COMMITTEE NAME: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE (ECUS)
MEETING DATE & TIME: 24 JANUARY 2014; 2:00 –3:15
MEETING LOCATION: 301 PARKS ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

ATTENDANCE:

MEMBERS		"P" denotes Present, "A" denotes Absent, "R" denotes Regrets	
R	Kelli Brown (Provost)	P	Susan Steele (CoHS, ECUS Vice-Chair)
R	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)			

	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, 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 **MOTION** *to approve the agenda* was made and seconded. Lyndall Muschell indicated an advisory item from SoCC was received after the agenda was circulated by email which she proposed be added to the agenda. This was agreeable to all present.	The agenda was approved as amended.	
III. Approval of Minutes	A **MOTION** *to approve the 04 Oct 2013 ECUS minutes* was made and seconded. A draft of these minutes had been circulated to	The 04 Oct 2013 ECUS minutes were approved as posted, so no additional action was required.	

	the meeting attendees via email with no revisions offered, Thus, the minutes had been posted as circulated to the minutes.gcsu.edu site.		
IV. Reports	Neither administrative (President, Provost) nor committee reports were on the agenda.		
V. Information Items Actions/Recommendations			
Electronic Tools	*23 Aug 2013*: *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.* *04 Oct 2013 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 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 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.

24 Jan 2014
As the 15-Nov-2013 ECUS meeting was cancelled due to no quorum, this update was provided by email.

From: Lyndall Muschell
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 7:50 PM
To: ECUS@LIST.GCSU.EDU
Subject: Information on University Senate Electronic Tools "Fix"

Attachment:
<mark>Electronic_Tools_Fixes_2013-10-17</mark>
Dear All,

- I am sharing the latest information on a fix for the University Senate Electronic Tools. See the email exchange below.
- I have also attached some information copied from earlier emails between Craig and Doc St. Clair related to this topic <mark>Electronic_Tools_Fixes_2013-10-17</mark>
-

Thanks,
Lyndall

From: Craig Turner
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 5:40 PM
To: Lyndall Muschell
Subject: More Timely Information on University Senate Electronic Tools "Fix"
Attachment:
<mark>Electronic_Tools_Fixes_2013-11-12</mark>
Lyndall,

1. Feel free to forward this update to those you deem appropriate (ECUS members for example).
2. I just received this message (<mark>See Electronic_Tools_Fixes_2013-11-12</mark>) from Kelly Rickman. She was the one who processed our SERVE ticket and reviewed the existing senate electronic tools - senate website and online motion database.
3. The bottom line is that
   a. there is no easy "fix" for the inability to edit the motion text field in the online motion

	database b. there is not programming to support all the functionality suggested on the front end (that a user of the program sees) c. the recommendation is to perform a rebuild (rewrite the code) and d. this rebuild would not be considered "soon" (for a couple months) given the current IT project load. e. this rebuild might (at least in part) be implementable via students (via a course project and/or via student workers). Craig		
Photos for University Senate	*23 Aug 2013 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 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.* *04 Oct 2013 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.		
University Senate Website	*23 Aug 2013* *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.* *4 Oct 2013* *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.*		*23 Aug 2013* 1. *Catherine Whelan to circulate the draft revisions to the web presence work group.* 2. *Catherine Whelan to meet with John Hachtel.* *04 Oct 2013* *Consideration postponed to a future ECUS meeting.*
Items Steered to Committees Via Email Conversations	1. **Pre-Law Concentration** Steered to CAPC via email discussion by ECUS was the review of the Pre-Law Concentration within the Philosophy Major. This request was directed to Lyndall Muschell, ECUS Chair, by Sunita Manian, Chair of the College of Arts and Sciences Curriculum and Instruction Committee. 2. **Honorary Degrees** Lyndall Muschell circulated a request from President Dorman regarding the establishment of a		.

