mills</b></p>	<p>Chavonda Mills reported on the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u><b>Election Oversight</b></u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u><b>Elected Faculty Senators</b></u> An update on the election results from all five academic units (CoAS, CoB, CoE, CoHS and Library).           <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. CoB election results have been received.</li> <li>ii. CoE and the Library have no open senate seats this year and were not required to conduct elections.</li> <li>iii. Friendly reminders to submit election results were sent to deans of CoAS and CoHS.</li> <li>iv. CoAS (5 out of 9 reported)               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Chemistry, Physics, and Astronomy – Hauke Busch and Kimberly Cossey</li> <li>2. Biological and Environmental Sciences – Tom Toney.</li> <li>3. Mathematics – Rodica Cazacu</li> <li>4. Theatre – Amy Pinney</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>		

	<p>v. CoB</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Information Systems and Computer Science – J.F. Yao.</li> <li>2. <b><u>Selected Staff Senators</u></b> On behalf of ECUS, Chavonda Mills contacted Staff Council Chair, Daniel McDonald, on 3 Dec 2015 and shared the relevant university senate bylaws to inform the selection of selected staff senators to serve on the 2016-2017 University Senate. The eligibility requirements from Staff Council governance document(s) as well as a written description of the selection procedure developed by Staff Council were submitted to the Executive Committee on 11 Dec 2015 by Staff Council Chair Daniel McDonald.</li> <li>3. <b><u>Vacancies</u></b> Updates regarding vacancies on the university senate and its committees as well as election oversight will be provided in the SCoN Report to be given at the 5 Feb 2016 ECUS/SCC meeting.</li> <li>4. <b><u>2016 Governance Retreat</u></b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b><u>Committee Members</u></b> Chavonda Mills (Committee Chair), John Swinton, Lyndall Muschell, Craig Turner. An invitation to serve on the 2016 governance retreat planning committee will be extended to senators at the 19 Feb 2016 university senate meeting.</li> <li>b. <b><u>Date</u></b> The 2016 Governance Retreat is scheduled for 9:00am-4:00pm on Tu 9 Aug 2016.</li> <li>c. <b><u>Location</u></b> The location for the 2016 Governance Retreat will be Rock Eagle</li> <li>d. <b><u>Contract</u></b> Request made of Shea Council to ensure the \$200 deposit and</li> </ol> </li> </ol>		
--	--	--	--

	signed contract are returned to the appropriate Rock Eagle personnel.		
<b>Secretary Report</b> <b>Craig Turner</b>	Craig Turner indicated that he had nothing to report as University Senate Secretary.		
<b>Library Senator Report</b> <b>Jolene Cole</b>	As Jolene Cole had extended her <i>regrets</i> and was unable to attend the meeting, there was no report from her as the Library Senator.		
<b>V. Information Items</b> Actions/Recommendations			
<b>University Senate Budget</b> <b>John R. Swinton</b>	<p><b><u>4 Sep 2015</u></b>  <i>The university senate has an operating budget of \$5000 per annum. The expenses of the 2015 governance retreat (bus transit, retreat print materials, facilities use of Rock Eagle, etc.) have been paid. The current balance is \$2667.30.</i></p> <p><i>A question about the existence of a foundations account in the amount of \$500 per annum was posed by the previous two university senate presiding officers (Susan Steele and Lyndall Muschell). ECUS Secretary Craig Turner confirmed that a foundation account (\$500) had been documented in the executive committee minutes for the two previous years. John R. Swinton indicated that Monica Starley had indicated to him that there was no foundation account for the university senate for 2015-2016. John R. Swinton was encouraged to clarify this information with Monica Starley and other appropriate budget personnel (if necessary) as the previous two university senate presiding officers recalled that such an account existed under their terms.</i></p> <p><b><u>6 Nov 2015</u></b></p>		<p><b><u>4 Sep 2015</u></b>  <i>John R. Swinton to check with Monica Starley and other appropriate budget personnel (if necessary) on the existence of a foundation account (\$500) for the university senate.</i></p> <p><b><u>6 Nov 2015</u></b>  <i>John R. Swinton did check on the foundation account and shared information with Executive Committee members as documented in the Presiding Officer Report of the 6 Nov 2015 ECUS meeting. As is indicated in that report, John R. Swinton to seek additional clarification from relevant university personnel on the existence of a foundation account for University Senate.</i></p> <p><b><u>5 Feb 2016</u></b></p>

*The balance of the university senate budget (\$5000 allocation annually) is presently holding at 2667.30. The expenditures for AAUP Redbook purchases for both the ten copies on reserve in the library and the proposed copies for ECUS members and standing committee chairs are not yet included.*

**4 Dec 2015**

*Although John R. Swinton had followed up on the matter of seeking clarification on the existence of a \$500 foundation account for the university senate, there was no paper trail of its existence. Activity for the university senate budget included the processing of the purchase of AAUP Redbooks – both the ten copies for FAPC review and the yet-to-be-ordered copies for university senate leaders, and the processing of the reimbursement for USGFC (University System of Georgia Faculty Council) meeting attendance expenses submitted by Chavonda Mills. At present not all of these items had posted to the account, so the current balance was higher than the available funds. An update will be provided at the next meeting of ECUS at which time all these expenditures should have posted.*

**5 Feb 2016**

1. **Foundation Account** John R. Swinton had followed up on the matter of seeking clarification on the existence of a \$500 foundation account for the university senate, and it continues to be the case that there is no documentation (paper trail or email record) of its existence. A suggestion from the floor was that if this situation persists, it may be wise to consider

John R. Swinton did seek additional clarification on the existence of a foundation account for University Senate.

