

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

MEETING DATE & TIME: 04 OCTOBER 2013; 2:00 –3:15

MEETING LOCATION: 301 PARKS ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

ATTENDANCE:

MEMBERS		“P” denotes Present, “A” denotes Absent, “R” denotes Regrets	
P	Kelli Brown (Provost)	P	Susan Steele (CoHS, ECUS Vice-Chair)
P	Steve Dorman (University President)	P	Craig Turner (CoAS, ECUS Secretary)
P	Joshua Kitchens (Library)	P	Catherine Whelan (CoB, ECUS Chair Emeritus)
P	Lyndall Muschell (CoE, ECUS Chair)		

GUESTS:	
Carly Jara (Graduate Assistant of the 2013-2014 University Senate)	

	<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 2:00 pm by Lyndall Muschell (Chair).		
II. Approval of Agenda	A <u>MOTION</u> to approve the agenda was made and seconded. Catherine Whelan identified two items for which she was point person (Election Oversight Letters to Deans, University Senate Website) on which she would have no update and requested that these two items be removed from the agenda. Catherine Whelan further requested that a PPPM (Policies, Procedures and Practices	The agenda was approved as amended.	

	Manual) Update be added to the agenda. These amendments to the agenda were accepted by those present.		
III. Approval of Minutes	A <u>MOTION</u> to approve the 23 Aug 2013 ECUS minutes 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 Aug 2013 ECUS minutes were approved as posted, so no additional action was required.	
IV. Reports	Neither administrative (President, Provost) nor committee reports were on the agenda.		
V. Information Items Actions/Recommendations			
Electronic Tools	<p><u>23 Aug 2013</u>: At the 2013 governance retreat, Doc St. Clair (from IT) indicated to Craig Turner that he was planning to oversee “fixes” to some the electronic tools of the University Senate. This might include the agenda tool and the motion database. His plan was to check with Tanya Goette, Chair of Information Systems & Computer Science, to see if she had any students that were able to assist in any of the necessary programming changes that support the tools. At present, this consultation is still in progress. More information on this matter will be forthcoming as it becomes available.</p> <p><u>04 Oct 2013</u> Craig Turner provided an informational update on this agenda item. Doc St. Clair (from IT) continues to oversee the “fixes” to some of the electronic tools of the University Senate. Doc had decided to start with the online motion database and had met with relevant university personnel to determine the server that is hosting the tool</p>		

and the existing glitches. The most glaring glitch is the fact that once motion text is submitted, it is not possible for the text to be edited – even by the individual who entered it, the Presiding Officer, or any of the System Administrators. The only way to change the motion text field is to manually change it in the database and only individuals with direct access to the file may amend it. This is undesirable and there is a Serve ticket (work order) indicating that this glaring glitch is presently under review for possible repair.

While there are other glitches in the existing online motion database, Doc St. Clair had indicated the current strategy was to fix the most glaring glitch and arrange to have the program rewritten. The rationale was that it would be easier to rewrite the software than to attempt to decipher the existing program. This was so as the programmer who wrote the software had left Georgia College and the existing program while functional was not documented well (few comments in the code). The few comments make it difficult to fix as the individual who would try to fix the code would first have to spend significant time to attempt to decipher how the uncommented code functioned before a repair could be made.

Doc was arranging for someone in IT to review the program to make an estimate on the cost of recoding the software. Doc had consulted Tanya Goette who identified a graduate student capable of writing the new program. This student's services have not yet been secured as the reprogramming cost will first be determined to see if fiscally viable.