	policy on awarding of honorary degrees by Georgia College. During the email conversation, Provost Brown had located an existing procedure on the awarding of honorary degrees. Lyndall had forwarded this to President Dorman to see if the existing procedure would satiate the earlier request or if it was desirable to have the existing document reviewed by a university senate committee. After the tentative ECUS agenda (for 24 Jan 2014 meeting) had been circulated, Lyndall received an email from President Dorman to indicate the existing procedure did in fact satiate the request and no further action by university senate or its committees was necessary on this matter at this time. 3. **ECUS & ECUS-SCC 28 Feb Meetings** a. As the usual location (Parks 301) of our meetings will be unavailable, we will hold our 28 Feb 2014 ECUS and ECUS-SCC meetings in the "Glass Room" of Kilpatrick. This room is located just past the CoE Dean's Office and overlooks the Kilpatrick atrium.		
VI. Unfinished Business **Review of Action &** **Recommendations, Provide** **updates (if any) to Follow-up**			
IT Policy Development	*23 Aug 2013* *1. IT Policy Development - Catherine Whelan will coordinate with Hance Patrick*		*23 Aug 2013* *1. Catherine Whelan to coordinate with Hance Patrick with respect to*

	4 Oct 2013 *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.*		*the IT Policy Development Proposal.* *4 Oct 2013* 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 Hance Patrick.*
PPPM – Policies, Procedures and Practices Manual	*23 Aug 2013* *Catherine Whelan reported that* • *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.* • *Mike Digby did a vast amount of work during 2012-2013 in reviewing the academic sections of the PPPM* • *Student Opinion Surveys and Student Opinion Forms need to be collated and reviewed for consistency* • *the "new" (revised & reformatted) version of the PPPM is still lurking in the background and its launch is anticipated soon.* *04 Oct 2013* *Catherine Whelan reported that* • *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* *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* *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.* *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.*		
Governance Retreat	*23 Aug 2013* 1. *There were 58 attendees, of whom 25 members responded to the survey.* 2. *Feedback narrative comments were overall quite positive, and the average*		*23 Aug 2013* 1. *Lyndall Muschell intends to prepare the governance retreat report.*

	rating for overall effectiveness was 4.61 out of 5.
	
	3. *The costs for the retreat were*
	   a. *$2000 for Rock Eagle (site/food)*
	   b. *$162 for printing/binding handbook*
	   c. *The cost for the shuttle bus was not included in the costs above.*
	
	4. *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
	
	04 Oct 2013
	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.
			04 Oct 2013
			1. *Lyndall Muschell has prepared a draft of the governance retreat report and submitted it for review to ECUS, SCC, and GRPC.*
			
			2. *Lyndall Muschell will incorporate editorial suggestions received prior to 18 Oct 2013 and will present the final version of the governance retreat report to University Senate at its 25 Oct 2013 meeting.*

| University Senate Budget (combined with 23 Aug 2013 USGFC Travel Request) | *23 Aug 2013* 1. *This is the first year that University Senate has received a budget allocation.* 2. *There are two accounts.* a. *$5000 in state funds (no rollover)* b. *$3500 in foundation (no rollover)* 3. *It is not known whether funds could be encumbered – possibly for example to support the 2014 Governance Retreat.* *USGFC Travel Request* 1. *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.* 2. *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.* 3. *Other ideas for possible funding to further consider included social events for faculty, higher education brown bags (civic leaders).* 4. *It was recommended that Lyndall Muschell invite feedback from university senators by email and at their 13 Sep 2013 meeting* *04 Oct 2013* *Lyndall Muschell provided an update on the university senate budget* 1. *As requested by ECUS at the last* | *The motion of item 2 (USGFC reimbursement) was approved with no discussion.* *The recommendation of item 4 (seeking feedback on using budget from senators) was unanimously endorsed by those present.* | *23 Aug 2013* 1. *Lyndall Muschell to check with Monica Starley regarding the rollover and ability to encumber funds.* 2. *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.* *04 Oct 2013* 1. *Lyndall Muschell did check with Monica Starley as she was charged to do at the 23 Aug 2013 ECUS meeting.* 2. *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.* |

	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.
	
	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 Request for Suggestions for Senate Events resulted in the following ideas.*
	   a. *to work with the President's Office to co-host the upcoming faculty Friday (social/reception) event on October 25 and*
	   b. *to sponsor a drop by event for coffee and a snack during the week of finals.*		