	<p>inquiring about the possibility of establishing such an account going forward. While there was no resistance offered orally to this possibility, there was also no formal vote to adopt this as a recommendation.</p> <p>2. <b><u>Budget (Operating)</u></b> The balance of the university senate budget (\$5000 allocation annually) is presently \$1691.72 and includes the recent purchases of AAUP Redbooks for the university senate leadership as well as the anticipated expenditure of a \$200 deposit to secure Rock Eagle as the site for the 2016 Governance Retreat.</p>		
<b>VI. Unfinished Business Review of Action &amp; Recommendations, Provide updates (if any) to Follow-up</b>			
<b>Appoint Georgia College Story Archivist</b>  <b>John R. Swinton</b>	<p><b><u>4 Sep 2015</u></b> <i>At the 2015 Governance Retreat, a proposal to appoint a Georgia College Story Archivist was made. The library representative (Jolene Cole) had indicated the library had some recommendations on this appointment. It was agreed to postpone further deliberation on this appointment to the next ECUS meeting so that the library perspective could inform the appointment.</i></p> <p><b><u>2 Oct 2015</u></b> <i>John R. Swinton summarized the discussion on this matter that took place at earlier ECUS meetings including the governance retreat and the 2 Sep 2015 ECUS meeting. Jolene Cole indicated that with the recent departure of the</i></p>		<p><b><u>4 Sep 2015</u></b> <i>John R. Swinton to ensure that this appointment of a Georgia College Story Archivist be considered at a future meeting of ECUS.</i></p> <p><b><u>2 Oct 2015</u></b> <i>1. John R. Swinton did place consideration of the appointment of a Georgia College Story Archivist on the agenda of this meeting of ECUS.</i> <i>2. Jolene Cole to consult with appropriate</i></p>

*University Archivist, she had in consultation with Nancy Davis Bray learned that storyteller is a function that will be included in the qualifications desired for the new position for which a search is beginning. It was noted that Dr. Robert J. Wilson III, who is our university historian, had recently retired and would now be serving in only a 49% capacity. Jolene Cole was invited to follow up on this issue to gather more information to report back to ECUS. The plan is to continue to monitor this situation with a goal of seeing a storyteller function come to fruition. A reminder that this emerged from the observation that a storyteller was present in at least one other USG institution.*

**6 Nov 2015**

*Jolene Cole indicated that she had consulted with university archives and that the search for a position with responsibilities including a university storyteller component is ongoing. As archivist, the stories would be more likely on historical events (those in the past) and university communications might contribute more directly to telling stories of current events. Jolene Cole indicated she would continue to consult and share information with the committee as it became available. There was general consensus to have this item be a standing item on future ECUS meeting agendas and check in with Jolene at each ECUS meeting to see if there is additional information available.*

**4 Dec 2015**

*Jolene Cole had no new information to report on this matter.*

*university personnel to gather information to inform further deliberation on this matter at a future ECUS meeting.*

**6 Nov 2015**

- 1. Jolene Cole did consult with appropriate university personnel to gather information to inform further deliberation on this matter.*
- 2. Jolene Cole to consult with appropriate university personnel to gather information to inform further deliberation on this matter at a future ECUS meeting.*



	<p><b><u>5 Feb 2016</u></b>  As Jolene Cole had extended <i>regrets</i> and was unable to attend this meeting, there was no new information on this matter.</p>		
<p><b>Selected Staff Senator Oversight</b></p>	<p><b><u>2 Oct 2015</u></b>  <i>It was noted that the ECUS Calendar and Checklists document lists <b>Share information on election expectations with Staff Council Leadership</b> to be completed in September. At the meeting, the task of drafting these letters was assigned to Subcommittee on Nominations (SCoN) Chair Chavonda Mills.</i>  <i>Note: Following the meeting and during the preparation of these minutes, it was clarified that this was an ECUS function not a SCoN function and so responsibility for ensuring these letters are drafted and sent shifted to ECUS Chair John R. Swinton.</i></p> <p><b><u>6 Nov 2015</u></b>  <i>After a brief discussion, it was determined that the Staff Council Leadership (Chair Daniel McDonald) has not been contacted regarding selection of selected staff senators for the 2016-2017 University Senate. Chavonda Mills offered to contact Staff Council Chair Daniel McDonald and share the relevant university senate bylaws. Her offer was accepted.</i></p> <p><b><u>4 Dec 2015</u></b>  <i>In her Presiding Officer Elect Report, Chavonda Mills noted that she had shared relevant university senate bylaws with Staff Council Chair Daniel McDonald to inform the selection of selected staff senators for the 2016-2017 University Senate.</i></p>		<p><b><u>2 Oct 2015</u></b>  <i>John. R. Swinton to ensure that selected staff senator selection information from the university senate bylaws is shared with the Staff Council Leadership.</i></p> <p><b><u>6 Nov 2015</u></b>  <i>Chavonda Mills to contact Daniel McDonald (Staff Council Chair) to share the relevant university senate bylaws to inform the selection of selected staff senators to serve on the 2016-2017 University Senate.</i></p> <p><b><u>4 Dec 2015</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Chavonda Mills did contact Daniel McDonald (Staff Council Chair) to share the relevant university senate bylaws to inform the selection of selected staff senators to serve on the 2016-2017 University Senate.</i></li> <li><i>2. John. R. Swinton did ensure that selected staff senator selection</i></li> </ol>

