

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

MEETING DATE & TIME: 15 NOVEMBER 2013; 3:30 –4:45

MEETING LOCATION: 301 PARKS ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

ATTENDANCE:

MEMBERS		“P” denotes Present, “A” denotes Absent, “R” denotes Regrets	
P	Alex Blazer (CoAS, FAPC Chair)	R	Cara Meade (CoE, CAPC Chair)
R	Kelli Brown (Provost)	R	Dee Sams (CoB, SAPC Chair)
R	Steve Dorman (University President)	P	Susan Steele (CoHS, ECUS Vice-Chair)
P	Maureen Horgan (CoAS, RPIPC Chair)	P	Craig Turner (CoAS, ECUS Secretary)
R	Joshua Kitchens (Library)	P	Catherine Whelan (CoB, ECUS Chair Emeritus)
P	Lyndall Muschell (CoE, ECUS Chair)	R	Howard Woodard (CoB, APC Chair)

GUESTS:

Kay Anderson (University Registrar)
 Nicole DeClouette (SAPC Secretary)
 Carly Jara (Graduate Assistant of the 2013-2014 University Senate)
 Leslie Moore (APC Vice-Chair)

	<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 Lyndall Muschell (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 4 Oct 2013 ECUS-SCC minutes was made and seconded. These minutes had been circulated to the meeting attendees via email with no revisions offered and subsequently posted at minutes.gcsu.edu.	The 4 Oct 2013 ECUS-SCC minutes were approved as posted to minutes.gcsu.edu.	
IV. Reports			
President's Report	As President Dorman had extended regrets and was unable to attend this meeting, there was no President's Report.		
Provost's Report	As Provost Brown had extended regrets and was unable to attend this meeting, there was no Provost's Report.		
Academic Policy Committee (APC) Leslie Moore reporting for Howard Woodard	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Motions</u> APC has no motions to submit for University Senate consideration at its 6 Dec 2013 meeting. 2. <u>Synopsis of 15 Nov 2013 APC Meeting</u> Kay Anderson, University Registrar, met with the APC to discuss the "probation loophole" and "repeating of grades" issues, and after hearing that these most likely involve the same students and have an effect on each other, APC will consider revising the academic progression policy to require students to return to probation status rather than warning status for any student who has previously been placed on probation and subsequently falls below minimum standards. The group will postpone work on the "repeating of grades" issue at this time. 		
Curriculum and Assessment Policy Committee (CAPC)	1. <u>Motions</u> CAPC will submit one motion for University Senate consideration at its 6 Dec 2013 meeting. The motion will be		

<p>Kay Anderson reporting for Cara Meade</p>	<p>a resolution (type R) and requests University Senate endorsement of the proposed Quality Enhancement Plan Community-Based Engaged Learning Outcomes. This request was submitted to ECUS by the Quality Enhancement Plan Task Force and ECUS steered the request to CAPC for review. CAPC has endorsed this request and is recommending it for University Senate consideration.</p> <p>2. SoCC List of Course Approvals CAPC received a list of courses approved by SoCC since its last meeting.</p> <p>3. Global Overlays CAPC also began a discussion, at SoCC's request, on whether the campus global overlay requirement might be broadened to include multicultural and domestic diversity issues. This discussion will continue at the next CAPC meeting scheduled for 24 Jan 2014.</p>		
<p>Faculty Affairs Policy Committee (FAPC)</p> <p>Alex Blazer</p>	<p>1. Motions FAPC has no motions to submit for University Senate consideration at its 6 Dec 2013 meeting.</p> <p>2. Old Business (Fact Finding Missions)</p> <p>a. Faculty Annual Evaluation: A work group looked into but ultimately dropped the issue of some faculty not receiving annual faculty evaluations due to lack of solid information.</p> <p>b. Summer Teaching Proration A work group continues to look into the issue of some faculty not receiving signed agreements regarding summer pay proration, but it appears that different colleges have different procedures and the</p>		