Point Persons for Recurring ECUS Functions	*23 Aug 2013*		*4 Oct 2013*
	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.		*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*
	• *Provost Brown – Corps of Instruction List*		*2. Lyndall Muschell is intending to call for volunteers to form the 2013-2014 governance retreat planning committee by end of fall 2013.*
	• *Catherine Whelan – Letters to Deans of Colleges for Election of Elected Faculty Senators*		
	• *Lyndall Muschell – Preparation of the 2013 Governance Retreat Report.*		
	• *Craig Turner – Apportionment*		
	• *Susan Steele – Chair of the 2013-2014 Governance Retreat Planning Committee.*		**24 Jan 2014**
	• *To be determined – Point for the drafting of the 2014-2015 Governance Calendar*		1. Catherine Whelan (in collaboration with Lyndall Muschell) did send letters to academic deans (library and colleges) regarding elected faculty senator election oversight
	4 Oct 2013		
	Indirectly updated by other agenda items that were discussed at the 4 Oct 2013 meeting.		
	• *Provost Brown – Corps of Instruction List – Completed 2 Oct 2013.*		2. Lyndall Muschell is intending to call for volunteers to form the 2013-2014 governance retreat planning committee by email and/or at the 14 Feb 2014
	• *Catherine Whelan – Letters to Deans of Colleges for Election of Elected Faculty Senators – Continuing in Collaboration with Lyndall Muschell*		
	• *Lyndall Muschell – Preparation of the 2013 Governance Retreat Report – Circulated to ECUS, SCC, and GRPC for review, completion anticipated 18 Oct 2013.*		
	• *Craig Turner – Apportionment – draft prepared and circulated, completion at the 4 Oct 2013 ECUS*		

	meeting.
	 • *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.*
	
	 24 Jan 2014
	 1. **Elected Faculty Senator Elections**:
	    a. Catherine Whelan has sent multiple reminders to deans of colleges and the library for the 1 Feb 2014 deadline of this year's elected faculty senator election results.
	    b. ECUS members indicated
	      • **CoAS** progressing at department level with anticipation to meet the 1 Feb deadline.
	      • **CoB** is completed.
	      • **CoE** scheduled for 31 Jan 2014 meeting of the CoE faculty.
	      • **CoHS** in progress.
	      • **Library** almost done.
	    c. The Elected Faculty Senator Election oversight documents are archived on the "Green Page" of the University Senate, see "Elections" row of the table at http://us.gcsu.edu
	 2. **Governance Calendar**: Catherine Whelan and Lyndall Muschell to serve
			meeting of the University Senate.

	as point persons for the 2014-2015 Governance Calendar. As part of the discussion, the following emerged. a. What was the reception of changes to the governance calendar for last year (reduction of annual meetings of committees and university senate from seven to six; having the ECUS/SCC meeting immediately follow the standing committee meetings) by members of the committee and university senate? b. Also ask Standing Committee Chairs for their opinion on the scheduling of ECUS/SCC immediately following the meetings of standing committees and of the impact (if any) of the loss of one standing committee meeting (seven to six annually). c. Pros of changes: • Fewer Fridays per month to spend in meetings pertaining to academic governance for leaders (chairs and ECUS members would have two rather than three). • More time between meetings to prepare motions and get them entered into the database. • More uniformity in semesters (three meetings		

	each semester rather than four in fall and three in spring)		

<div style="margin-left:2em">

d. Cons of changes:
- Fewer deadlines to get things done: people tend to respond to deadlines so having seven meetings on the calendar gives the committees and university senate one more deadline to accomplish business by thus having business done earlier rather than later.
- Easier to cancel a meeting than schedule a meeting. If there is no business, then a meeting could be cancelled and effectively implement six or fewer meeting even if seven were scheduled.

e. No clear consensus by ECUS members for the governance calendar changes. Mixed reviews by various members.

</div>

3. **GRPC 2013-14: Governance Retreat Planning Committee**

<div style="margin-left:2em">

a. Susan Steele was appointed (and accepted) to serve as GRPC Chair at the 23 Aug 2013 ECUS meeting.

b. At the 24 Jan 2014 ECUS meeting, Lyndall Muschell and Craig Turner volunteered to serve as members of the GRPC.

c. Lyndall Muschell intends to call for volunteers to serve on

</div>

	the GRPC at the next (14 Feb 2014) meeting of University Senate.		
University Senate Endorsements (sparked by the endorsement request of the QEP Theme and Goals)	*4 Oct 2013* *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.* *Among the conversation points were the following.* *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 your university senate." This was a source of concern to some.* *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*	*4 Oct 2013* *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.* *In common academic parlance, involvement before the train has left the station.*	*4 Oct 2013* 1. *Lyndall Muschell to meet with direct reports of the University President to determine if there is intent to launch any university-wide initiatives.*

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.