	<p><b><u>5 Feb 2016</u></b> In her Presiding Officer Elect Report, Chavonda Mills noted that the eligibility requirements from Staff Council governance document(s) as well as a written description of the selection procedure developed by Staff Council were submitted to the Executive Committee on 11 Dec 2015 by Staff Council Chair Daniel McDonald.</p>		<p><i>information from the university senate bylaws is shared with the Staff Council Leadership.</i></p>
<p><b>Policy/Procedure on Applying for and Garnering Academic Department Status (or other relevant status changes)</b></p> <p><b>John R. Swinton</b></p>	<p><b><u>4 Sep 2015 (Creation of New Department)</u></b></p> <p><i>One of the supporting documents articulated support from College of Arts and Sciences Dean Ken Procter of a proposal from Program Coordinator Sunita Manian of a proposed designation change of the Philosophy and Liberal Studies program to the Department of Philosophy and Liberal Studies. This program already has an administrative assistant and it is proposed that the coordinator title become department chair. This was shared as an information item.</i></p> <p><i>There was a philosophical discussion on the lack of an existing policy/procedure for a group requesting or garnering status as an academic department. In some cases, the cost of department status may require allocation of resources (such as funding for a department chair position and/or an administrative assistant position and/or an operating budget, etc.). That was not the case in the current proposal. While there was a concern of the lack of a policy/procedure for requesting or garnering academic department status, there was no formal recommendation regarding the establishment of such a policy/procedure. It</i></p>		<p><b><u>2 Oct 2015</u></b></p> <p><i>John R. Swinton to place this matter on the tentative agenda of a future ECUS or ECUS-SCC meeting once the document that Costas Spirou is preparing is available.</i></p> <p><b><u>6 Nov 2015</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. John R. Swinton to seek individuals interested in assisting with the drafting of the procedure.</i></li> <li><i>2. John R. Swinton to assign a committee to prepare parallel policy.</i></li> </ol> <p><b><u>4 Dec 2015</u></b></p> <p><i>John R. Swinton did place this matter on the tentative agenda of this ECUS meeting.</i></p>

*was noted that there is an existing task force authorized by President Dorman working on taxonomy and nomenclature and bringing consistency to the naming of units on campus such as division, department, etc. and noting that this task force may not be considering policy/procedure for the establishment of such units.*

**2 Oct 2015**

*A proposal to steer the development of a policy/procedure on applying for and garnering academic department status which was discussed (see above) at the previous meeting to the appropriate standing committee was made. Provost Brown indicated that Interim Associate Provost Costas Spirou is pulling together into a document the current practice on this matter and related matters. There was general agreement to postpone the steering of this matter until such time as it can be informed by the aforementioned document that is in preparation.*

**6 Nov 2015**

- 1. **Prior to the Meeting** Interim Associate Provost Costas Spirou had supplied a document that provided a starting point for discussion on a procedure to request and garner academic department status or rename an academic department. This document had been circulated by John R. Swinton with the tentative agenda of the*

*meeting. This document is attached as a supporting document to these minutes.*

2. **Context** *Interim Associate Provost Costas Spirou provided the following contextual information.*

a. *This initiative was triggered by the recent information item received by ECUS that PALS (Philosophy and Liberal Studies) garnered academic department status in the College of Arts and Sciences.*

b. *The main points of the draft were highlighted to note that (1) it was a procedure for renaming a department or requesting academic department status (2) initially a conversation among the department, dean and provost on viability and rationale of the proposed revision (name change or request for academic department status) would take place (see Steps I and II in the supporting document) (3) there was guidance on the content of a proposal (see Step III in the supporting document) (4) the proposal should be considered by a committee of the university senate and APC, CAPC or FAPC is proposed yet perhaps (after a conversation with Craig Turner prior to this meeting) it would be more appropriate to route the proposal to this group (ECUS) and have ECUS steer the proposal to the relevant*

*university senate committee (see Step IV in the supporting document) (5) the remaining steps involve review by the Provost and a decision made by the University President (see Steps V and following in the supporting document) (6) the goal was to inject transparency into the process and to provide a means by which an individual or individuals that are considering making such requests (to rename an academic department or request academic department status) can be educated on how to do so. In short, the document is designed to guide and assist proposers.*

