

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

**MEETING DATE & TIME:** 4 APRIL 2014; 2:00 –3:15

**MEETING LOCATION:** 301 PARKS ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

<b>GUESTS:</b>	
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.

<b>AGENDA TOPIC</b>	<b>DISCUSSIONS &amp; CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>ACTION OR RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>FOLLOW-UP</b> {including dates/responsible person, status (pending, ongoing, completed)}
<b>I. Call to order</b>	The meeting was called to order at 2:01 pm by Lyndall Muschell (Chair).		
<b>II. Approval of Agenda</b>	A <b>MOTION</b> to approve the agenda was made and seconded.	The agenda was approved as circulated.	
<b>III. Approval of Minutes</b>	A <b>MOTION</b> to approve the 28 Feb 2014 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 28 Feb 2014 ECUS minutes were approved as posted, so no additional action was required.	

<b>IV. Reports</b>	Neither administrative (President, Provost) nor committee reports were on the agenda.		
<b>V. Information Items</b> Actions/Recommendations			
<b>2013-2014 ECUS Committee Annual Report</b>	Lyndall Muschell indicated that her intent was to have had a draft of the ECUS annual report prepared for committee review but that unfortunately she had not found time to do so. All were understanding of that and agreed to Lyndall's proposal to circulate by email a draft of the ECUS annual report for committee review and feedback.		Lyndall Muschell to draft the 2013-14 ECUS annual report and circulate it for feedback to the members of the 2013-14 ECUS via email.
<b>Status of Recognitions (Certificates)</b>	Lyndall Muschell informed those present that Carly Jara, Graduate Assistant of the 2014-2015 University Senate, had prepared the recognition certificates for outgoing senators, outgoing committee members and committee officers (other than committee chair) and delivered those certificates to standing committee chairs for distribution at the 4 Apr 2014 meetings (2:00-3:15) of standing committees (APC, CAPC, FAPC, SAPC, RPIPC). In this case, outgoing meant term of service was ending in April 2014. Lyndall Muschell further noted that she intended to invite these individuals (outgoing university senators, outgoing committee vice-chairs and secretaries, outgoing committee members) to stand and be recognized at the 25 Apr 2014 meeting of the University Senate. She intended to recognize standing committee chairs and executive committee members with their certificates at the 25 Apr 2014 meeting of the university senate. This is consistent with the practice from the 2012-2013 academic year.		

<p><b>Electronic Tools</b></p>	<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 &amp; 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 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</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provost Brown intends to ask James Carlisle to search for existing software that may be a viable option to replace the existing online motion database for the university senate.</li> <li>2. Lyndall Muschell to include this item in the 2013-14 ECUS annual report as a matter for continued consideration by the 2014-15 ECUS.</li> </ol>
--------------------------------	---	--	---

*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*

	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><b><u>24 Jan 2014</u></b>  <i>As the 15-Nov-2013 ECUS meeting was cancelled due to no quorum, this update was provided by email.</i></p> <p><b><i>From:</i></b> Lyndall Muschell  <b><i>Sent:</i></b> Tuesday, November 12, 2013 7:50 PM  <b><i>To:</i></b> ECUS@LIST.GCSU.EDU  <b><i>Subject:</i></b> Information on University Senate Electronic Tools "Fix"  <b><i>Attachment:</i></b>  <i>Electronic_Tools_Fixes_2013-10-17</i>  <i>Dear All,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>I am sharing the latest information on a fix for the University Senate Electronic Tools. See the email exchange below.</i></li> <li>• <i>I have also attached some information copied from earlier</i></li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--

*emails between Craig and Doc St. Clair related to this topic  
Electronic\_Tools\_Fixes\_2013-10-17*

•  
*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:***

*Electronic\_Tools\_Fixes\_2013-11-12*

*Lyndall,*

- 1. Feel free to forward this update to those you deem appropriate (ECUS members for example).*
- 2. I just received this message (See Electronic\_Tools\_Fixes\_2013-11-12) 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

**04-Apr 2014**

As part of “minutes cleanup,” discussion of the closure of this matter for the 2013-14 academic year was considered.

