COMMITTEE NAME: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE (ECUS) WITH STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIRS **MEETING DATE & TIME:** 27 FEBRUARY 2015; 3:30–4:45 **MEETING LOCATION:** 301 PARKS ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

ATTENDANCE:

Мем	MEMBERS "P" denotes Present, "A" denotes Absent, "R" denotes Regrets			
Р	Kelli Brown (Provost)	P	Susan Steele (CoHS, ECUS Chair)	
Р	Ben Davis (Library)	Р	John Swinton (CoB, ECUS Vice-Chair)	
Р	Steve Dorman (University President)	Р	Tom Toney (CoAS, FAPC Chair)	
R	Macon McGinley (CoAS, SAPC Chair)	Р	Craig Turner (CoAS, ECUS Secretary)	
Р	Ben McMillan (CoB, RPIPC Chair)	R	Stephen Wills (CoE, CAPC Chair)	
R	Lyndall Muschell (CoE, ECUS Chair Emeritus)	Р	Howard Woodard (CoB, APC Chair)	
GUESTS: Kay Anderson (University Registrar) Bill Miller (Vice-Chair, Curriculum and Assessment Policy Committee) Amy Pinney (Vice-Chair, Student Affairs Policy Committee) Tom Ormond (Senior Associate Provost) Carter Shadden (Graduate Assistant of the 2014-2015 University Senate)				
Italicized text denotes information from a previous meeting. *Denotes new discussion on old business.				

AGENDA TOPIC	DISCUSSIONS & CONCLUSIONS	ACTION OR RECOMMENDATIONS	FOLLOW-UP {including dates/responsible person, status (pending, engoing completed)
I. Call to Order	The meeting was called to order at 3:34 pm by Susan Steele (Chair).		ongoing, completed)}

II. Approval of Agenda	A <u>MOTION</u> to approve the agenda was made and seconded.	The agenda was approved as circulated.	
III. Approval of Minutes	A <u>MOTION</u> to approve the minutes of the 23 Jan 2015 meeting of the Executive Committee with Standing Committee Chairs was made and seconded. A draft of these minutes had been circulated to the meeting attendees via email with no revisions offered. Thus, the minutes had been posted as circulated to the minutes.gcsu.edu site.	The 23 Jan 2015 Executive Committee with Standing Committee Chairs minutes were approved as posted, so no additional action was required.	
IV. Reports			
President's Report	When ECUS Chair Susan Steele invited President Dorman to provide a report, his response was that he had no items to report.		
Executive Committee of the	1. Motions ECUS has one motion to submit		
University Senate (ECUS)	for University Senate consideration at its 27 Mar 2015 meeting. This motion is for		
Susan Steele	 27 Mar 2015 meeting. This motion is for the proposed revisions to the Service Recognition Policy. See details below in item 3.a. 2. Officers The 2014-15 ECUS officers are Susan Steele (Chair), John R. Swinton (Vice-Chair) and Craig Turner (Secretary) 3. Meeting ECUS met at 2:00 pm today and following are highlights of that meeting. a. Service Recognition Policy Proposed revisions have been received from Leslie Pierce and Crystal Reeves of Human Resources based on a series of meetings with a work group whose membership also included Monica Starley, Susan Steele, and Craig Turner. As the modifications to the policy statement were editorial and 		

proposed revisions to procedure	
include (1) adding recognition of a five	
year milestone, so that key milestones	
for recognitions will be all positive	
integer multiples of five (5 years, 10	
years, 15 years, etc.) (2) extending to	
each employee via her/his supervisor	
an opportunity to review for accuracy	
the Human Resources record of her/his	
years of service and to propose	
corrections if that record is in error (3)	
ownership of the service recognition	
ceremony is proposed to shift from the	
University President's Office to	
Human Resources, ECUS proposed as	
a next step that consideration of these	
revisions be done as a <i>committee of the</i>	
whole by the university senate at its 27	
Mar 2015 meeting. By the university	
senate bylaws, committee of the whole	
consideration can occur only with a	
two-thirds majority approval by the	
university senate. If this two-thirds	
majority approval is not achieved, the	
proposal will be steered by ECUS (the	
Executive Committee of the	
University Senate) to RPIPC (the	
Resources, Planning and Institutional	
Policy Committee) for consideration at	
the 3 Apr 2015 RPIPC meeting. As a	
follow-up, an agreement was made to	
implement this next step plan only if	
permission to deviate from the usual	
committee review process is secured	
from RPIPC Chair Ben McMillan at	
the 27 Feb 2015 meeting of ECUS	
with Standing Committee Chairs. This	

L		
	permission from Ben McMillan was	
	granted.	
b.	New Faculty Orientation Effective	
	with the 2015-2016 academic year, the	
	academic affairs component of new	
	faculty orientation is being expanded	
	to two full days. The new faculty	
	orientation events, scheduled to occur	
	between Su 9 Aug 2015 and We 12	
	Aug 2015, were provided for inclusion	
	on the 2015-2016 governance	
	calendar.	
с.	Volunteer Survey ECUS approved	
	distribution of a survey to university	
	senate committee volunteers regarding	
	the establishment of a wearable token	
	of appreciation comparable to the	
	university senate pin received by	
	university senators. Please encourage	
	each of the volunteers on your	
	committees to complete this brief	
	survey.	
d.	<u>PPPM Internal Audit</u> ECUS voted to	
	endorse the advisory review as written	
	by Julia Hann of the Policies,	
	Procedures, and Practices Manual and	
	the policy review process of the	
	university senate. The report has	
	identified some areas for improvement	
	that we hope will be addressed with the	
	retooling of the university senate	
	electronic presence including the	
	online motion database that is in	
	progress and being done by Enterprise	
	Applications personnel David Smith	
	and Kelly Rickman under the	
	leadership of James Carlisle.	
μ	reaction por valido caritore.	