3. **Discussion** *The following were the points of conversation.*
  - a. *Item (4) in the contextual information above (replacing APC or FAPC or CAPC with ECUS in Step IV) was agreeable to those present.*
  - b. *A question from the floor was “Where is the consideration of anticipated students enrolled?” and it was noted that this aspect fit within at least one of **Cost** or **Student Service** in Step III.*
  - c. *A suggestion to place this in the policy template format of the university senate was offered. It was noted that the current document contained only procedure and not policy. The response was that there should be an*

*overarching policy that might be simply to follow the proposed procedure under discussion. Susan Steele volunteered to assist in the drafting of the policy and formatting in compliance with the policy template.*

- d. The renaming of an academic department is sometimes guided by accreditation bodies or nomenclature changes within a discipline and in this case a streamlined proposal might be appropriate (not requiring all the information requested in Step III). While some of those present agreed with this perspective, there was no formal vote of the group on this nuance. Some noted that the proposer could abbreviate the responses and focus on the rationale being to comply with accreditation or nomenclature change.*
- e. A suggestion to add a restructuring option (to the rename or establish a department options already present) to accommodate a split of a department into two or more departments was offered from the floor. Most of those present agreed that this option was a reasonable addition.*
- f. Clarification questions were posed to tease out the nature of the review of individuals and committees.*

	<p>i. <i>Could a proposal continue through the process without garnering approval of the dean?</i></p> <p>ii. <i>Was the university senate approving or recommending? That is, could the lack of support from the university senate prevent a proposal from reaching the University President?</i></p> <p><i>One perspective was that the University President made the decision and that all lower level reviews were recommendations to inform this decision. While some of those present agreed with this perspective, there was no formal vote of the group on this nuance.</i></p> <p>g. <i>A concern about reviewer reliability was offered indicating that as different deans may have different perspectives, the stringency of reviews may not be consistent – some being more stringent and some being less stringent. While some of those present agreed with this perspective, there was no formal vote of the group on this nuance.</i></p> <p>h. <i>The question of who could initiate a request was posed from the floor. The answer was faculty. Perhaps this could be more explicitly stated in the proposal.</i></p>		
--	--	--	--

i. *Interim Provost Costas Spirou expressed his appreciation for the suggestions and rich discussion.*

4. **Next Steps** *As the committee deliberation concluded, Presiding Officer John R. Swinton proposed the following next steps.*

a. *All present were invited to share with Costas Spirou any other suggestions that may emerge if they continue to review the document.*

b. *Assign a committee to prepare parallel policy. Susan Steele was the only volunteer for this committee.*

c. *Review the combined policy and procedure at the next ECUS meeting and route to a standing committee (APC, CAPC, FAPC, SAPC, RPIPC) for review.*

*These proposed steps met with no resistance from those present.*

**4 Dec 2015**

1. **At the Meeting** *Interim Associate Provost Costas Spirou supplied, to those present at the meeting, hard copies of the latest draft of procedures to establish, restructure, or rename an academic department.*

2. **Context** *Interim Associate Provost Costas Spirou provided the following contextual information.*

a. *This initiative was triggered by the recent information item received by ECUS that PALS (Philosophy and*



*Liberal Studies) garnered academic department status in the College of Arts and Sciences.*

- b. As suggested by ECUS on 6 Nov 2015
  - i. The draft now includes the option to propose the restructuring of a department in addition to establishing and renaming.*
  - ii. The draft now includes a streamlining of the documentation necessary to support a proposal to rename an academic unit. This streamlining requires only a rationale rather than a full proposal. Renaming is usually not a substantive change and often made to comply with discipline-based or accreditation-based nomenclature.*
  - iii. The reference to APC or FAPC or CAPC in Step IV has been replaced by a reference to ECUS.**
- c. Costas Spirou reported consulting
  - i. at length with Craig Turner and that this consultation had been quite helpful in refining the current draft*
  - ii. with deans who had recommended no further revisions*
  - iii. with chairs who provided mixed feedback, some indicating the process seemed overly complicated and unnecessary**

*while others found no concerns with the process as proposed*

3. **Discussion** *The following were the points of conversation.*

a. **Is a Programs an Academic Unit?**

*Interim Associate Provost Costas Spirou noted the broadening of the definition of the term academic unit to include program, department, school or college and this definition had been explicitly added since 6 Nov 2015. Some of the department chairs reviewing the draft had wondered if a program should be considered an academic unit. This question was posed to those present at the meeting.*

i. *One comment was recalling the formal definition of program being given in an institutional document. Upon further consideration, it was thought to be the aforementioned curricular policy document that is still in preparation.*

ii. *One perspective was that a program could be culled from the illustrative examples of academic units as the transformation of a program to a department could be handled as the establishment of a department and the migration of a program from an existing department to another department could be accommodated by a*

*restructuring. This perspective did not garner sufficient traction to affect a change.*

*iii. Ultimately, there was consensus among those present that there was not a problem with leaving program in the illustrative example list of academic units, mostly due to the fact that there was no compelling justification for it being removed from this list.*

*b. **Editorial Suggestions** Discussion continued with the following editorial suggestions to the document*

*i. To parallel the construction of Step V, a suggestion to replace The Provost with If recommended, the Provost in Step IV was offered and supported by those present. This modification would allow the possibility that the proposal is not forwarded by the Provost to ECUS in the event a viable proposal is not constructed by the proposer.*