	<p>college in question seems to have moved from a signed agreement procedure to a pay calculator model.</p> <p>3. <u>New Business:</u></p> <p>a. <u>Faculty Workload</u> A work group has been formed to look into faculty workload issues across colleges, independent/directed study courses, and core courses, being mindful that some of the findings may be internal to colleges and departments and therefore outside of the committee's charge.</p> <p>b. <u>Pre-Tenure Review Notifications</u> There have been contradictory reports that the Office of Academic Affairs has not been sending out notifications of Pre-Tenure Review and some faculty are not undergoing review. We are making inquiries to Academic Affairs and advising those faculty members of the Pre-Tenure Review Policy < which can be found in the Policies, Procedures and Practices Manual (the PPPM) at http://gcsu.smartcatalogiq.com/en/Policy-Manual/Policy-Manual/Academic-Affairs/EmploymentPolicies-Procedures-Benefits/Performance-Evaluations-Administrators-and-Faculty/Faculty-Performance-Evaluation/Pre-Tenure-Review >.</p>		
<p>Student Affairs Policy Committee (SAPC)</p> <p>Nicole DeClouette reporting for</p>	<p>1. <u>Motions</u> SAPC has no motions to submit for University Senate consideration at its 6 Dec 2013 meeting.</p> <p>2. <u>Veteran Center</u> The committee has been talking to Doc St. Clair about starting up</p>	<p>Regarding the POUNCE item on the SAPC report, Kay Anderson, University Registrar, noted that the year-long POUNCE has allowed for more behind-the-</p>	

<p>Doreen Sams</p>	<p>a Veteran Center on campus. Georgia College (GC) is not presently a veteran friendly institution, and we started by looking at whether or not GC has an Active Military Attendance Policy and it does not. Without such a policy, in the event that a student who serves in the military has to be called away for short term TDY (Temporary Duty Yonder), the faculty member can determine whether or not students can make up the work they miss. This disadvantages our military students (and future military students). SAPC is considering proposing an amendment to the current class attendance policy (e.g., <i>“Likewise if a student is representing the United States military for Temporary Duty Yonder (TDY), the instructor will not penalize the student for those absences, and the students should consult their instructor before anticipated absences.”</i>). Dee Sams will seek guidance from University Registrar Kay Anderson about the specific language that should be used.</p> <p>3. POUNCE Evelyn Thomas raised a concern about a student worker who was closed out of classes. This is the first year that freshman POUNCED for the whole year (so they are already registered for classes). After the seniors, juniors, and sophomores registered, there were some classes that were already closed. This likely affects only a few students (those who are third semester freshman), but it could be a retention issue too. Steve Wills volunteered to talk to Kay Anderson and Suzanne Pittman about this</p>	<p>scenes planning resulting in a higher proportion of students having full-time spring schedules immediately after registration than ever before. In short, the year-long POUNCE seems to benefit all students rather than limit seats in courses. Kay Anderson noted that students who are unable to get the courses they need to make progress in their degree programs are encouraged to come to the Registrar’s office or contact her directly for assistance.</p>	
---------------------------	--	---	--

	and report back to SAPC in January 2014.		
Resources, Planning and Institutional Policy Committee (RPIPC) Maureen Horgan	<p>RPIPC met on Friday 15 Nov 2013 from 2:00pm to 3:20pm in Porter Hall Room 228.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Motion</u> RPIPC has no motions to submit for University Senate consideration at its 6 Dec 2013 meeting. 2. <u>Policies Under Review</u> Two proposed policies are under review and expected to be discussed by RPIPC again on 24 Jan 2014 and submitted for consideration by the University Senate at its 14 Feb 2014 meeting. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Background Investigations</u> Has gone back to Executive Cabinet for revision, will come back to RPIPC before the end of this academic term. b. <u>Sexual Harassment Policy</u>. Guests Jennifer Graham (Women's Center and Diversity Coordinator), Andy Lewter (Dean of Students), and Qiana Wilson (Associate General Counsel) attended. While there was extended questioning and discussion, topics included format, definitions, relationship to state and federal law as well as BoR policy, as it pertains to both employees and students, and how this document compares to the previous policy, there were no suggested revisions offered by RPIPC members. Maureen Horgan will work with Jennifer Graham to revise the format to comply with the policy template of University Senate. 3. <u>Diversity Action Plan</u> Guest Veronica Womack attended to solicit feedback on the Diversity Action Plan. The committee 		

working to develop this plan includes faculty, staff, students, administrators, and community members. Three public forums on the topic were held in September and were well attended. RPIPC suggested revisions to the definition of underrepresented minorities. It was clarified that this is a preliminary document to specify the goals of President Dorman's charge to the committee and to reference how they tie into Georgia College's Mission and Strategic Directions. The plan will again be presented to the Georgia College community in December – developing procedures to implement the goals will begin after that.