. Diploma Size and Wordi	ng The	
executive committee heard an	n update	
on a proposal made by	Student	
Government President Juawn	Jackson	
to President Dorman to modify	the size	
and wording of institutional d	iplomas,	
and recommended that these r	revisions	
be considered formally by the	enlarged	
group of executive commit	tee and	
standing committee chairs. De	tails will	
be provided and that delibera	tion will	
occur later in this meeting.		
2015-2016 Governance Cale	endar A	
draft of the 2015-2016 gov	vernance	
calendar was discussed and fin	nalized.	
g. <u>Governance Retreat</u> The	e 2015	
Governance Retreat is sched	uled for	
Tuesday, 11 Aug 2015. This c	late does	
not overlap with other ever	nts, and	
deans and departments chairs	s will be	
asked to schedule colleg	ge and	
department events on other da	ays. This	
retreat will be open to all men	mbers of	
the 2015-2016 university	senate	
committees and not exclusiv	e to the	
university senators. This invi	tation to	
all committee members ha	as been	
practice for the last three year	ars. Any	
assistance you can provide to	get this	
word out is appreciated.		
. <u>Graduate Council</u> A draft	of the	
bylaws for a newly forming (Graduate	
Council were presented by	Provost	
Brown and Graduate Direct		
Senior Associate Provost		
The executive committee j		
editorial suggestions and f	feedback	

	regarding these bylaws which Tom
	Ormond will take back to the drafting
	group for consideration.
Academic Policy Committee	
•	
(APC)	for University Senate consideration at its
Howard Woodard	27 Mar 2015 meeting.
Howard Woodard	2. <u>Officers</u> The 2014-15 APC officers are
	Howard Woodard (Chair), Donovan
	Domingue (Vice-Chair) and John Sirmans
	(Secretary)
	3. Meeting The APC met on Fri 27 Feb 2015
	and discussed the following items.
	a. Academic Calendar/Exam Schedule
	i. Reviewed academic calendars
	from seven other institutions: some
	USG, some COPLAC, and others.
	ii. Reviewed the suggestions received
	from constituents. Among these
	(1) shift fall break to Thanksgiving
	week in the fall semester
	(2) begin spring semester one week
	earlier.
	iii. This deliberation will inform the
	next academic calendar committee
	slated to meet in spring 2016.
	iv. There may be a survey seeking
	feedback from faculty, staff, and
	students on academic calendar in
	fall 2015.
	b. <u>Grade Appeal/Grievance Policy</u>
	i. After deliberation, the APC
	recommendation is to keep
	current policy, specifically to
	maintain the procedure to start
	this appeal with a consultation by
	the student with the instructor,
	and to recommend to academic

	affairs the addition of a link to the current policy on the list of		
	statements required for all course		
	syllabi.		
	c. <u>Priority Registration</u> APC consulted		
	with the Priority Registration Task		
	Force and was educated on the existing		
	process by which a group of students		
	can request approval for priority		
	registration. This process will be		
	reported back to the student group		
	that submitted a request for priority		
	registration.		
	4. Announcements In his role as Associate		
	Chief Information Officer, Howard		
	Woodard shared the following items.		
	a. ECARS Survey An invitation to		
	faculty to complete a survey on		
	technology use in teaching and		
	research is coming soon by email.		
	b. <u>MyPassword</u> The transition to a new		
	password system, called MyPassword,		
	is in-progress. This new password has		
	a longer 180-day life and will be used		
	to authenticate access to unify, email,		
	and university-issued computer logins.		
	Employees (faculty and staff) are being asked to make the transition		
	prior to 23 Mar 2015 at which time		
	students will be invited to make the		
	transition. As early as 30 Mar 2015,		
	this password will be used to		
	authenticate access to PAWS.		
Curriculum and Assessment	1. Motions CAPC has five motions to submit		
Policy Committee (CAPC)	for University Senate consideration at its		
27 February 2015 ECUS_SCC Meetin	- Minutes (EINAL DDAET)		Page 7

	27 Mar 2015 meeting. Each of these
Bill Miller	motions are proposed curricular revisions.
for	a. New concentration proposal in
Stephen Wills	Psychiatric Mental Health Practitioner
	in the Master of Science in Nursing
	b. New program proposal for a Master's
	of Science degree with a major in
	Athletic Training
	c. Change in degree designation from
	M.Ed. to M.S. and title from
	Kinesiology to Health and Human
	Performance
	d. Change in admissions requirements
	for M.A. in Art Therapy
	e. Changes in Minor in Creative Art
	Therapies
	2. Officers The 2014-15 CAPC officers are
	Stephen Wills (Chair), Bill Miller (Vice-
	Chair) and Juan Ling (Secretary).
	3. Guidelines for Submitting Proposals
	Language pertaining to graduate curricular
	revisions in the <i>Guidelines for Submitting</i>
	Proposals to CAPC was reviewed as had
	been requested.
	a. <u>Request</u> At the 14 Nov 2014 ECUS-
	SCC meeting, Susan Steele requested
	that Stephen Wills facilitate CAPC
	review of one particular passage in the
	document Guidelines for Submitting
	Proposals to the Curriculum,
	Assessment, and Policy Committee
	Revised October 7, 2011 found at the
	CAPC web page on senate.gcsu.edu
	http://senate.gcsu.edu/sites/senate.gcs
	u.edu/files/CAPCreview%28Oct2011
	<u>%29.pdf</u> The specific language is