*ii. Similarly, in Step II, a suggestion to replace The Provost with If deemed appropriate, the Provost was offered and supported by those present. This modification would allow the consideration of a proposal to terminate in Step II if it was not deemed appropriate.*

- |  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  | <p>iii. <i>A question of In Step V, what is the action of the University Senate? Is it an endorsement, an approval, etc.? Discussion continued and this question was never definitively answered, although a suggestion to replace in Step V The request is reviewed with The Executive Committee facilitates the review was offered and supported by those present.</i></p> <p>iv. <i>An observation that the current Step VI of the action by the university senate being routed to the Provost, rather than the University President, was not in compliance with university senate bylaws where motions of the University Senate are forwarded to the University President. This observation did not garner sufficient traction to affect change. During the preparation of these minutes, it is noted that the relevant university senate bylaws include I.Section1.D dealing with the University President taking actions of accept or veto on an action of the University Senate and I.Section2 in which the University Senate serves in an advisory role to the administration. Depending on the nature of the review by the</i></p> |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|

*University Senate in Step V, this review may be considered an advisory action to the administration and in particular the Provost. Further discussion may be advisable to consider this nuance.*

- c. **Appreciation** *Interim Provost Costas Spirou expressed his appreciation for the suggestions and rich discussion.*

**5 Feb 2016**

1. **Prior to the Meeting** The 10 Dec 2015 draft of the *procedures to establish, restructure, or rename an academic unit* was a supporting document circulated with the tentative agenda.
2. **Context** Interim Associate Provost Costas Spirou provided the following contextual information.
  - a. This initiative was triggered by the recent information item received by ECUS that PALS (Philosophy and Liberal Studies) garnered academic department status in the College of Arts and Sciences.
  - b. The latest draft incorporates the editorial suggestions offered at the 4 Dec 2015 ECUS meeting. I appreciate all the guidance and feedback that you have offered to this point. In particular, I appreciate the feedback provided by

Craig Turner as he and I have spent a lot of time discussing the draft.

3. **ECUS Deliberation**

- a. **Editorial Suggestion** Craig Turner offered one more editorial suggestion to Costas Spirou in writing. The editorial suggestion was to re-express the sentence in Step III that starts with *In all other cases* and modify it to excise the phrase *for the establishment / restructuring or renaming of the academic unit*.
- b. **Information Item** John R. Swinton invited Costas Spirou to share this procedure as an information item with the university senate at its next meeting. Costas Spirou accepted this invitation.
- c. **PPPM** A question was posed from the floor *How will this procedure make its way into the PPPM (Policies, Procedures and Practices Manual)?*
  - i. One observation was that there is no codified revision process included in the PPPM.
  - ii. Another observation was the perception that the current practice is to have editors for various sections of the PPPM (Academic Affairs, Finance and Administration, Faculty Handbook, Campus Technology Policies, Office of Human Resources,

	<p>University Advancement, Information Technology Department Policies) who assist in its maintenance for their respective sections. This was not absolutely confirmed.</p> <p>iii. Another observation was the perception that there is an archive of the PPPM and an effort to maintain a record of previous versions of entries that are revised. This was not absolutely confirmed although the PPPM does support a collection of Changelogs for the aforementioned sections.</p> <p>iv. Earlier this academic year, there was a revision of the Requirements for a Course Syllabus to increase the clarity of the exposition of that entry.</p> <p>v. Costas Spirou offered to check on the revision process for matters that pertain to Academic Affairs and this offer was accepted on behalf of the committee by ECUS Chair John R. Swinton.</p> <p>4. <b>Appreciation</b> Interim Provost Costas Spirou expressed his appreciation for the suggestions and rich discussion.</p>		
<p><b>Elected Faculty Senator Oversight</b></p>	<p><u>2 Oct 2015</u>  <i>It was noted that the ECUS Calendar and Checklists document lists <b>Share information on election expectations in academic units</b></i></p>		<p><u>2 Oct 2015</u>  <i>John. R. Swinton to ensure that elected faculty senator oversight letters (with the</i></p>

*(colleges and library) with a letter to college deans and the university librarian as a recurring annual ECUS function to be completed in September. Given the reapportionment of a seat shifting from College of Education (CoE) to College of Arts and Sciences, a quick check was made to see if at least one CoE elected faculty senator had a term ending in 2016 (finding it was the case). At the meeting, the task of drafting these letters was assigned to Subcommittee on Nominations (SCoN) Chair Chavonda Mills.*

*Note: Following the meeting and during the preparation of these minutes, it was clarified that this was an ECUS function not a SCoN function and so responsibility for ensuring these letters are drafted and sent shifted to ECUS Chair John R. Swinton.*

**6 Nov 2015**

*Ultimately, Chavonda Mills sent the letters with appropriate appendices to the deans of the academic units (colleges and library) after providing ECUS members the opportunity to review the draft letters and appendices.*

**4 Dec 2015**

*As noted by Chavonda Mills in her Presiding Officer Elect Report, the elected faculty senator election procedures have been received from each academic unit. Election results are due no later than 1 Feb 2016.*