After Craig Turner provided a brief summary of the current status of this matter (see above) to refresh the memories of committee members, there was discussion that included the following points

1. Howard Woodard has communicated to Craig Turner the existence of an electronic tool that may meet the needs of the university senate with respect to an online motion database.
2. Howard Woodard has communicated a desire to converse with Craig Turner to determine if the proposed tool is a viable option to replace the existing online motion database of the university senate. However, that meeting has not yet been scheduled.
3. Provost Kelli Brown advocated for exploration of existing software that could be purchased that might meet the needs of the university senate. She indicated that James Carlisle has historically demonstrated remarkable prowess in finding software that meets the needs of the university on a number of matters and offered to

	<p>consult with him with respect to the identification of electronic tools that may serve as a viable option to replace the existing online motion database for the university senate. This offer was gratefully accepted by the committee members present.</p> <p>4. There was consensus that this matter be recommended to the 2014-2015 ECUS for further consideration.</p> <p>5. Note: The summary of the review by Kelly Rickman and approximate costs are provided in two supporting documents of the minutes of the 24 Jan 2014 meeting of the Executive Committee, each including the phrase “Electronic Tool Fixes” in the names.</p> <p>This discussion brings closure to the 2013-2014 ECUS consideration of this matter.</p>		
<p><b>Photos for University Senate</b></p>	<p><u><b>23 Aug 2013</b></u> <i>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 (2<sup>nd</sup> 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.</i></p> <p><u><b>04 Oct 2013</b></u> <i>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</i></p>		



*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.*

**04 Apr 2014**

As part of “minutes cleanup,” discussion of the closure of this matter for the 2013-14 academic year was considered.

The main point of deliberation was to consider whether the above recommendation was still viable given the recent relocation of the office of the university photographer Tim Vacula. Lyndall Muschell had communicated with Tim Vacula via email to obtain his opinion to inform the deliberation. In his response, Tim Vacula noted that the culture of “mug shots” (head shots) at the university has migrated toward a more consistent look for all members of the university community and that this look cannot be realized by him coming to the university senate meeting. He proposed that the new process be

1. Tim Vacula is sent a list of individuals for whom “mug shots” are needed for the online senator database.
2. Tim Vacula checks to see if he has an image of the individuals on this list in his photo gallery and if so provides the image(s) for use in the

	<p>online senator database.</p> <p>3. Tim Vacula contacts those on the list for whom he does not have an image in his photo gallery to attempt to arrange for that individual to come to his studio for a “mug shot.”</p> <p>This process was endorsed by those present as an excellent way to proceed in the future. Craig Turner noted that he had independently contacted Tim Vacula prior to the meeting and already sent the list of those individuals on the 2014-15 university senate who did not have a “mug shot” in the online university senator database.</p> <p>This discussion brings closure to the 2013-2014 ECUS consideration of this matter.</p>		
<p><b>University Senate Website</b></p>	<p><b><u>23 Aug 2013</u></b>  <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><b><u>4 Oct 2013</u></b>  <i>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.</i></p> <p><b><u>04 Apr 2014</u></b>  As part of “minutes cleanup,” discussion of the closure of this matter for the 2013-14</p>		<p><b><u>23 Aug 2013</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Catherine Whelan to circulate the draft revisions to the web presence work group.</i></li> <li><i>Catherine Whelan to meet with John Hachtel.</i></li> </ol> <p><b><u>04 Oct 2013</u></b>  <i>Consideration postponed to a future ECUS meeting.</i></p> <p><b><u>04 Apr 2014</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Catherine Whelan to send to Provost Brown the detailed information on the updates desired for the university senate web presence found at <a href="http://senate.gcsu.edu">http://senate.gcsu.edu</a></li> <li>Provost Brown to assist</li> </ol>