President Dorman and Provost Brown were

	<p>supportive of the recoding of the program. President Dorman inquired if commercial software was available that could be purchased. Craig Turner indicated that this software was not commercially available (to his knowledge) and that such motion tracking utilities are typically homegrown within the institution at which they are implemented as had been done here. President Dorman noted that this venture may lead to a product (an online motion database system) that could be marketable to other universities and colleges and become a source of revenue for this institution. Craig Turner pointed out that in the recent past, another institution had expressed interest in procuring the current software and explored with individuals on campus the possibility of purchasing it. There was uncertainty as to whether the cost of fixing glitches (if any) and the cost of the reprogramming would come out of the budget of the university senate or some other funding source. While nothing was settled, there was a general observation that the university senate budget was provided with recurring annual costs in mind and that this reprogramming would be more of a one-time cost so it was not unreasonable to keep open the possibility of alternate funding options. More information on this matter will be forthcoming as it becomes available including but not limited to the cost estimate of the reprogramming.</p>		
<p>Photos for University Senate</p>	<p><i><u>23 Aug 2013</u> In consultation with University Photographer Tim Vacula, a new process for obtaining the “mug shots” (headshots) used in the online senator database would be implemented this year. The new process</i></p>		

	<p>would have those needing “mug shots” to stop by Tim’s studio in Lanier Hall (2nd floor) on their way to the University Senate meeting. This process will provide a higher quality and more uniform image. The old process of having Tim come to the meeting can be revived if necessary.</p> <p><u>04 Oct 2013</u> Lyndall Muschell provided an informational update on this item. Of the seven individuals without mug shots who were invited to stop by Tim Vacula’s studio, only Carly Jara (graduate assistant) had done so. Only Lyndall Muschell had stopped by for a new mug shot to replace her existing one. There was general agreement by those present that the process of going to Tim Vacula’s studio (rather than bringing Tim Vacula to the university senate meeting) would continue as the mug shot process going forward. The process will be enacted for the annual organizational meeting. In addition, the process could be enacted for other university senate meetings at the discretion of the Executive Committee.</p>		
<p>University Senate Website</p>	<p><u>23 Aug 2013</u> <i>Catherine Whelan will circulate the draft of the proposed modifications made by the 2012-2013 University Senate Web Presence Work Group to the members of the work group to confirm they are still desirable. The work group members were Bryan Marshall, Josh Kitchens, Craig Turner, Catherine Whelan, and Matthew Williams. After this consultation, Catherine Whelan will meet with John Hachtel to determine whether the desired modifications can be implemented.</i></p>		<p><u>23 Aug 2013</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Catherine Whelan to circulate the draft revisions to the web presence work group. 2. Catherine Whelan to meet with John Hachtel. <p><u>04 Oct 2013</u> Consideration postponed to a future ECUS meeting.</p>

	<p><u>4 Oct 2013</u> While this item was on the tentative agenda that was circulated by Lyndall Muschell, its consideration was postponed to a future ECUS meeting during the agenda review.</p>		
<p>Items Steered to Committees Via Email Conversations</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Steered to APC was the review of the university senate endorsement request of the QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan) Theme and Goal statements. This request was made by Steve Jones on behalf of the QEP task force. 2. Steered to FAPC was a proposed update to the current student opinion survey syllabus statement. Associate Provost Tom Ormond drafted the proposed update and made this request. 		
<p>VI. Unfinished Business Review of Action & Recommendations, Provide updates (if any) to Follow-up</p>			
<p>IT Policy Development</p>	<p><u>23 Aug 2013</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>IT Policy Development - Catherine Whelan will coordinate with Hance Patrick</i> </p> <p><u>4 Oct 2013</u> Catherine Whelan reported that she has had a few conversations with Hance Patrick on this matter. In preparation is an articulation of the development of all university policy – not simply development of IT policy. Hance Patrick has confirmed with Catherine Whelan that such an articulation would satisfy the need he has in the development of IT Policy. Catherine Whelan will continue her efforts on this drafting of this articulation.</p>		<p><u>23 Aug 2013</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Catherine Whelan to coordinate with Hance Patrick with respect to the IT Policy Development Proposal.</i> </p> <p><u>4 Oct 2013</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Catherine Whelan did coordinate with Hance Patrick as charged at the 23 Aug 2013 meeting. 2. Catherine Whelan to continue to coordinate, as necessary, with </p>