**5 Feb 2016**

*In her Presiding Officer Elect Report at this meeting, Chavonda Mills provided an update on election results.*

*typical supporting documents) are sent to the college deans and university librarian.*

**6 Nov 2015**

*John R. Swinton did ensure that elected faculty senator oversight letters (with the typical supporting documents) were sent to the college deans and university librarian.*



<p><b>At-Large Election</b></p>	<p><u><b>6 Nov 2015</b></u>  <i>It was noted that a recurring ECUS function is to administer the at-large election of an elected faculty senator and that this election must be implemented during February and completed by March 1. Chavonda Mills accepted the invitation to draft an at-large election procedure for ECUS review. John R. Swinton offered to share the at-large election materials from 2014-2015 with Chavonda, an offer which she quickly accepted.</i></p> <p><u><b>4 Dec 2015</b></u>  <i>Chavonda Mills invited Craig Turner to provide context on the proposed changes and he accepted this invitation. Most of the updates involved the timeline and mimicked the timeline used during 2014-15. The quote of University Senate Bylaw II.Section1.A.2 was corrected to cite thirty-seven (37) faculty members rather than the errant thirty-six (36) cited in 2014-15. The only other modification was to reword a sentence referencing apportionment and the corps of instruction list to cull the reference to the academic year and refer to the most recent versions so that this sentence would not require an annual update. Historically the two main points of conversation are the longstanding tie-breaker procedure (dating back to 2005-2006) of a blind draw and the even longer standing replacement procedure (dating back to 2004-2005) of the Miss America Rule. The Miss</i></p>		<p><u><b>6 Nov 2015</b></u>  <i>Chavonda Mills to draft an at-large election procedure for ECUS review.</i></p> <p><u><b>4 Dec 2015</b></u>  <i>Chavonda Mills did draft an at-large election procedure for ECUS review.</i></p>
---------------------------------	--	--	--

	<p><i>America Rule is where the first-runner up, second runner up, etc. would be invited (in order) to complete the term of service should the elected at-large senator be unable to complete the three year term of service. Following this contextual presentation, the at-large procedure was adopted as presented.</i></p>		
<p><b>Governance Calendar for 2016-2017</b></p>	<p><b><u>6 Nov 2015</u></b>  <i>It was noted that a recurring ECUS function is to prepare a governance calendar (in this case for 2016-2017) by April 1. Craig Turner, John R. Swinton and Chavonda Mills indicated their interest in assisting with the preparation of a draft of the 2016-2017 governance calendar for ECUS review.</i></p> <p><b><u>4 Dec 2015</u></b>  <i>Concerns regarding the Governance Calendar were raised from the floor during the 20 Nov 2015 meeting of the university senate. The interested reader is directed to those minutes for details. At the conclusion of this open discussion at the 20 Nov 2015 university senate meeting, John R. Swinton had promised to ensure that the university senate has an opportunity during the spring 2016 semester to review and offer feedback on the draft governance calendar for 2016-2017.</i></p> <p><i>ECUS deliberation on this topic was to consider the timeline for the development of the 2016-2017 governance calendar to ensure time for university senate review. The university</i></p>	<p>It</p>	<p><b><u>6 Nov 2015</u></b>  <i>Craig Turner, John R. Swinton, and Chavonda Mills to ensure that a draft of the 2016-17 governance calendar is prepared for ECUS review.</i></p> <p><b><u>4 Dec 2015</u></b>  <i>John R. Swinton to ensure that this matter receives consideration at a future ECUS and/or ECUS-SCC meeting.</i></p>

*senate bylaws call for a 1 April completion date. It was agreed that the governance calendar drafting committee (John R. Swinton, Chavonda Mills, and Craig Turner) would strive to complete a draft of the calendar to allow the university senate time to review the draft during at least one of its 22 Jan 2016 and 19 Feb 2016 meetings.*

*During the conversation, there was a reminder that the governance calendar was initially (in 2005-2006) a meeting priority calendar and claimed to indicate the meeting which would have priority for a common meeting time. At some point (specifically 2006-2007) the calendar was streamlined to include only governance (department, college, college committee, university senate, and university senate committee) meetings and became known at the governance calendar. There was an agreement to consider returning to the meeting priority calendar nomenclature at a future meeting of the Executive Committee.*

*A question from the floor - What is the action the University Senate would take on the calendar? - stimulated further deliberation. The possibilities for university senate action that were offered for consideration included (1) to review and advise the governance calendar development committee (2) to endorse the governance calendar as a resolution (3) to formalize the governance*