	<p>academic year was considered.</p> <p>Catherine Whelan indicated that she had talked to a number of relevant individuals on campus who could possibly assist in the reformatting of the university senate web presence – which was primarily to streamline the website and place some of the content in an area that would require unify credentials to access. These requests were consistently met with a response of “insufficient time or insufficient resources to consider at this time” and so Catherine had curtailed making the request. Provost Kelli Brown indicated that resources were being allocated to update the existing web presence of the university and so it may be an opportune time to revisit making this request. Catherine Whelan was invited to provide the detailed information on the desired updates to the Provost who would assist in getting the information to the relevant parties for consideration of its inclusion in the update to the university web presence.</p> <p>This discussion brings closure to the 2013-2014 ECUS consideration of this matter.</p>		<p>in communicating the desired updates to those individuals who might be able to consider their inclusion in the pending update to the university web presence.</p>
<p><b>VI. Unfinished Business Review of Action &amp; Recommendations, Provide updates (if any) to Follow-up</b></p>			
<p><b>IT Policy Development</b></p>	<p><u><b>23 Aug 2013</b></u>  <i>1. IT Policy Development - Catherine Whelan will coordinate with Hance Patrick</i></p> <p><u><b>4 Oct 2013</b></u>  <i>Catherine Whelan reported that she has had a few conversations with Hance Patrick on</i></p>		<p><u><b>23 Aug 2013</b></u>  <i>1. Catherine Whelan to coordinate with Hance Patrick with respect to the IT Policy Development Proposal.</i></p>

*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.*

**28 Feb 2014**

1. **Background** *Prior to the meeting, Lyndall Muschell had circulated a draft of the “Policy for the Development and Revision of Policies,” which had been prepared by Catherine Whelan, for review by the members of the Executive Committee. Craig Turner offered some suggested edits for consideration and Catherine Whelan had accepted the majority of the suggested edits and incorporated them into the draft to be reviewed at this meeting.*
2. **Suggested Edits** *The following editorial suggestions emerged from the committee deliberation:*
  - a. *In item 2 in the Procedures section, make the Policy Template Guide more accessible rather than require it to be requested via [senate@gcsu.edu](mailto:senate@gcsu.edu)*
  - b. *In paragraph 3 of item 3 in the Procedures section, replace “Chair of the Executive Committee” with “Presiding Officer of the University Senate”.*
  - c. *In paragraph 3 of item 3 in the Procedures section, replace “person*

**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.*

**28 Feb 2014**

1. *Lyndall Muschell to forward the policy document to Maureen Horgan, RPIPC Chair, for consideration.*

**04 Apr 2014**

*Lyndall Muschell did forward the policy document to Maureen Horgan, RPIPC Chair, for consideration. This brings closure to the 2013-2014 ECUS consideration of this matter.*

	<p>or department” with “person(s) or department(s).”</p> <p>d. In paragraph 4 of item 3 in the Procedures section, replace the word “provided” with either “specified” or “articulated.”</p> <p>e. In Appendix B, replace “Georgia College &amp; State University” with “Georgia College.”</p> <p>3. <b>Discussion</b> There was general agreement to incorporate the suggested edits. With respect to the issue of institutional nomenclature in item 2.e, there was a suggestion to consider revising the splash page for the online Policies, Procedures and Practices Manual with a note about the use of the name with something like “Even though the official name of our institution is Georgia College &amp; State University, the name “Georgia College” may be used in the context of a policy statement.” with the understanding that the particular wording might be modified to keep this sentiment</p> <p>4. <b>Steering</b> The members of the Executive Committee accepted the edits and institutional nomenclature discussion to be incorporated into the draft and agreed to steer further consideration of this policy to the Resources, Planning and Institutional Policy Committee.</p>		
<p><b>PPPM – Policies, Procedures and Practices Manual</b></p>	<p><b><u>23 Aug 2013</u></b>  Catherine Whelan reported that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>		<p><b><u>04 Apr 2014</u></b></p> <p>1. Lyndall Muschell to consider the inclusion of this item in the 2013-14 ECUS annual report as an item for further consideration</p>

	<p><i>copy of BoR Policy Language with a link to BoR Policy.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Mike Digby did a vast amount of work during 2012-2013 in reviewing the academic sections of the PPPM</i></li> <li>• <i>Student Opinion Surveys and Student Opinion Forms need to be collated and reviewed for consistency</i></li> <li>• <i>the “new” (revised &amp; reformatted) version of the PPPM is still lurking in the background and its launch is anticipated soon.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>04 Oct 2013</u></b></p> <p><i>Catherine Whelan reported that</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>the “new” (revised &amp; reformatted) version of the PPPM is about to go live</i></li> <li>• <i>Mike Digby is reviewing the changes he was authorized by the 2012-2013 ECUS to make including</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>links to BoR policy replace quotes of BoR policy</i></li> <li>○ <i>update procedures to reflect current practice</i></li> <li>○ <i>update titles to make them more index-friendly</i></li> <li>○ <i>edits to make searching more convenient for PPPM users</i></li> <li>○ <i>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,</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<p>by the 2014-15 ECUS.</p>
--	--	--	-----------------------------

*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.*

**04 Apr 2014**

As part of “minutes cleanup,” discussion of the closure of this matter for the 2013-14 academic year was considered.