			Hance Patrick.
PPPM – Policies, Procedures and Practices Manual	<p><u>23 Aug 2013</u> <i>Catherine Whelan reported that</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Updates to the PPPM had been made and these were in compliance with the ECUS guidance to Mike Digby during 2012-2013. These included replacing any language that was a copy of BoR Policy Language with a link to BoR Policy.</i> • <i>Mike Digby did a vast amount of work during 2012-2013 in reviewing the academic sections of the PPPM</i> • <i>Student Opinion Surveys and Student Opinion Forms need to be collated and reviewed for consistency</i> • <i>the “new” (revised & reformatted) version of the PPPM is still lurking in the background and its launch is anticipated soon.</i> <p><u>04 Oct 2013</u> Catherine Whelan reported that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the “new” (revised & reformatted) version of the PPPM is about to go live • Mike Digby is reviewing the changes he was authorized by the 2012-2013 ECUS to make including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ links to BoR policy replace quotes of BoR policy ○ update procedures to reflect current practice ○ update titles to make them more index-friendly ○ edits to make searching more convenient for PPPM users 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ identification of policies where there are conflicting versions present in the manual. The only policy of this type is for the topic of Student Opinion Surveys – two versions (with conflicting language) presently exist. Mike Digby, Tom Ormord, and Catherine Whelan are preparing proposed revisions that, upon completion, will be submitted to the Executive Committee for steering to the relevant committee of the university senate for review. <p>Josh Kitchens, University Archivist, reminded those present of the intent to make an annual pdf snapshot of the PPPM for University Archives. This reminder received a favorable review from those present.</p>		
<p>Governance Retreat</p>	<p><u>23 Aug 2013</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>There were 58 attendees, of whom 25 members responded to the survey.</i> 2. <i>Feedback narrative comments were overall quite positive, and the average rating for overall effectiveness was 4.61 out of 5.</i> 3. <i>The costs for the retreat were</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>\$2000 for Rock Eagle (site/food)</i> b. <i>\$162 for printing/binding handbook</i> c. <i>The cost for the shuttle bus was not included in the costs above.</i> 4. <i>Lyndall Muschell noted that Craig Turner has prepared a web page to archive the documents that pertain to the 2013 governance retreat. The url for this site is http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/univ_senate/Retreat_13/index.htm</i> 		<p><u>23 Aug 2013</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Lyndall Muschell intends to prepare the governance retreat report.</i> <p><u>04 Oct 2013</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Lyndall Muschell has prepared a draft of the governance retreat report and submitted it for review to ECUS, SCC, and GRPC.</i> 2. <i>Lyndall Muschell will incorporate editorial suggestions received prior to 18 Oct 2013</i>

	<p><u>04 Oct 2013</u> Lyndall Muschell announced that she has drafted the 2013 Governance Retreat report and circulated it for review to the Executive Committee (ECUS), Standing Committee Chairs (SCC) and the 2012-2013 Governance Retreat Planning Committee (GRPC). Lyndall requested that those who choose to review the draft submit editorial suggestions to her by 18 Oct 2013 as she plans to submit the final report to the University Senate at its 25 Oct 2013 meeting.</p>		<p>and will present the final version of the governance retreat report to University Senate at its 25 Oct 2013 meeting.</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>University Senate Budget (combined with 23 Aug 2013 USGFC Travel Request)</p>	<p><u>23 Aug 2013</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>This is the first year that University Senate has received a budget allocation.</i> <i>There are two accounts.</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>\$5000 in state funds (no rollover)</i> <i>\$3500 in foundation (no rollover)</i> <i>It is not known whether funds could be encumbered – possibly for example to support the 2014 Governance Retreat.</i> <p><i>USGFC Travel Request</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Susan Steele, Presiding Officer Elect of the University Senate and the Voting Member of the University System of Georgia Faculty Council (USGFC), had inquired by email about USGFC meeting travel reimbursement. The email feedback proposed ECUS consideration of using the University Senate budget for this reimbursement.</i> <i>A MOTION to adopt a standing practice to reimburse costs (mileage, hotel, registration, etc.) incurred by the Presiding Officer Elect to attend and participate as a voting member of the USGFC was made and seconded.</i> <i>Other ideas for possible funding to further consider included social events for faculty, higher education brown bags (civic leaders).</i> <i>It was recommended that Lyndall Muschell invite feedback from university senators by email and at their 13 Sep 2013 meeting</i> <p><u>04 Oct 2013</u></p> <p>Lyndall Muschell provided an update on the university senate budget</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> As requested by ECUS at the last 	<p><i>The motion of item 2 (USGFC reimbursement) was approved with no discussion.</i></p> <p><i>The recommendation of item 4 (seeking feedback on using budget from senators) was unanimously endorsed by those present.</i></p>	<p><u>23 Aug 2013</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Lyndall Muschell to check with Monica Starley regarding the rollover and ability to encumber funds.</i> <i>Lyndall Muschell to seek feedback from the university senators regarding the use of the budget allocation for university senate both by email and at their 13 Sep 2013 meeting.</i> <p><u>04 Oct 2013</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Lyndall Muschell did check with Monica Starley as she was charged to do at the 23 Aug 2013 ECUS meeting.</i> <i>Lyndall Muschell did seek feedback from the university senators regarding the use of the budget allocation for university senate both by email and at their 13 Sep 2013 meeting as she was charged to do at the 23 Aug 2013 ECUS meeting.</i>
---	---	--	--