	Note If the proposal involves a
	graduate program, the department
	must consult with graduate faculty
	within the college prior to sending the
	proposal to the College Curriculum
	and Instruction committee.
	The specific clarifications sought were
	answers to questions such as Who
	specifically needs to be consulted? All
	graduate faculty in the college? What
	is the specific meaning of the word
	consult as used in this context?
	b. <u>Resolution</u>
	i. The wording revision for the
	graduate proposal submission
	(revisions shown in bold type)
	Note: If the proposal involves a
	graduate program, the department
	must consult with all those
	affected by the proposed changes,
	including the department chair
	and faculty, both within and
	outside the college prior to
	sending the proposal to the
	College Curriculum and
	Instruction committee.
	ii. We (CAPC members) determined
	that it was not necessary for us to
	specify what consulting entails or
	any approval requirements.
Resources, Planning and	1. <u>Motion</u> RPIPC has no motions to submit
Institutional Policy	for University Senate consideration at its
Committee (RPIPC)	27 Mar 2015 meeting.
Ben McMillan	2. <u>Officers</u> The 2014-15 RPIPC officers are Bon McMillon (Chair) Ion Clark (Vice
Den wicivillian	Ben McMillan (Chair), Jan Clark (Vice- Chair) and Brittiny Johnson (Sacratary)
	Chair) and Brittiny Johnson (Secretary).

3. Meetin	ng The RPIPC met on Fri 27 Feb	
2015 a	nd discussed the following items.	
a. <u>Ba</u>	anner/PAWS Access to Classes	
wi	ith No Restrictions / Prerequisites	
RI	PIPC is working with Division of	
	formation Technology (DoIT) staff	
	d the Registrar's Office to have	
fu	nctionality in place potentially by	
the	e start of the fall semester.	
b. <u>C</u>	ommon Meeting Time Reviewed	
co	ommon meeting times and could not	
	ake a recommendation to allow	
stu	udents more access to our common	
m	eeting times.	
c. <u>S</u>	Dace Utilization Policy Space	
uti	ilization has no specific policy.	
Tł	nerefore no changes could be made	
fo	r modifications for priority of	
pr	ogram type through drop add week.	
d. <u>Su</u>	ustainability Council The council	
red	commendations were tabled so that	
the	e sustainability council could	
ap	proach the areas impacted by their	
red	commendations for feedback.	
W	Then recommendations are made to	
RI	PIPC, we will refer specific requests	
to	the committees that have oversight.	
e. <u>Fa</u>	aculty List Serve List Serve for	
fac	culty is in the process of being	
im	plemented. A potential moderator	
ha	s volunteered and restrictions /	
lir	nitations of comments are being	
de	eveloped. This proposal is pending	
an	d to be submitted to University	
Co	ommunications. It will be an opt-in	
lis	st.	

	4. <u>ECUS/SCC Deliberation</u> The topic of
	space utilization triggered discussion with
	the following conversation points.
	a. The requests from SAPC (regarding
	prioritization to certain spaces during
	drop/add week) are procedural in
	nature and not policy.
	b. A document titled Space Utilization
	Policy (hard copy at meeting held by
	Ben McMillan) has been located – but
	is it policy? This document was
	handed by Ben McMillan to President
	Dorman as an information item.
	c. The Space Utilization Committee met
	this morning (27 Feb 2015) and there
	are some possible revisions to the R25
	space request system under
	consideration.
	d. Discussion of this topic may occur in
	the University President's Cabinet.
Student Affairs Policy	1. Motions SAPC has no motions to submit
Committee (SAPC)	for University Senate consideration at its
	27 Mar 2015 meeting.
Amy Pinney	2. <u>Officers</u> The 2014-15 SAPC officers are
for	Macon McGinley (Chair), Amy Pinney
Macon McGinley	(Vice-Chair) and Nicole DeClouette
	(Secretary).
	3. <u>Cancelled Meeting</u> At 1:00pm 27 Feb
	2015, I received my 7th "regrets"
	notification, and as such knew we would
	not have a quorum. I sent the following
	notification to the committee:
	Dear Colleagues,
	I've just received my seventh
	"regrets" notification, and I fear
	we won't have a quorum.
	However, I'll be in SAC 104 at

1		
	2:00 if you'd like to chat	
	informally.	
	Amy	
	a. <u>Attendees</u> Dr. Andy Lewter showed	
	up, as did Juawn Jackson near the end	
	of the scheduled meeting time, after	
	he'd completed his SGA duties.	
	b. <u>Class Absences</u> Andy and I discussed	
	professors not allowing students to	
	make up work when they miss class for	
	medical reasons. He is running into	
	issues with some professors not	
	allowing students to make up work	
	which is leading to students making	
	bad medical decisions. For example,	
	returning to class after having surgery	
	before they have been medically	
	cleared to do so. He is afraid this could	
	be a dangerous situation. He has	
	discussed this issue with the provost,	
	and would like to begin a conversation	
	among faculty and administration.	
	c. APC Membership Juawn arrived	
	later wanting to informally address	
	adding a student to APC. At this	
	meeting of the ECUS-SCC, Howard	
	Woodard agreed to take up this issue	
	with APC	
4.	ECUS/SCC Deliberation The topic of	
	APC membership triggered discussion	
	with the following conversation points.	
	a. The proposal of adding a student as a	
	voting member to the APC has come	
	up in the university senate recently and	
	was one of the closest votes in	
	university senate history. <u>Note</u> : During	
	the preparation of these minutes, it is	
μ		