Catherine Whelan has recently spoken to Tom Ormond on this matter and indicated the following items in her committee update.

1. Tom Ormond is aware of the concern regarding a need for a communication process to ensure that revisions to existing policies or new policies that emerge as motions of the university senate that are also approved by the university president are placed into the PPPM.
2. Catherine Whelan has noticed some broken links in the PPPM that need resolution.
3. Catherine Whelan reminded those present of the conflicting policies on Student Opinion Surveys that still require resolution and noted that Tom Ormond is aware of this need.

Josh Kitchens indicated that there is a continuing desire to determine an appropriate

	<p>day on which a snapshot of the PPPM should be taken for archival purposes. Josh Kitchens indicated that the catalog which uses the same software (called smart catalog) already undergoes this annual snapshot, so it seems that the taking of the snap shot should be feasible to implement.</p> <p><i>Note: This might be an item to include in the annual report of the 2013-14 ECUS for further consideration by the 2014-15 ECUS.</i></p> <p>This discussion brings closure to the 2013-2014 ECUS consideration of this matter</p>		
<p><b>Governance Retreat</b></p>	<p><b><u>23 Aug 2013</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>There were 58 attendees, of whom 25 members responded to the survey.</i></li> <li>2. <i>Feedback narrative comments were overall quite positive, and the average rating for overall effectiveness was 4.61 out of 5.</i></li> <li>3. <i>The costs for the retreat were</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <i>\$2000 for Rock Eagle (site/food)</i></li> <li>b. <i>\$162 for printing/binding handbook</i></li> <li>c. <i>The cost for the shuttle bus was not included in the costs above.</i></li> </ol> </li> <li>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 <a href="http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/univ_senate/Retreat_13/index.htm">http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/univ_senate/Retreat_13/index.htm</a></i></li> </ol> <p><b><u>04 Oct 2013</u></b></p> <p><i>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</i></p>		<p><b><u>23 Aug 2013</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Lyndall Muschell intends to prepare the governance retreat report.</i></li> </ol> <p><b><u>04 Oct 2013</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Lyndall Muschell has prepared a draft of the governance retreat report and submitted it for review to ECUS, SCC, and GRPC.</i></li> <li>2. <i>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.</i></li> </ol> <p><b><u>04 Apr 2014</u></b></p> <p><i>Lyndall Muschell did</i></p>



	<p><i>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.</i></p>		<p>incorporate the editorial suggestions received and did present the final version of the governance retreat report to University Senate at its 25 Oct 2013 meeting. This report is also archived at the retreat website on the green page. This brings closure to the consideration by the 2013-2014 ECUS of this matter.</p>
--	--	--	---

<p><b>University Senate Budget</b> (combined with 23 Aug 2013 USGFC Travel Request)</p>	<p><b><u>23 Aug 2013</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>This is the first year that University Senate has received a budget allocation.</i></li> <li><i>There are two accounts.</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>\$5000 in state funds (no rollover)</i></li> <li><i>\$3500 in foundation (no rollover)</i></li> </ol> </li> <li><i>It is not known whether funds could be encumbered – possibly for example to support the 2014 Governance Retreat.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>USGFC Travel Request</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><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></li> <li><i>A <b>MOTION</b> 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></li> <li><i>Other ideas for possible funding to further consider included social events for faculty, higher education brown bags (civic leaders).</i></li> <li><i>It was recommended that Lyndall Muschell invite feedback from university senators by email and at their 13 Sep 2013 meeting</i></li> </ol> <p><b><u>04 Oct 2013</u></b></p> <p><i>Lyndall Muschell provided an update on the university senate budget</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>As requested by ECUS at the last</i></li> </ol>	<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><b><u>23 Aug 2013</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Lyndall Muschell to check with Monica Starley regarding the rollover and ability to encumber funds.</i></li> <li><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></li> </ol> <p><b><u>04 Oct 2013</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Lyndall Muschell did check with Monica Starley as she was charged to do at the 23 Aug 2013 ECUS meeting.</i></li> <li><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></li> </ol> <p><b><u>04 Apr 2014</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Lyndall Muschell to</i></li> </ol>
---	---	--	--

*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.**

**04 Apr 2014**

As part of "minutes cleanup," discussion of the closure of this matter for the 2013-14 academic year was considered.