	<p>meeting, Lyndall Muschell did consult with Monica Starley and Kathy Waers in the President's office regarding rollover and encumbering the funds in the university senate budget. The state budget funds can be encumbered, but must be used in the first quarter. The foundations funds may not be encumbered.</p> <p>2. Lyndall Muschell distributed by email prior to the meeting the feedback that she had received from University Senators on the use of funds in the University Senate budget. A discussion based on the responses from the <i>Request for Suggestions for Senate Events</i> resulted in the following ideas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. to work with the President's Office to co-host the upcoming faculty Friday (social/reception) event on October 25 andb. to sponsor a drop by event for coffee and a snack during the week of finals.		
--	--	--	--

<p>Point Persons for Recurring ECUS Functions</p>	<p><u>23 Aug 2013</u> <i>Some of the recurring functions of ECUS, which can be found in the University Senate Bylaws and the ECUS checklists document, were considered and assigned points.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Provost Brown – Corps of Instruction List</i> • <i>Catherine Whelan – Letters to Deans of Colleges for Election of Elected Faculty Senators</i> • <i>Lyndall Muschell – Preparation of the 2013 Governance Retreat Report.</i> • <i>Craig Turner – Apportionment</i> • <i>Susan Steele – Chair of the 2013-2014 Governance Retreat Planning Committee.</i> • <i>To be determined – Point for the drafting of the 2014-2015 Governance Calendar</i> <p><u>4 Oct 2013</u> Indirectly updated by other agenda items that were discussed at the 4 Oct 2013 meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Provost Brown – Corps of Instruction List – Completed 2 Oct 2013.</i> • <i>Catherine Whelan – Letters to Deans of Colleges for Election of Elected Faculty Senators – Continuing in Collaboration with Lyndall Muschell</i> • <i>Lyndall Muschell – Preparation of the 2013 Governance Retreat Report – Circulated to ECUS, SCC, and GRPC for review, completion anticipated 18 Oct 2013.</i> • <i>Craig Turner – Apportionment – draft prepared and circulated, completion at the 4 Oct 2013 ECUS meeting.</i> 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Catherine Whelan (in collaboration with Lyndall Muschell) is continuing to prepare letters for academic deans (library and colleges) pertaining to elected faculty senator election oversight 2. Lyndall Muschell is intending to call for volunteers to form the 2013-2014 governance retreat planning committee by end of fall 2013.
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Susan Steele – Chair of the 2013-2014 Governance Retreat Planning Committee – Lyndall Muschell intends to call for volunteers to form the committee by end of fall 2013. • To be determined – Point for the drafting of the 2014-2015 Governance Calendar – remained to be determined. 		
VII. New Business Actions/Recommendations			
University Senate Endorsements (sparked by the endorsement request of the QEP Theme and Goals)	<p>The email conversation regarding the steering of the university senate endorsement request of the QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan) Theme and Goals sparked interest in an agenda item for a conversation on university senate endorsements in general.</p> <p>Among the conversation points were the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A perception that the QEP Theme and Goals would advance independent of whether an endorsement by the university senate was granted. This perceived reality was a point of concern to some. • A recollection that in the past, there have been some administrators that have “commanded” an endorsement by university senate (or one of its committees) and received such endorsement, only to use it as a response to faculty pushback – and be able to say something to the effect “wait ..wait ... this was endorsed by <i>your</i> university senate.” This was a source of concern to some. 	<p>The main takeaway was to start the transition to the university senate being involved at the front end of an initiative, specifically prior to the initiative being launched for implementation rather than the university senate having involvement after the initiative has been launched.</p> <p>In common academic parlance, <i>involvement before the train has left the station.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lyndall Muschell to meet with direct reports of the University President to determine if there is intent to launch any university-wide initiatives.