	being noted that this previous
	consideration occurred at the 23 Feb
	2009 university senate meeting as
	Motion 0809.EC.004.B.
	b. Student interests on some topics (no
	examples or list of such topics offered)
	that would be steered to APC may
	differ significantly from those of the
	faculty.
	c. Historically, the practice of the APC is
	to invite students to attend APC
	meetings when certain topics (no
	examples or list of such topics offered)
	are on the agenda to inform APC
	deliberation with student perspective.
	d. Some of the topics (no examples or list
	of such topics offered) that are
	considered by the APC may not be
	appropriate for students to vote on.
	e. All meetings of the APC (and of
	course any committee of the university
	senate) are open meetings and students
	(as well as any interested party) are
	able to attend the meetings and to
	speak if recognized by the APC Chair.
	This recognition is common practice.
Subcommittee on	1. Motions SCoN has no motions to submit
Nominations (SCoN)	for University Senate consideration at its
	27 Mar 2015 meeting.
John R. Swinton	2. <u>Officers</u> The 2014-15 SCoN officers are
	John R. Swinton (Chair), (No Vice-Chair
	position) and Craig Turner (Secretary).
	3. <u>At-Large Election</u> Due to technical
	issues, implementing the at-large ballot
	had been delayed and will be implemented
	as soon as possible. The delay was caused
	by the time needed to prepare an email list
	by the time needed to prepare an emain list

	for the Corps of Instruction. Qualtrics
	survey (ballot) for at-large elected faculty
	senator to be launched on $2/27/15$ with
	election results ready 3/6/15.
	4. <u>Election Oversight</u> All the academic units
	(four colleges and the library) have
	submitted their elected faculty senator
	election results.
	5. <u>Committee Preference Surveys</u> Once the
	at-large election is complete, committee
	preference surveys will be implemented.
	One survey will provide the 2015-2016
	elected faculty senators an opportunity to
	share their preferences regarding serving
	on a committee and serving as an officer
	(Secretary, Presiding Officer Elect). The
	other survey will provide all members of
	the university faculty an opportunity to
	express their interest in serving on a
	university senate committee as a
	volunteer.
Faculty Affairs Policy	1. Motions FAPC has no motions to submit
Committee (FAPC)	for University Senate consideration at its
	27 Mar 2015 meeting.
Tom Toney	2. Officers The 2014-15 FAPC officers are
	Tom Toney (Chair), Barbara Roquemore
	(Vice-Chair) and Carol Sapp (Secretary).
	3. Meeting The Faculty Affairs Policy
	Committee of the University Senate met
	on 27 Feb 2015 from 2:00pm to 3:15pm.
	The following topics were discussed.
	a. <u>Student Opinion Surveys</u> Ashley
	Taylor and Mike Rose are reviewing
	the proposed policy changes and
	should have a report shortly.
	b. <u>Emeritus Faculty</u> Douglas Goings is
	drafting a rights/privileges document
μ	

	and data Kanada Ot (II ' ')	
	guided by Kennesaw State University	
	document and consistent with existing	
	USG policy.	
с.	Contingent Faculty Participation in	
	Shared Governance A work group of	
	the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee	
	has prepared an on-line survey and it	
	has just recently been implemented.	
	They will do appropriate follow-ups to	
	try to maximize participation.	
d.	Pretenure Review There continue to	
	be issues regarding notification - who	
	is responsible for notifying faculty,	
	standard dates for notification and	
	submission of materials, etc. Seems to	
	vary A LOT among departments and	
	colleges	
e.	IFR Due Date The IFR (individual	
	faculty report) due date was moved	
	forward (from 15 Mar 2015 to 27 Feb	
	2015) for reasons perceived as	
	reasonable (to inform possibilities of	
	merit increases to faculty salaries on	
	the anticipated USG timeline) but it	
	did cause a lot of faculty to have to	
	scurry around to get this in sooner than	
	expected. This could continue to be	
	problematic if dates can be "changed"	
	based on issues such as possible merit	
	pay increases.	
	CUS/SCC Deliberation (IFR) The	
-	bic of IFR due date triggered discussion	
	th the following conversation points.	
a.	As a point of information, the Provost	
	noted that this due date shift was a	
	decision made by the college deans.	

	b. Given the likelihood of the USG
	timeline for merit increases to salaries
	to remain consistent going forward, it
	may be wise to adapt the IFR due date
	to late January or early February (Feb
	1) rather than the current due date of
	March 15 to conform to the USG
	5. <u>ECUS/SCC Deliberation (SOS)</u> The
	topic of student opinion surveys triggered
	discussion on the minimum size of a class
	that could be surveyed with the following
	conversation points.
	a. The general policy guideline in which
	we operate is that the class size
	shouldn't be so small that it
	compromises the assurance of
	anonymity for the student responder.
	There is not a particular threshold
	number offered in these general
	guidelines.
	b. Typically ten (10) is the statistical
	minimum for best practice. This is the
	standard our university Institutional
	Research office uses.
	c. If all the students in a class of size
	below the threshold agree to grant
	permission to implement the survey,
	that is one way by which the surveys
	can be done in such small classes.
V. Information Items	
Actions/Recommendations	
New Faculty Orientation	Effective with the 2015-2016 academic year,
	the academic affairs component of new
Susan Steele	faculty orientation is being expanded to two
	full days. The new faculty orientation events,

	scheduled to occur between Su 9 Aug 2015	
	and We 12 Aug 2015, were provided for	
	inclusion on the 2015-2016 governance	
	calendar. Steven Jones is the point person for	
	New Faculty Orientation.	
Electronic Presence of the	In consultation with David Smith of	
University Senate	Enterprise Applications, the update on the	
C C	electronic presence of the university senate	
Craig Turner	was Unfortunately, we have not made any	
8	progress on the university senate site worth	
	reporting. We have all been pulled into	
	helping the IT departments various initiatives	
	for fall 2015.	
USG Background	Susan Steele had been requested to ensure that	
Investigations Revisions	the USG Background Investigation Policy –	
(Steer)	recently amended – receives the appropriate	
(Steel)	attention of the university senate. This matter	
Susan Steele	was steered for review and recommendations	
Susan Steele	to the Resources, Planning and Institutional	
	Policy Committee (RPIPC) by the Executive	
	Committee at its 27 Feb 2015 meeting. A hard	
	copy of the supporting documents were	
	passed from Susan Steele to RPIPC Chair Ben	
	McMillan.	
Chancellor's Documents	Susan Steele noted that among the supporting	
~ ~ ~	documents that she had circulated by email	
Susan Steele	with the agenda were (1) USG enrollment	
	predictions memorandum from Chancellor	
	Huckaby (2) Chancellor's budget remarks to	
	legislature and (3) Chancellor's PowerPoint	
	presentation to legislature. These documents	
	were provided as an information item.	
	Questions regarding these documents were	
	invited. No questions were forthcoming.	
VI. Unfinished Business		
Review of Action &		
Recommendations, Provide		
updates (if any) to Follow-up		