- o *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.*
  - o *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.*
  - o *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.* o *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* o *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.*		
Apportionment of Elected Faculty Senators	*4 Oct 2013* *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*	*4 Oct 2013* *The apportionment motion was approved with no discussion.*	*4 Oct 2013* 1. *Provost Brown indicated her intent to consult with Neil Jones, who prepares the Corps of*

	had been named the ECUS point person on apportionment at the 23 Aug 2013 meeting of ECUS. In this case the elected faculty senators were being apportioned to the academic units (library, colleges), a recurring ECUS function.
	
	Craig Turner provided the following update:
	
	• *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:*
	   ○ *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.*
	   ○ *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*
		Instruction list, to obtain historical information on the presence of the "College of Administration."
		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.*

	number of elected faculty senators assigned to an academic unit). o *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.* *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.*		
VII. New Business Actions/Recommendations			

| University Senate Bylaws Revisions (SoCC) | 1. Mary Magoulick had sent to Lyndall Muschell a document providing some proposed revisions to university senate bylaws pertaining to SoCC with rationale. This document was circulated to ECUS by email by Lyndall Muschell and is attached to these minutes as ==SoCC Bylaws Revisions with Rationale==.

 2. Craig Turner had circulated by email the results of a review of the draft revisions (by Ken Farr and Craig Turner) with suggested revised language to improve clarity and align the language with similar language elsewhere in the university senate bylaws. This document is attached to these minutes as ==SoCC Bylaws Revisions with Rationale SUGGESTIONS==.

 3. A distillation of the discussion among the members of ECUS follows.
    a. All SUGGESTIONS offered by Craig Turner and Ken Farr were endorsed unanimously by ECUS.
    b. It was noted that the relevant bylaw required ECUS to direct any suggestions to the source (in this case CAPC and SoCC) for "acceptance" of the ECUS suggestions. The relevant bylaw (V.Section 1.C.5) is quoted below. See in particular the blue highlighted portion.
    c. Two other matters emerged during discussion. | | Lyndall Muschell to share this information with Cara Meade and Mary Magoulick to seek CAPC and SoCC feedback, respectively. |

i. Given there a separate teaching representative for C1 and C2 areas of the core, why not separate teaching representatives for D1, D2, D3 representing Math, Science, and Technology? ECUS suggests either shoring up the rationale on this matter or adding D1, D2, and D3 teaching representatives to the draft bylaw revisions on SoCC composition.

ii. ECUS recommends consideration by CAPC and SoCC of eligibility language for SoCC chair:

Only elected faculty senators or teaching representatives are eligible to serve as the committee chair, but any member of the committee is eligible to serve as vice chair or secretary.

iii. Lyndall Muschell was charged by ECUS to share this information with Cara Meade and Mary Magoulick to seek CAPC and SoCC feedback, respectively.

V.Section1.C.5. *Motion Review*. The

Executive Committee may make editorial suggestions to the language of any motion, including a resolution, that is submitted for University Senate consideration. The Executive Committee should apply this responsibility judiciously, noting that the purpose of this review is to improve clarity, remove ambiguity, and identify inconsistencies with superseding policy. Any such editorial suggestions are incorporated only after review and approval by the body submitting the motion.		

Task Force Recommendations	1. **Graduate Education Task Force** Four self-nominations were received. The nominee selected was Catherine Whelan.		1. Lyndall Muschell to forward Catherine Whelan as the university senate representative to serve on the Graduate Education Task Force.
	2. **Space Utilization Task Force** No self-nominations were received. What to do?		2. Lyndall Muschell to consult with Howard Woodard to see if he is serving on the Technology Assisted Task Force by virtue of his position. If not, forward Howard Woodard as the university senate representative. If not, consult with other self-nominees from graduate education task force to see if any of them is interested.
	3. **Technology Assisted Task Force** One self-nomination from Howard Woodard was received, but he noted that he may wind up on the task force by virtue of the position he holds at the university. What to do?		
	4. What to do?		
	a. Lyndall Muschell to forward Catherine Whelan as the university senate representative to serve on the Graduate Education Task Force.		
	b. Lyndall Muschell to consult with Howard Woodard to see if he is serving on the Technology Assisted Task Force by virtue of his position. If not, forward Howard Woodard as the university senate representative. If not, consult with other self-nominees from graduate education task force to see if any of them is interested.		3. Lyndall Muschell to consult with other self-nominees from the graduate education task force to see if any of them is interested in serving on the space utilization task force
	c. Lyndall Muschell to consult with other self-nominees from the graduate education task force to see if any of them is interested in serving on the space utilization task force.		4. If not able to identify a representative to one or more of task forces by taking the actions above, Lyndall Muschell to check with university senators for self-nominations again.
	d. If not able to identify a representative to one or more of		

	task forces by taking the actions above, Lyndall Muschell to check with university senators for self-nominations again.		