4. **Smoking Policy Enforcement** The issue of Smoking Policy Enforcement was revisited. RPIPC concluded last year that the policy was unenforceable, and that education was the device most likely to produce the desired effect. An education committee was formed, did some work; no one from the committee was available to come to today's meeting to give an update. The most effective tool seemed to be temporary signs (paid for by SGA), but they are no longer up. RPIPC again concluded that the policy is unenforceable, and that if education is the way to go, it needs both a sustained effort and funding. Suggested as possible implementers for this education were Human Resources for employees, and the Dean of Students for students. Doug Oetter will pursue this item and report back at the next RPIPC meeting.

	<p>5. <u>Recycling and Other Sustainability Council Initiatives</u> Doug Oetter reported for the Sustainability Council that the recycling program seems to be working, the next major project will be energy usage on campus</p> <p>6. <u>12-month pay option.</u> Maureen Horgan requested input on a draft survey to faculty on a 12-month pay option. RPIPC had suggested that the current option that faculty can have a second pay deduction that goes to a saving account be added to the survey as an information item.</p> <p>Lyndall Muschell had circulated the draft of the survey to the meeting attendees by email prior to the meeting. Maureen summarized the issue and the current draft of the survey. While there was some discussion of the issue, no substantive suggestions were offered regarding the current draft of the survey. Maureen noted that Barbara Monnett, University Webmaster, would be helping with the implementation of the survey.</p>		
<p>Executive Committee of the University Senate (ECUS)</p> <p>Lyndall Muschell</p>	<p>1. <u>Motions</u> ECUS has no motions to submit for University Senate consideration at its 6 Dec 2013 meeting.</p> <p>2. <u>Steering Items</u> ECUS has steered the aforementioned (in the CAPC Report) endorsement request of the QEP Learning Outcomes to CAPC.</p> <p>3. <u>Proposed Revision to Bylaws</u> A proposed revision to the University Senate Bylaws was submitted on 14 Nov 2013. Proposed are revisions to the membership of SoCC (Subcommittee on the Core Curriculum) and the election of officers for this subcommittee. This item</p>		

	<p>will be added to the tentative agenda of the 24 Jan 2014 ECUS meeting.</p> <p>4. <u>Electronic Tool Fixes</u> Craig Turner is continuing to work with Doc St. Clair on “fixes” for the University Senate Electronic Tools.</p> <p>5. <u>Elected Faculty Senator Elections</u> Letters were emailed on 18 Oct 2013 to all deans and the director of the library regarding the Elected Faculty Senator Elections and Apportionment. Election procedures are due from each academic unit (colleges, library) on 1 Dec 2013 and election results are due on 1 Feb 2014. A reminder was given to the academic deans and the library director at the Academic Leadership Team meeting on 11 Nov 2013. ECUS representatives have been asked to follow up with their respective dean or director to offer clarification or explanation as needed.</p>		
<p>Presiding Officer Elect Report</p> <p>Susan Steele</p>	<p><u>USGFC</u> Georgia College will host the Spring 2014 USGFC (USG Faculty Council) meeting. Tentative date is 1 Mar 2014. If we are able to host, we may require technology support for the meeting, and there is a \$25.00 per hour fee for that service from Georgia College, unless we are able to obtain a Senate volunteer who might provide the service.</p> <p><u>USG Symposium</u> On 6 Nov 2013, I attended the USG Symposium <i>New Models: MOOCS and Beyond</i> at Georgia Tech as our USGFC representative. Dr. Kelly Brown and Dr. Howard Woodward also attended. Executive Vice Chancellor Houston Davis presented information about the current status of the system in relationship to use of technology to expand opportunities for</p>		<p>1.</p>