SoCC Bylaws	22 Aug 2014	
	Susan Steele noted that at the 24 Apr 2014	
Susan Steele (22 Aug 2014)	meeting of the University Senate, revisions to	
	the university bylaws pertaining to the	
Susan Steele (3 Oct 2014)	Subcommittee on the Core Curriculum	
	(SoCC) were recommended to President	
Julia Metzker (14 Nov 2014)	Dorman by the University Senate. This	
	recommendation has not yet received action	
Susan Steele (23 Jan 2015)	(approval, veto) by President Dorman as he	
	desires additional information on a couple of	
Craig Turner (27 Feb 2015)	the details: in particular the definition of the	
	term teaching representative. As President	
	Dorman had extended regrets and was unable	
	to attend this meeting, consideration of this	
	matter was postponed to a future meeting of	
	ECUS or ECUS-SCC.	
	<u>3 Oct 2014</u>	
	1. President I met with Dr. Dorman	
	regarding Motion 1314.EC.001.B that	
	proposed revisions to the university senate	
	bylaws affecting the Subcommittee on the	
	Core Curriculum (SoCC). He has not	
	approved this motion due to concerns	
	about two areas of the proposed language.	
	He requested revisions to these two areas	
	or he feels he needs to veto the motion.	
	2. <u>SoCC</u> I had a telephone meeting with	
	SoCC Chair Julia Metzker to brief her on	
	my meeting with President Dorman. I	
	asked Julia to facilitate a discussion with	
	SoCC members to see if revisions to	
	address President Dorman's concerns	
	could be identified. SoCC discussed this	

matter at its weekly meeting on 26 Sep	
2014, and Craig Turner and I were asked	
to be present at the SoCC meeting on 3 Oct	
2014 to inform the SoCC deliberation on	
this matter.	
inis matter.	
14 Nov 2014	
<i>The Subcommittee on Core Curriculum</i>	
(SoCC) has consulted with the University	
President to formulate a compromise	
regarding the proposed revisions to the	
university senate bylaws found in Motion	
1314.EC.001.B.	
The following excerpt from the 03 Oct 14	
meeting of the Executive Committee of the	
University Senate with Standing Committee	
Chairs (ECUS-SCC) provides context for the	
issue.	
"Susan Steele noted that at the 24 Apr 2014	
meeting of the University Senate, revisions to	
the university bylaws pertaining to the	
Subcommittee on the Core Curriculum	
(SoCC) were recommended to President Dorman by the University Senate. This	
recommendation has not yet received action	
(approval, veto) by President Dorman as he	
desires additional information on a couple of	
the details: in particular the definition of the	
term teaching representative." The specific issues and proposed compromise	
are detailed below:	
1. Teaching Representative	
a. Issue The term teaching	
representative isn't clearly defined and	
could be subject to interpretation.	
b. <u>Solution</u> The following definition is	
acceptable to Dr. Dorman and was	
endorsed by SoCC. "A teaching	
representative is defined as a full-time	

member of the Corps of Instruction
who has taught a course in the
represented area within two calendars
years prior to the date of appointment
to the subcommittee." [NOTE: We
realize that all members of the Corps
of Instruction are full-time but we felt
the emphasis was important.]
2. <u>SoCC Chair Eligibility</u>
a. <u>Issue</u> The proposed bylaw change
allows for non-senator members of
SoCC to hold the chair position. This
is not common practice in University
Senate standing committees. However,
restricting the chair to the elected
faculty senator members would limit
the potential candidates to three
members, which could be as little as
20% of the members of the committee.
b. <u>Solution</u> The following process for
electing the SoCC chair was
acceptable to Dr. Dorman and was
endorsed by SoCC. "During the
organizational meetings for the
committees, SoCC and CAPC will
convene together. At this meeting,
SoCC will elect their chair from the
body. Any member of SoCC is eligible
for chair. During the same meeting,
the SoCC chair will be presented to
CAPC for an approval vote. If the
chair is not approved by CAPC then
SoCC will elect another chair and
repeat the process."
3. <u>Discussion at 14 Nov 2014 ECUS-SCC</u>
a. <u>Parliamentary Procedure</u> There was
some discussion primarily seeking