The primary discussion point was how best to archive a record of the agreement to routinely reimburse USGFC travel by the Presiding Officer Elect from the University Senate budget (See the motion from the 23 Aug 2013 meeting above). The general agreement was to work this into the ECUS calendar and checklists document. The

add the adopted standing practice to reimburse USGFC travel (see 23 Aug 2013 motion) to the ECUS calendar and checklists document.

	<p>details of how to do that were left to the discretion of Lyndall Muschell, though suggestions were for the addition of a university senate budget checklist or a presiding officer checklist.</p> <p>This discussion brings closure to the 2013-2014 ECUS consideration of this matter.</p>		
--	--	--	--

<p><b>Point Persons for Recurring ECUS Functions</b></p>	<p><b><u>23 Aug 2013</u></b>  <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"> <li>• <i>Provost Brown – Corps of Instruction List</i></li> <li>• <i>Catherine Whelan – Letters to Deans of Colleges for Election of Elected Faculty Senators</i></li> <li>• <i>Lyndall Muschell – Preparation of the 2013 Governance Retreat Report.</i></li> <li>• <i>Craig Turner – Apportionment</i></li> <li>• <i>Susan Steele – Chair of the 2013-2014 Governance Retreat Planning Committee.</i></li> <li>• <i>To be determined – Point for the drafting of the 2014-2015 Governance Calendar</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>4 Oct 2013</u></b>  <i>Indirectly updated by other agenda items that were discussed at the 4 Oct 2013 meeting.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Provost Brown – Corps of Instruction List – Completed 2 Oct 2013.</i></li> <li>• <i>Catherine Whelan – Letters to Deans of Colleges for Election of Elected Faculty Senators – Continuing in Collaboration with Lyndall Muschell</i></li> <li>• <i>Lyndall Muschell – Preparation of the 2013 Governance Retreat Report – Circulated to ECUS, SCC, and GRPC for review, completion anticipated 18 Oct 2013.</i></li> <li>• <i>Craig Turner – Apportionment – draft prepared and circulated, completion at the 4 Oct 2013 ECUS</i></li> </ul>		<p><b><u>4 Oct 2013</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>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</i></li> <li>2. <i>Lyndall Muschell is intending to call for volunteers to form the 2013-2014 governance retreat planning committee by end of fall 2013.</i></li> </ol> <p><b><u>24 Jan 2014</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Catherine Whelan (in collaboration with Lyndall Muschell) did send letters to academic deans (library and colleges) regarding elected faculty senator election oversight</i></li> <li>2. <i>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 meeting</i></li> </ol>
--	---	--	---

	<p>meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• To be determined – Point for the drafting of the 2014-2015 Governance Calendar – remained to be determined.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>24 Jan 2014</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Elected Faculty Senator Elections:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>b. ECUS members indicated <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>CoAS</u></b> progressing at department level with anticipation to meet the 1 Feb deadline.</li> <li>• <b><u>CoB</u></b> is completed.</li> <li>• <b><u>CoE</u></b> scheduled for 31 Jan 2014 meeting of the CoE faculty.</li> <li>• <b><u>CoHS</u></b> in progress.</li> <li>• <b><u>Library</u></b> almost done.</li> </ul> </li> <li>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 <a href="http://us.gcsu.edu">http://us.gcsu.edu</a></li> </ol> </li> <li>2. <b><u>Governance Calendar:</u></b> Catherine</li> </ol>		<p>of the University Senate.</p> <p><b><u>28 Feb 2014</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lyndall Muschell to ensure that the adopted editorial revisions are incorporated into the 2014-2015 governance calendar.</li> </ol> <p><b><u>04 Apr 2014</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lyndall Muschell did ensure that the adopted editorial revisions were incorporated into the 2014-2015 governance calendar.</li> <li>2. At the request of Susan Steele, the responsibility to call for volunteers to serve on the governance retreat planning committee was passed from Lyndall Muschell to Susan Steele.</li> <li>3. Susan Steele has made the call for volunteers and is populating the 2013-14 governance retreat planning committee.</li> </ol>
--	---	--	---