	<p>student success and access within the state. A document was circulated to all attendees in advance of the symposium providing the framework for USG expansion of distance education <i>This document is attached to these minutes as a supporting document - filename USG_NewModelsFrameworkDavis.pdf.</i></p> <p>A panel of five faculty from four institutions presented their own work with new models of distance education including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whiteboard animation, online group problem-solving and independent labs to conduct a fully online laboratory science class • Studio-taped lectures and teaching assistant to monitor online discussions for a Psychology class • Cross-institutional development of a pre-calculus fully online course using a math emporium model • Next Generation grant to design a 3 year curriculum targeted to non-traditional students based on competencies, rather than credits. • Opportunities for adaptive learning exist with technology assisted instruction, but there are so many options, and the rapidly evolving models also create many questions and challenges. <p>Another panel presented policy issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competency vs. credit models and challenges with current accreditation standards • RACDE (Regents Advisory Committee on Distance Education) has developed a prioritized list of r core technologies to be made available on every campus in 		
--	--	--	--

	<p>the system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for valid assessment processes and use of technology to assess issues such as plagiarism • Expansion of education for post-baccalaureate and continuing education offerings as well as creating a pathway to inspire persons to consider college • Need to incorporate best practices in distance education to improve progression and graduation • Importance of universal design to ensure access for different learning styles and challenges • Evolving roles of faculty <p>I attended a breakout session on new faculty roles. Consensus of the group was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty must control the learning outcomes and assessment of learning, regardless of the mode of delivery. • Faculty development is needed in use of technologies as they become more available. • Group also acknowledged that there is a level of concern across the system about future job losses. 		
V. Information Items Actions/Recommendations			
Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Craig Turner	<p>Craig Turner is the University Senate liaison to the Steering Committee of the Quality Enhancement Plan Task Force. One of the responsibilities of this role is to provide updates to the University Senate leadership on the activities of the QEP Task Force.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The QEP Steering Committee meets weekly on Wednesdays from 1pm to 2pm 	<p>Regarding the request by the QEP task force,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The endorsement request of the QEP community-based engaged learning outcomes will be submitted by CAPC into the online motion database as a resolution for 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lyndall Muschell to place a QEP Report on the tentative agenda of the 6 Dec 2013 meeting of the University Senate. 2. Lyndall Muschell to place the item of

	<p>in Arts & Sciences 3-51A.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. This task force has three subcommittees, each of which meets at least once a week. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Professional Development and Assessment (PDA) b. Communications (COM) c. Budget & Implementation (B&I) 3. The minutes of the QEP task force including all of its subcommittees will be posted at http://minutes.gcsu.edu 4. The QEP is due in mid-February 2014 and drafting is in progress. In early Jan 2014, Suzanne Ozment (our current SACS consultant) will review the draft QEP and offer feedback and editorial suggestions. 5. There were two documents that Lyndall Muschell circulated with the agenda. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The first shows the QEP Theme, Goals, the QEP Community-Based Engaged Learning Outcomes as proposed (reported on earlier at this meeting by CAPC) and a working definition of Engaged Learning. <i>This document is attached to these minutes as a supporting document entitled EngagedLearningOutcomes_FINAL.pdf</i> b. The second document is the primary stimulus for conversation today. <i>This document is attached to these minutes as a supporting document as US_QEP_2013-11-06_FINAL.pdf.</i> The document addresses four items. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>University Senate Endorsement of the QEP Community-Based Engaged Learning Outcomes:</u> This details the QEP Task Force request already mentioned today within the CAPC report ii. <u>Inform University Community</u> 	<p>consideration by University Senate at its Fri 6 Dec 2013 meeting scheduled from 2:00 pm to 3:15 pm in Arts & Sciences 2-72.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. After a brief discussion, there was agreement by those present to add a QEP Report (with a time limit) to the tentative agenda of the Fri 6 Dec 2013 University Senate meeting. 3. The inclusion of a QEP Report (with a time limit) on the tentative agendas of future meetings of the University Senate was anticipated so long as its inclusion would not take priority over or compromise the disposition of University Senate business. 4. While there was a brief discussion on the most appropriate participation of the University Senate in future QEP planning efforts, no proposal was formalized. Discussion of this item should be continued at a future ECUS and/or ECUS-SCC meeting. 	<p>future involvement of the University Senate with the QEP on the tentative agenda of a future ECUS and/or ECUS-SCC meeting.</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>The QEP Task Force requests the opportunity to provide reports at the remaining meetings of the 2013-2014 University Senate.</p> <p>iii. <u>Historical University Senate Involvement with the QEP</u> Given that University Senate is in its eleventh year and QEPs come around every ten years, this is the second time University Senate has been around for a QEP. Ten years ago, Georgia College was the first (or among the first) university to have the QEP as part of the SACS reaccreditation process. At that time, University Senate reviewed the QEP ad seriatim (line by line) and most agree this is not the role the University Senate wishes to take today. Back then, a QEP assessment plan was also reviewed and endorsed by the University Senate following the submission of the QEP. Repeating this may be appropriate and desirable.</p> <p>iv. <u>Future University Senate Involvement with the QEP</u> The QEP Task Force is seeking guidance from ECUS (in consultation with the University Senate, its committees, and its constituencies) on the most appropriate participation of the University Senate in future QEP planning efforts.</p>		
VI. Unfinished Business Review of Action &	There were no items of unfinished business.		