	<p><i>calendar as a motion. While no formal vote was taken, the option that garnered the most vocal support was option (2) endorsing the governance calendar as a resolution. It was agreed to continue the consideration of this matter at a future meeting of the Executive Committee.</i></p> <p><b><u>5 Feb 2016</u></b>  John R. Swinton requested and received permission from those present at this meeting to circulate the DRAFT 2016-2017 Governance Calendar to the members of the university senate and invite them to review the draft and offer feedback. <i>Note: During the preparation of these minutes, this email was sent.</i></p>		
<p><b>AAUP Redbooks for University Senate Leaders</b></p>	<p><b><u>6 Nov 2015</u></b>  <i>Recent practice has been to consider annually the purchase of AAUP Redbooks for the university senate leadership. This leadership group includes all members of ECUS and committee chairs. While a suggestion was to consider buying copies of the books to loan to university senate leaders during their terms of service, it was ultimately agreed that the book should be a token of appreciation to be kept by the individuals serving in these leadership positions. The ECUS members present agreed to allocate funds from the university senate budget to purchase 11<sup>th</sup> Edition AAUP Redbooks for all ECUS members and committee chairs (APC, CAPC, FAPC, RPIPC,</i></p>		

	<p><i>SoCC, SAPC). John R. Swinton took a poll and found out that most members of ECUS already had the most current edition (11<sup>th</sup>) of the AAUP Redbook and noted that only two books (for Chavonda Mills and Jolene Cole) would need to be ordered for ECUS members.</i></p> <p><b><u>4 Dec 2015</u></b></p> <p><i>John R. Swinton confirmed the AAUP Redbook (11<sup>th</sup> Edition) count for part of the university senate leadership – in particular ECUS members. Three books (Jolene Cole, Chavonda Mills, Craig Turner) were needed. Confirmation of the number needed for other leaders (university senate committee chairs) would occur at the 4 Dec 2015 meeting of the Executive Committee with Standing Committee Chairs.</i></p> <p><b><u>5 Feb 2016</u></b></p> <p>John R. Swinton indicated that AAUP Redbooks ordered for university senate leaders had been received and would be distributed at the 5 Feb 2016 meeting of ECUS with Standing Committee Chairs.</p>		
<p><b>VII. New Business</b> Actions/Recommendations</p>			
<p><b>Campus Carry</b>  <b>Craig Turner</b></p>	<p>John R. Swinton had received an email inquiry asking what action the university senate is taking with respect to this matter. This email inquiry triggered the inclusion of this matter as an agenda item for this ECUS meeting. John R. Swinton invited Craig Turner to provide</p>		

contextual information on the current proposal under consideration in the Georgia Legislature. One supporting document circulated with this meeting's tentative agenda was relevant to. HB 859, a house bill under consideration in the Georgia Legislature. This bill proposes the following.

*To amend Part 3 of Article 4 of Chapter 11 of Title 16 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to carrying and possession of firearms, so as to authorize the carrying and possession of certain weapons by weapons carry license holders in or on certain buildings or real property owned by or leased to public institutions of postsecondary education; to provide for related matters; to repeal conflicting laws; and for other purposes.*

**BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF GEORGIA:**

**SECTION 1.**

*Part 3 of Article 4 of Chapter 11 of Title 16 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to carrying and possession of firearms, is amended in subsection (c) of Code Section 16-11-127.1, relating to carrying weapons within school safety zones, at school functions, or on a bus or other transportation furnished by a school, by deleting "or" at the end of paragraph (17), by replacing the period with "; or" at the end of paragraph (18), and by adding a new paragraph to read as follows:*

*(19) Any license holder when he or she is in or on any building or real property owned by or leased to any public technical school, vocational school, college, university, or other institution of postsecondary education; provided, however, that such exception shall not apply to buildings or property used for athletic sporting events or student housing, including, but not limited to, fraternity and sorority houses; and provided, further, that*

	<p><u>such exception shall only apply to the carrying of weapons which are licensed pursuant to Code Section 16-11-129."</u></p> <p><b>SECTION 2.</b></p> <p><i>All laws and parts of laws in conflict with this Act are repealed.</i></p> <p>Bills of this type are referenced as <i>Campus Carry</i> in the media. This bill offers a 19<sup>th</sup> exception to the current Georgia code (state law). As examples, other exceptions include allowances for (1) school officials (principals) to authorize with respect to their own schools the use of a weapon which would otherwise be prohibited by Georgia code (2) law enforcement personnel in exercising their duties. Craig Turner indicated that he had a conversation with President Dorman (prior to this meeting) regarding this matter. Following that conversation (and prior to this meeting), President Dorman communicated with USG leadership including the Chancellor and indicated that within the next week, guidance from the USG leadership is anticipated. Craig Turner also noted that the faculty governance body of Augusta University (formerly Georgia Regents University) recently passed a resolution pertaining to this proposed legislation. There was general consensus to inform university senate activity on this matter with the guidance anticipated from the USG leadership. There was also an observation offered from the floor that university employees are of course free to contact their legislative representatives and express their opinions on this matter as Georgia citizens.</p>		
<p><b>Student Government Association Resolution to Require the use of D2L</b></p>	<p>When this matter was reached on the agenda, Student Government Association (SGA) President Juawn Jackson was not yet present. It</p>	<p>a</p>	