I		
	clarification on the parliamentary	
	procedure relevant to this discussion	
	on the floor of the university senate.	
	Susan Steele indicated that she had	
	consulted with university senate	
	parliamentarian John Sirmans who	
	noted that one possibility was for a	
	member who had been a proponent	
	(voted in favor) of Motion	
	1314.ECUS.001.B make a Motion to	
	Reconsider which requires a second	
	and then allows discussion. In the	
	spirit of the first and second reading	
	bylaws revision process for non-	
	editorial revisions, the vote on this	
	Motion to Reconsider could be	
	postponed to the next meeting at the	
	conclusion of the discussion.	
b	<u>Next Steps</u> In consultation with	
	Stephen Wills and Craig Turner, Julia	
	Metzker will prepare a supporting	
	document that will include the	
	aforementioned compromise language	
	prepared by SoCC to address the	
	concerns of President Dorman. The	
	hope is that this document will	
	facilitate the deliberation on the floor	
	of the university senate. If this new	
	supporting document can be prepared	
	soon enough to meet the ten day prior	
	to the meeting submission deadline,	
	the Motion to Reconsider might be	
	offered at the 5 Dec 2014 meeting of	
	the University Senate.	
	Post Meeting Paliamentary During	
С.		
	the preparation of these minutes, it	
	was noted that a Motion to Reconsider	

	is applied within the same meeting as the disposition of the main motion. Thus, a Motion to Amend Something Previously Adopted would be the more appropriate motion to apply in this context.		
	23 Jan 2015 It was noted that the contextual information on the compromise positions to address the concerns of President Dorman on motion 1314.EC.001.B. The motion to amend something previously adopted, specifically motion 1314.EC.001.B, will be offered for university senate consideration at its 13 Feb 2015 meeting.		
	27 Feb 2015 (This update was added by Craig Turner during minutes preparation) This matter was recommended to President Dorman as Motion 1415.CAPC.003.B by the university senate at its 13 Feb 2015 meeting. This motion provides closure to university senate deliberation of this issue. The interested reader is invited to review the details available in the 13 Feb 2015 university senate minutes.		
VII. New Business Actions/Recommendations			
University Senate Agenda	1. Tentative Agenda 27 Mar 2015: Based on	The motion (circulate minutes)	1. Susan Steele to draft
and Minutes Review	 a. <u>Motions</u> There will be up to six motions on the agenda of the 27 Mar 2015 meeting of the University Senate, specifically CAPC (5) 	was approved.	 busing breefer to draft the tentative agenda of the 27 Mar 2015 meeting of the University Senate. Motions to be entered into the online motion

1) New concentration proposal in	database by CAPC (5),
Psychiatric Mental Health	ECUS (1).
Practitioner in the Master of	3. Craig Turner to
Science in Nursing	circulate the DRAFT
2) New program proposal for a	minutes of the 13 Feb
Master's of Science degree with	2015 meeting of the
a major in Athletic Training	University Senate to
3) Change in degree designation	university senators for
from M.Ed. to M.S. and title	review.
from Kinesiology to Health and	
Human Performance	
4) Change in admissions	
requirements for M.A. in Art	
Therapy	
5) Changes in Minor in Creative	
Art TherapiesRPIPC (1)	
Proposed Information	
Technology Policy	
ii. ECUS (1) Service Recognition	
b. <u>Reports</u> Administrative reports and	
committee reports will also be agenda	
items.	
2. <u>University Senate Minutes Review</u> : A	
MOTION that the DRAFT minutes of the 13	
Feb 2015 University Senate meeting be	
circulated for university senator review	
was made and seconded.	

AAUP Redbook	1. <u>Centennial</u> The American Association of
(11 th Edition)	University Professors (AAUP) celebrates
	the 100 th anniversary of its 1915 founding
Susan Steele	during 2015. As part of this celebration, a
	new (11 th) edition of the Redbook (so
	called due to its red cover and more
	formally titled Policy Documents and
	Reports) was published in December 2014
	and is now available for purchase.
	2. <u>Russell Library Copy</u> Susan Steele noted
	that through the efforts of Ben Davis and
	Craig Turner this book has been donated
	to the Ina Dillard Russell Library and is
	available in the reference section and thus
	cannot be checked out of the library. Some
	of the previous editions of this book are
	available in the library in the general
	collection and available for checkout by
	patrons.
	3. <u>10th Edition</u> Recently (2011-2012)
	university senate leaders (committee
	officers and executive committee
	(10 th) and the set of the previous
	(10 th) edition of the Redbook. In
	anticipation of the pending publication of the new (11 th) addition the nine remaining
	the new (11 th) edition, the nine remaining
	copies of this 10 th edition that had been purchased by the university senate in
	purchased by the university senate in 2011-2012 were offered to and accepted
	by committee officers at the 14 Nov 2014
	meeting of executive committee with
	standing committee chairs.
	4. <u>11th Edition: Purchase Copies?</u> The
	retail cost of the eleventh edition of this
	book is \$49.95 per copy (plus tax and
	shipping) although AAUP members can
	obtain a 30% discount reducing the cost to

	\$34.97 per copy. The question before the		
	assembly was whether to allocate dollars		
	from the university senate budget to		
	purchase copies of this book. President		
	Dorman quickly offered to purchase		
	copies of the 11 th Edition for AAUP		
	officers, University Senate leaders (chairs		
	of major university senate committees and		
	executive committee members), academic		
	deans, and members of his executive		
	cabinet. Appreciation was expressed to		
	President Dorman for his generosity and		
	support. No further discussion of		
	purchasing copies occurred at this		
	meeting.		
	5. <u>Endorsement</u> During the conversation of		
	the previous point, an opinion was offered		
	that it might be a good idea for the		
	University (presumably the University		
	Senate) to restate its commitment to the		
	principles of the AAUP as written in the		
	most recently edited Policy Documents		
	and Reports (11th ed.). This conversation		
	point was interrupted by the generous		
	offer of President Dorman (to purchase		
	Redbooks) and this position was not		
	formally discussed further.		
Diploma Size and Wording	Student Government Association President	The motion (endorse proposed	
	Juawn Jackson met with President Dorman	diploma modifications) was	
Provost Brown	and requested consideration of modifications	endorsed.	
and	to diploma size and wording. While President		
Kay Anderson	Dorman has the authority to implement the		
University Registrar	requested changes, his preference is to inform		
· · ·	his decision on whether to implement by		
	vetting the proposal to faculty representatives,		
	specifically with the leaders of the university		
	senate which include standing committee		
	senare which merade standing committee		