Recommendations, Provide updates (if any) to Follow-up			
VII. New Business Actions/Recommendations			
University Senate Agenda and Minutes Review	<p>1. Tentative Agenda 6 Dec 2013: Based on the committee reports at this meeting,</p> <p>a. Motions There will be one motion on the agenda of the 6 Dec 2013 meeting of the University Senate, specifically</p> <p>i. CAPC (1) University Senate endorsement request of the proposed QEP Community-Based Engaged Learning Outcomes.</p> <p>b. Reports Administrative reports, a QEP Report, and committee reports will also be agenda items.</p> <p>University Senate Minutes Review:</p> <p>1. A MOTION that the <i>DRAFT minutes of the 25 Oct 2013 University Senate meeting be circulated for university senator review</i> was made and seconded.</p>	The motion (circulate minutes) was approved with no further discussion.	<p>1. Lyndall Muschell shall draft the tentative agenda of the 6 Dec 2013 meeting of the University Senate.</p> <p>2. Motion to be entered into the online motion database by CAPC (1).</p> <p>3. Craig Turner shall circulate the DRAFT minutes of the 25 Oct 2013 meeting of the University Senate to university senators for review.</p>
VIII. Next Meeting (Tentative Agenda, Calendar)			
1. Calendar	6 Dec 2013 @ 2pm Univ. Senate A&S 2-72 24 Jan 2014 @ 2pm Univ. Senate committees 24 Jan 2014 @ 3:30pm ECUS/SCC Parks 301		
2. Tentative Agenda	Some of the deliberation today may have generated tentative agenda items for future ECUS and ECUS-SCC meetings.		Lyndall Muschell will ensure that such items are added to agendas of the appropriate ECUS and/or ECUS-SCC meetings.
IX. Adjournment	As there was no further business to consider, a MOTION to <i>adjourn the meeting</i> was made and seconded.	The motion to adjourn was approved and the meeting adjourned at 4:29 pm.	

Distribution:

First; To Committee Membership for Review
Second: Posted to the Minutes Website

Approved by: _____

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

COMMITTEE OFFICERS: LYNDALL MUSCHELL (CHAIR), SUSAN STEELE (VICE-CHAIR) CRAIG TURNER (SECRETARY)

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2013-2014

AGGREGATE ATTENDANCE RECORD FOR MEETINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIRS

“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	08-23-13	10-04-13	11-15-13						
Kelli Brown <i>Provost</i>	R	P	R						
Steve Dorman <i>University President</i>	R	P	R						
Joshua Kitchens <i>EFS; Library</i>	P	P	R						
Lyndall Muschell <i>EFS; CoE; ECUS Chair</i>	P	P	P						
Susan Steele <i>EFS; CoHS; ECUS Vice-Chair</i>	P	P	P						
Craig Turner <i>EFS; CoAS; ECUS Secretary</i>	P	P	P						
Catherine Whelan <i>EFS; CoB; ECUS Chair</i>	P	P	P						
Howard Woodard <i>EFS; CoB; APC Chair</i>	P	P	R						
Cara Meade <i>EFS; CoE; CAPC Chair</i>	P	P	R						
Alex Blazer <i>EFS; CoAS; FAPC Chair</i>	P	P	P						
Maureen Horgan <i>EFS; CoAS, RPIPC Chair</i>	P	P	P						
Doreen Sams <i>EFS; CoB, SAPC Chair</i>	P	P	R						

CHAIRPERSON SIGNATURE _____

(Including this Approval by chair at committee discretion)

DATE _____