<p><b>(Desire2Learn) by all GCSU Faculty</b></p> <p><b>Juawn Jackson</b></p>	<p>is worth noting that President Jackson serves on the Student Affairs Policy Committee (SAPC) and that SAPC and ECUS meetings are concurrent.</p> <p>While awaiting the arrival of the SGA representatives – Juawn Jackson (SGA President) and Netta Ben-Hashal (author of the resolution; <i>Note that each of Juawn Jackson and Netta Ben-Hashal is a selected student senator and a member of the Student Affairs Policy Committee</i>) – the following were conversation points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The total cost of D2L (\$112,828) is absorbed by three funding sources (USG \$66,902, GC Student Fees \$22,963, and GC Academic Affairs \$22, 963).</li> <li>2. A distillation of the resolution is that SGA seeks a standard tool with which to obtain access to their academic performance – i.e. grades for coursework. It will be helpful to confirm this perception with the student government representatives.</li> <li>3. While the reporting of a formal midterm grade is required of all courses that can be used to satisfy an area A-E core requirement, students are likely looking for more information than that type of feedback.</li> <li>4. Nursing presently uses D2L in all courses.</li> <li>5. Given that we have D2L, why do some academic units (departments, schools, colleges) purchase other software that accomplishes the same thing just because their faculty don't find D2L appealing? Is this a responsible use of state funds?</li> <li>6. Education uses LiveText and requires all their students to access LiveText. This product was selected to comply with</li> </ol>		
--	---	--	--



	<p>accreditation body requirements. College of Education faculty would prefer not to be required to redundantly record grade information in D2L (as well as maintain a record in LiveText). D2L has been tested and does not support the reports needed for College of Education accreditation documentation.</p> <p>7. Possible committees to which this might be steered are FAPC as it could be a matter of academic freedom, CAPC as there is an assessment component (grades), and APC as there are implications to broad academic policy. There was not complete agreement by those present that there were implications to academic freedom.</p> <p>When the SGA representatives arrived, John R. Swinton summarized the deliberation on this matter that occurred prior to their arrival. The student representatives indicated that their primary concern was to have a standard repository for all courses to obtain syllabus and grade information. In particular, they asked that the resolution in its current form not be shared with a university senate committee that would be considering a policy as they should have promoted GeorgiaVIEW (which presently is D2L).</p> <p>Jeanne Sewell, Interim Director of IDEAS, provided the following information</p> <p>(a) Not all students are acquainted with GeorgiaVIEW.</p> <p>(b) A pair of online courses – self-paced, streamlined, focused, interactive, providing what you really need to know – are being developed (one for faculty, one for students) and should be completed prior to the end of spring 2016 semester.</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>(c) We are also reaching out to GeorgiaVIEW users to inquire about their needs.</p> <p>The steering of this matter was deferred to the 5 Feb 2016 meeting of the Executive Committee with Standing Committee Chairs and the students (Juawn Jackson, Netta Ben-Hashal) were invited to attend. As the students were unable to attend the forthcoming meeting of ECUS with Standing Committee Chairs, John R. Swinton promised to send SGA President Juawn Jackson an email providing information, specifically the university senate committee to which this matter is steered.</p>		
<b>VIII. Next Meeting</b> (Tentative Agenda, Calendar)			
<b>1. Calendar</b>	<p>19 Feb 2016 @ 2:00pm Univ. Senate in A&amp;S 2-72</p> <p>4 Mar 2016 @ 2:00pm ECUS in 301 Parks</p> <p>4 Mar 2016 @ 3:30pm ECUS-SCC in 301 Parks</p>		
<b>2. Tentative Agenda</b>	Some of the deliberation today may have generated tentative agenda items for future ECUS and ECUS-SCC meetings.		John R. Swinton to ensure that such items (if any) are added to agendas of an ECUS and/or ECUS-SCC meeting in the future.
<b>IX. Adjournment</b>	As there was no further business to consider, a <b>MOTION</b> to adjourn the meeting was made and seconded.	The motion to adjourn was approved and the meeting adjourned at 3:15 pm.	

**Distribution:**

First; To Committee Membership for Review

Second: Posted to the Minutes Website

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

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

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

**COMMITTEE OFFICERS:** JOHN R. SWINTON (CHAIR), CHAVONDA MILLS (VICE-CHAIR), CRAIG TURNER (SECRETARY)

**ACADEMIC YEAR:** 2015-2016

**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 & Sciences, CoB = College of Business; CoE = College of Education; CoHS = College of Health Sciences										
	Meeting Dates	09-04-15	10-02-15	11-06-15	12-04-15	02-05-16	03-04-16	04-01-16	Present	Regrets	Absent
Kelli Brown <i>Provost</i>	R	P	P	R	R				2	3	0
Jolene Cole <i>EFS; Library, ECUS Member</i>	R	P	P	P	R				3	2	0
Steve Dorman <i>University President</i>	P	R	R	R	R				1	4	0
Chavonda Mills <i>EFS; CoAS; ECUS Vice-Chair</i>	P	P	P	P	P				5	0	0
Lyndall Muschell <i>EFS; CoE; ECUS Member</i>	P	P	P	P	P				5	0	0
Susan Steele <i>EFS; CoHS; ECUS Chair Emeritus</i>	P	P	P	P	P				5	0	0
John R. Swinton <i>EFS; CoB; ECUS Chair</i>	P	P	P	P	P				5	0	0
Craig Turner <i>EFS; CoAS; ECUS Secretary</i>	P	P	P	P	P				5	0	0