0	
	chairs and elected faculty senators on the
	executive committee. The proposed changes
	are
	 <u>Diploma Size</u> To increase the size of
	the master's degree diploma from its
	current size matching that of a
	bachelor's degree to the size of the
	terminal degree (presently used only
	for the Doctor of Nursing Practice.
	(DNP)).
	• Wording To add the designation of
	the major to the undergraduate
	diploma, e.g. rather than Bachelor of
	Science it would be Bachelor of
	Science in Nursing.
	Other contextual information points related to
	the proposal included
	• should the diploma size be amended,
	the way in which it is presented to a
	recipient would also be amended.
	Specifically it would no longer include
	a cover but rather be rolled up with a
	ribbon (as is the case presently for the
	DNP)
	• double majors receive two degrees one
	with each major
	• a recent registrar survey indicated that
	about fifty percent of all institutions
	put the major on the degrees with
	anticipation of this number continuing
	to climb
	 #1 call from students to the registrar's
	office regarding commencement is to
	pose the question <i>Why isn't my major</i>
	listed on my degree? The prominence
	of this question is indicative of the fact
	that most students think about their

 not as a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) or Bachelor of Arts (B.A.). ECUS/SCC Deliberation Discussion on this matter had the following conversation points. 1. The earliest these modification would be implemented is 2017 as we have existing paper stock to use up first. 2. There was general consensus that this should be shared with the university senate as an information item and that formal review by a committee (say SAPC) was deemed unnecessary. 3. An opinion from the floor noting that in some cases it might be preferable not to the have the major on the degree – one contextual example offered was for an academic (professor) who displays degrees on her/his office wall when her/his advanced degree is in a discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. Motion A MOTION that the recommended diploma modifications he endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and 	<u>Г</u>		
 Bachelor of Arts (B.A.). <u>ECUS/SCC Deliberation</u> Discussion on this matter had the following conversation points. The earliest these modification would be implemented is 2017 as we have existing paper stock to use up first. There was general consensus that this should be shared with the university senate as an information item and that formal review by a committee (say SAPC) was decread unnecessary. An opinion from the floor noting that in some cases it might be preferable not to the have the major on the degree – one contextual example offered was for an academic (professor) who displays degrees on her/his office wall when her/his advanced degree is in a discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. Motion A MOTION that the recommended as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the terminal degree and 		undergraduate degree by their major	
ECUS/SCC Deliberation Discussion on this matter had the following conversation points. 1. The earliest these modification would be implemented is 2017 as we have existing paper stock to use up first. 2. There was general consensus that this should be shared with the university senate as an information item and that formal review by a committee (say SAPC) was deemed unnecessary. 3. An opinion from the floor noting that in some cases it might be preferable not to the have the major on the degree – one contextual example offered was for an academic (professor) who displays degrees on her/his office wall when her/his advanced degree is in a discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. Motion A MOTION that the recommended diploma modifications be endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the terminal degree and			
 matter had the following conversation points. 1. The earliest these modification would be implemented is 2017 as we have existing paper stock to use up first. 2. There was general consensus that this should be shared with the university senate as an information item and that formal review by a committee (say SAPC) was deemed unnecessary. 3. An opinion from the floor noting that in some cases it might be preferable not to the have the major on the degree – one contextual example offered was for an academic (professor) who displays degrees on her/his advanced degree is in a discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. Motion A MOTION that the recommended diploma modifications be endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and 			
 The earliest these modification would be implemented is 2017 as we have existing paper stock to use up first. There was general consensus that this should be shared with the university senate as an information item and that formal review by a committee (say SAPC) was deemed unnecessary. An opinion from the floor noting that in some cases it might be preferable not to the have the major on the degree one contextual example offered was for an academic (professor) who displays degrees on her/his office wall when her/his advanced degree is in a discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. Motion A MOTION that the recommended diploma modifications be endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and 			
 be implemented is 2017 as we have existing paper stock to use up first. 2. There was general consensus that this should be shared with the university senate as an information item and that formal review by a committee (say SAPC) was deemed unnecessary. 3. An opinion from the floor noting that in some cases it might be preferable not to the have the major on the degree – one contextual example offered was for an academic (professor) who displays degrees on her/his office wall when her/his advanced degree is in a discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. Motion A MOTION that the recommended as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and 		6 1	
 existing paper stock to use up first. 2. There was general consensus that this should be shared with the university senate as an information item and that formal review by a committee (say SAPC) was deemed unnecessary. 3. An opinion from the floor noting that in some cases it might be preferable not to the have the major on the degree one contextual example offered was for an academic (professor) who displays degrees on her/his office wall when her/his advanced degree is in a discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. Motion A MOTION that the recommended diploma modifications be endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and 		1. The earliest these modification would	
 2. There was general consensus that this should be shared with the university senate as an information item and that formal review by a committee (say SAPC) was deemed unnecessary. 3. An opinion from the floor noting that in some cases it might be preferable not to the have the major on the degree – one contextual example offered was for an academic (professor) who displays degrees on her/his office wall when her/his advanced degree is in a discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. Motion A MOTION that the recommended diploma modifications be endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree and 		be implemented is 2017 as we have	
 should be shared with the university senate as an information item and that formal review by a committee (say SAPC) was deemed unnecessary. 3. An opinion from the floor noting that in some cases it might be preferable not to the have the major on the degree – one contextual example offered was for an academic (professor) who displays degrees on her/his office wall when her/his advanced degree is in a discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. Motion A MOTION that the recommended approposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree and 		existing paper stock to use up first.	
 senate as an information item and that formal review by a committee (say SAPC) was deemed unnecessary. 3. An opinion from the floor noting that in some cases it might be preferable not to the have the major on the degree – one contextual example offered was for an academic (professor) who displays degrees on her/his office wall when her/his advanced degree is in a discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. Motion A MOTION that the recommended diploma modifications be endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and 		2. There was general consensus that this	
formal review by a committee (say SAPC) was deemed unnecessary. 3. An opinion from the floor noting that in some cases it might be preferable not to the have the major on the degree – one contextual example offered was for an academic (professor) who displays degrees on her/his office wall when her/his advanced degree is in a discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. Motion A MOTION that the recommended diploma modifications be endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and		should be shared with the university	
 SAPC) was deemed unnecessary. 3. An opinion from the floor noting that in some cases it might be preferable not to the have the major on the degree one contextual example offered was for an academic (professor) who displays degrees on her/his office wall when her/his advanced degree is in a discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. Motion A MOTION that the recommended diploma modifications be endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and 		senate as an information item and that	
 3. An opinion from the floor noting that in some cases it might be preferable not to the have the major on the degree – one contextual example offered was for an academic (professor) who displays degrees on her/his office wall when her/his advanced degree is in a discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. Motion A MOTION that the recommended diploma modifications be endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and 		formal review by a committee (say	
 in some cases it might be preferable not to the have the major on the degree – one contextual example offered was for an academic (professor) who displays degrees on her/his office wall when her/his advanced degree is in a discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. Motion A MOTION that the recommended diploma modifications be endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and 		SAPC) was deemed unnecessary.	
 in some cases it might be preferable not to the have the major on the degree – one contextual example offered was for an academic (professor) who displays degrees on her/his office wall when her/his advanced degree is in a discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. Motion A MOTION that the recommended diploma modifications be endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and 		3. An opinion from the floor noting that	
 – one contextual example offered was for an academic (professor) who displays degrees on her/his office wall when her/his advanced degree is in a discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. <u>Motion</u> A <u>MOTION</u> that the recommended diploma modifications be endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and 		in some cases it might be preferable	
for an academic (professor) who displays degrees on her/his office wall when her/his advanced degree is in a discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. <u>Motion A MOTION</u> that the recommended diploma modifications be endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and		not to the have the major on the degree	
displays degrees on her/his office wall when her/his advanced degree is in a discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. <u>Motion</u> A <u>MOTION</u> that the recommended diploma modifications be endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and		– one contextual example offered was	
displays degrees on her/his office wall when her/his advanced degree is in a discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. <u>Motion</u> A <u>MOTION</u> that the recommended diploma modifications be endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and		for an academic (professor) who	
when her/his advanced degree is in a discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. Motion A MOTION that the recommended diploma modifications be endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and			
discipline different from her/his undergraduate major. <u>Motion A MOTION</u> that the recommended diploma modifications be endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and			
undergraduate major. <u>Motion</u> A <u>MOTION</u> that the recommended diploma modifications be endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and			
Motion A MOTION that the recommended diploma modifications be endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and		-	
diploma modifications be endorsed as proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and			
proposed – specifically (1) to increase the size of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and			
of the master's degree diploma from its current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and		1 0	
current size matching that of a bachelor's degree to the size of the terminal degree and			
degree to the size of the terminal degree and		· · · ·	
		о .	
(2) to add the designation of the major to the		(2) to add the designation of the major to the	
<i>undergraduate diploma</i> was made and			
seconded.		· ·	
VIII. Next Meeting	VIII. Next Meeting		
(Tentative Agenda, Calendar)	e		
1. Calendar 27 Mar 2015 @ 3:30pm Univ. Senate A&S 2-72		27 Mar 2015 @ 3:30pm Univ. Senate A&S 2-72	
27 Feb 2015 @ 2:00pm Univ. Senate committees	·	1	
27 Feb 2015 @ 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.		Susan Steele will ensure that such items (if any) are added to agendas of the appropriate ECUS or					
			ECUS-SCC meetings.					
IX. Adjournment	As there was no further business to consider,	5						
	a <u>MOTION</u> to adjourn the meeting was made	approved and the meeting						
	and seconded.	adjourned at 4:39 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: SUSAN STEELE (CHAIR), JOHN R. SWINTON (VICE-CHAIR), CRAIG TURNER (SECRETARY) **ACADEMIC YEAR: 2014-2015**