- A perception by some who provide input into a review process that if their input is not incorporated it was not heard.
- Relative to the QEP – suggestions:
 - the university senate should be asked to endorse the process rather than particular aspects of the QEP. There was no objection by those present for such an endorsement request to be made of the university senate. Some of those present may choose to collaborate to author such an endorsement request for the 25 Oct 2013 meeting of the University Senate.
 - the QEP Theme and Goals might be reported to university senate as an information item rather than an endorsement request.
- Discussion to clarify the contextual meaning of certain words – approval, endorsement, support – there was a point offered that there seemed to be semantics involved including the communication challenges present between the precise intent of words and the reception of the words.
 - An approval is an action the university senate applies or fails to apply to a policy
 - University Senate operational definition:
A policy is a statement of record that governs

the conduct of the university community and/or embodies a general principle that guides university affairs.

- An endorsement is an action the university senate applies or fails to apply to a resolution
 - A resolution is a formal expression in writing of an opinion, especially one agreed to by means of a vote of a legislative body.
- Support is not as clearly established as a formal action by the university senate.
- A suggestion that university-wide initiatives (rather than those at the academic unit (library, colleges), department, unit, etc. levels) be considered by university senate at the front-end rather than at the eleventh hour. Implementation of this might be accomplished by
 - Presiding Officer of the University Senate meeting with direct reports of the University President to determine if there is intent to launch any university-wide initiatives. The Presiding Officer may choose to consult with the Executive Committee to determine which initiatives might warrant consideration of the university senate.

<p>University System of Georgia Faculty Council (USGFC) Meeting (14 Sep 2013) Update</p> <p>Susan Steele</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The USGFC meeting was hosted by Bainbridge College in Bainbridge, GA on Saturday 14 Sep 2013 2. Dr. Houston Davis – Executive Vice Chancellor for the USG – met with the USGFC via Skype to field questions. The topics (in bold) of discussion and a synopsis of his responses are provided. For more detailed versions of his responses, see the attached USGFC meeting minutes (also referenced in item 5 below). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MOOCs State will be developing a consortium with 2-3 representatives from each school to look at MOOC (Massive Open Online Course) models and online educational issues. • Consolidations More will probably occur but none are imminent. The system learned a great deal from the consolidations recently completed. • Institutional goals to move up a tier in the USG Procedures are being developed, but approval is complex and must consider both funding and facilities. • Salary System is looking at work load vs. across the board increases for financial reasons. • 12 month pay option This request was prior to Dr. Davis’s hire and he was not aware of the issue but agreed to follow up. 		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>State funding to USG institutions</u> Most likely will never return to 75% of operating costs. 60% may occur, but is currently approximately 50% across the system. Each institution needs to look at alternative funding sources. • <u>D2L Analytics package</u> USG has decided not to purchase this system wide, and to leave this as an institutional purchase if needed. • <u>Program enrollments</u> Low enrollments do not mean a guaranteed program closure, but represent a starting point for discussion and evaluation. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Other topics of discussion by attendees included summer enrollment, expansion of the USGFC leadership team to promote continuity, and evaluation of teaching. 4. Group was invited to consider Georgia College as the meeting site for the spring 2014 semester meeting. 5. The USGFC minutes (14 Sep 2013) are attached to these minutes as a supporting document. 		
Apportionment of Elected Faculty Senators	<p>Prior to the meeting, Lyndall Muschell had circulated by email the 2013-2014 Corps of Instruction List and the two versions of the apportionment document. These documents had been prepared by Craig Turner, as he had been named the ECUS point person on apportionment at the 23 Aug 2013 meeting of ECUS. In this case the elected faculty</p>	<p>The apportionment motion was approved with no discussion.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provost Brown indicated her intent to consult with Neil Jones, who prepares the Corps of Instruction list, to obtain historical information on the