At-Large Election	1. Upon seeing Craig Turner's email suggestion, in response to Lyndall Muschell's call for feedback, to mimic last year's at-large election process, Catherine Whelan drafted a revision of last year's process for use this year.
	  a. Nominations: Feb 3-Feb 14
	  b. Vote: Feb 19-Feb 26
	  c. Results: Mar 1
	2. The proposed process was endorsed unanimously by ECUS members.
	3. Emails used for implementation of nomination and ballot and results during last year will serve as models for this year.
			Catherine Whelan and Lyndall Muschell to ensure the at-large election procedures are archived in the appropriate format and implemented.

Recognitions	1. Lyndall Muschell, ably assisted by graduate assistant Carly Jara, will start preparations of the recognition certificates for the 2013-2014 academic year. Lyndall posed the following questions seeking ECUS guidance.
	  a. <u>Question</u> Who is recognized with a certificate?
	  <u>Answer</u> Outgoing senators, Outgoing committee members who are not senators, Officers of university senate, Officers of committees, ECUS members. A list of recipients is generated using the last item under the SEARCH menu in the online senator database.
	  b. <u>Question</u> When should the recognitions occur?
	  c. <u>Answer</u> Most recognitions
			Lyndall Muschell and Carly Jara to prepare the recognition certificates for the 2013-2014 academic year.

	were done at the committee level last year, with only recognition with certificates of the officers of university senate and standing committee chairs at the final meeting of the university senate. Others who may have received their certificate of recognition at the final committee meetings of the year were asked to stand (if present at the university senate meeting) and be recognized by applause including outgoing university senators, vice-chairs and secretaries of committees, and outgoing non-senator members of committees. You might refer to the RECOGNITIONS section of the minutes of the 19 Apr 2013 meeting of the university senate for details. d. Question Any other guidance you would offer? Answer There is an ECUS Calendar and Checklist document (one of the checklists pertains to these recognitions) archived on the "Green Page" of the University Senate.		

SoCC Advisory Issue	1. Lyndall Muschell had received an email from John Swinton seeking ECUS advice on a SoCC matter. The item was guidance on fielding an appeal, the first ever appeal in fact, on a SoCC decision. This decision was considered an information item in the SoCC Report to University Senate and the question was "Is there a written appeal process for this in university senate documents or should this be considered within academic affairs by appeal to chair, dean, associate provost, provost as appropriate?" 2. After some discussion, the ECUS consensus was that a. Lyndall Muschell should reply to John Swinton with guidance to consider this within academic affairs. 3. Lyndall Muschell indicated her intent to contact Associate Provost Tom Ormond who has oversight over the matter in dispute (under appeal) within academic affairs.		1. Lyndall Muschell to reply to John Swinton with guidance to consider this within academic affairs. 2. Lyndall Muschell to contact Associate Provost Tom Ormond who has oversight over the matter in dispute (under appeal) within academic affairs.
VIII. Next Meeting (Tentative Agenda, Calendar)			
1. Calendar	14 Feb 2014 @ 2pm Univ. Senate A&S 2-72 28 Feb 2014 @ 2pm Univ. Senate committees 28 Feb 2014 @ 3:30pm ECUS/SCC Glass Room		
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 3:06 pm.	

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: LYNDALL 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	11-15-13	01-24-14					
Kelli Brown *Provost*		P	P	Meeting Cancelled	R					
Steve Dorman *University President*		R	P	Meeting Cancelled	R					
Joshua Kitchens *EFS; Library*		P	P	Meeting Cancelled	P					
Lyndall Muschell *EFS; CoE; ECUS Chair*		P	P	Meeting Cancelled	P					
Susan Steele *EFS; CoHS; ECUS Vice-Chair*		P	P	Meeting Cancelled	P					
Craig Turner *EFS; CoAS; ECUS Secretary*		P	P	Meeting Cancelled	P					
Catherine Whelan *EFS; CoB; ECUS Chair Emeritus*		P	P	Meeting Cancelled	P					
				No Quorum						