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 Se CoAS = College of Arts			e of Busines		llege of Educ	cation: CoHS	5 = College	of Health Sci	ences
Meeting Dates	08-22-14	10-03-14	11-14-14	01-23-15	02-27-15	04-03-15	Present	Regrets	Absent
Kelli Brown Provost	Р	R	Р	R	Р		3	2	0
Ben Davis EFS; Library	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р		5	0	0
Steve Dorman University President	R	R	R	R	Р		1	4	0
Lyndall Muschell EFS; CoE; ECUS Chair Emeritus	Р	Р	Р	Р	R		4	1	0
Susan Steele EFS; CoHS; ECUS Chair	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р		5	0	0
John Swinton EFS; CoB; ECUS Vice-Chair	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р		5	0	0
Craig Turner EFS; CoAS; ECUS Secretary	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р		5	0	0
Howard Woodard EFS; CoB; APC Chair	Р	Р	R	Р	Р		4	1	0
Stephen Wills EFS; CoE; CAPC Chair	Р	Р	Р	Р	R		4	1	0
Tom Toney EFS; CoAS; FAPC Chair	Р	Р	R	Р	Р		4	1	0
Ben McMillan EFS; CoB, RPIPC Chair	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р		5	0	0
Macon McGinley EFS; CoAS, SAPC Chair	Р	Р	Р	Р	R		4	1	0

CHAIRPERSON SIGNATURE

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