	<p>senators were being apportioned to the academic units (library, colleges), a recurring ECUS function.</p> <p>Craig Turner provided the following update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recent emergence of a “College of Administration” in the Corps of Instruction List supplied by the Office of Academic Affairs breeds two versions of apportionment, one including the members of the College of Administration in the counts of the number of faculty within an academic unit (library, colleges) and one not. • There were seven (7) individuals in the College of Administration in the 2013-2014 Corps of Instruction List. They are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CoAS (1): Steven Jones; ○ CoE (4): Paul Jones, Sharon Jones, Charlie Martin, Cara Meade; ○ CoHS (2): Kelli Brown, Tom Ormond. • The Huntington-Hill method of apportionment is used. This method has been in use by the United States Congress since 1941. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This apportionment method increases the threshold for an academic unit (library, colleges) to be apportioned one more elected faculty senator with an increase in its lower quota (minimum number of elected faculty senators assigned to an academic unit). 		<p>presence of the “College of Administration.”</p> <p>2. Lyndall Muschell will announce the number of elected faculty senators that were apportioned to each of the academic units (library, colleges) to the members of the University Senate.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Specifically the geometric mean (square root of the product) of the lower and upper quotas for an academic unit is used as the threshold. • In neither version did the number apportioned to each academic unit (library, colleges) vary from last year's (2012-2013) apportionment. • Given our charge to base the apportionment on the Corps of Instruction List, it has become recent practice to incorporate into academic unit (library, colleges) counts the relevant members of the "College of Administration" as these individuals are listed as members of the Corps of Instruction. <p>A MOTION to approve the version with the individuals assigned to the "College of Administration" incorporated into the academic unit (library, colleges) counts as the official apportionment of elected faculty senators to academic units (library, colleges) for the 2013-2014 academic year was made and seconded.</p>		
VIII. Next Meeting (Tentative Agenda, Calendar)			
1. Calendar	25 Oct 2013 @ 2pm Univ. Senate A&S 2-72 15 Nov 2013 @ 2pm Univ. Senate committees 15 Nov 2013 @ 3:30pm ECUS/SCC Parks 301		
2. Tentative Agenda	Some of the deliberation today 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 adjourn the meeting was made	The motion to adjourn was approved and the meeting	

	and seconded.	adjourned at 3:21 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: LINDALL MUSCHELL (CHAIR), SUSAN STEELE (VICE-CHAIR) CRAIG TURNER (SECRETARY)

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2013-2014

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	08-23-13	10-04-13							
Kelli Brown <i>Provost</i>	P	P							
Steve Dorman <i>University President</i>	R	P							
Joshua Kitchens <i>EFS; Library</i>	P	P							
Lyndall Muschell <i>EFS; CoE; ECUS Chair</i>	P	P							
Susan Steele <i>EFS; CoHS; ECUS Vice-Chair</i>	P	P							
Craig Turner <i>EFS; CoAS; ECUS Secretary</i>	P	P							
Catherine Whelan <i>EFS; CoB; ECUS Chair Emeritus</i>	P	P							