*Whelan and Lyndall Muschell to serve 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)*

*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.*

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

*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 the GRPC at the next (14 Feb 2014) meeting of University Senate.*

**28 Feb2014**

**1. 2014-2015 Governance Calendar**

*The draft of this calendar was circulated by Lyndall Muschell via email prior to the meeting for review by the members of the Executive Committee. Lyndall Muschell noted that all the feedback received from standing committee chairs and academic administrators (deans and chairs) supported modeling the 2014-2015 governance calendar after the 2013-2014 governance calendar. The draft circulated was adopted with the following revisions.*

- a. On the cover page, separate out the governance meetings (the meetings scheduled between 2pm and 5pm on Fridays) from the other events provided on the calendar (university convocation, fall semester startup week items such as assessment day, etc.) as a matter of convenience.*
- b. The Provost requested that the start date (1 Aug 2014) and end date (date grades are due in Spring 2015) of faculty contracts be added to the calendar.*
- c. An email from SGA President-Elect Juawn Jackson had been received noting that the SGA intended to continue holding meetings on each Friday from*

*2:00pm-3:15pm and requesting that the meetings of the university senate and its committees be scheduled for 3:30pm to 4:45pm. After some discussion, it was decided to shift five of the six university senate meetings from 2:00-3:15 to 3:30-4:45 (the exception being the 13 Feb 2015 as it was immediately followed by the Service Recognition Ceremony) but that the committee meetings would remain in the 2:00-3:15 slot as they were immediately followed by the coordination meetings of the Executive Committee with Standing Committee Chairs.*

- 2. The Executive Committee members endorsed the 2014-2015 governance calendar as amended and Lyndall Muschell indicated that she would incorporate the editorial changes.*

**04 Apr 2014**

As part of “minutes cleanup,” discussion of the closure of this matter for the 2013-14 academic year was considered.

The only unresolved matter was an update on the governance retreat planning committee. Susan Steele, who is chairing this committee, provided an update that indicated that the committee is being populated and that she is using the information supplied to her by Lyndall Muschell from the 2012-2013 governance retreat planning committee as a guide for moving forward. Susan Steele is confident that this work was proceeding well

	<p>and provided a first draft of the tentative agenda for the 2014 governance retreat as an information item. There was brief discussion of the use of funds from the university senate budget and Susan Steele was encouraged to consult with Monica Starley to ensure the most efficient use of existing funds (particularly the foundation funds) to finance the 2014 retreat which is next fiscal year. Thus the issue of encumbering funds becomes relevant.</p> <p>This discussion brings closure to the 2013-2014 ECUS consideration of this matter.</p>		
<p><b>University Senate Endorsements</b> (sparked by the endorsement request of the QEP Theme and Goals)</p>	<p><b><u>4 Oct 2013</u></b> <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>Among the conversation points were the following.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> <li>• <i>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></li> </ul>	<p><b><u>4 Oct 2013</u></b> <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>In common academic parlance, involvement before the train has left the station.</i></p>	<p><b><u>4 Oct 2013</u></b> 1. <i>Lyndall Muschell to meet with direct reports of the University President to determine if there is intent to launch any university-wide initiatives.</i></p> <p><b><u>04 Apr 2014</u></b> 1. <i>Lyndall Muschell did meet with direct reports of the University President to determine if there was intent to launch any university-wide initiatives.</i> 2. <i>Lyndall Muschell to add the standing practice that the current University Senate Presiding Officer routinely meet with direct reports of the University President to</i></p>

	<p><i>your university senate.” This was a source of concern to some.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>A perception by some who provide input into a review process that if their input is not incorporated it was not heard.</i></li> <li>• <i>Relative to the QEP – suggestions:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>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.</i></li> <li>○ <i>the QEP Theme and Goals might be reported to university senate as an information item rather than an endorsement request.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>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.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>An approval is an action the university senate applies or fails to apply to a policy</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>University Senate operational definition:</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<p>determine if there is intent to launch any university-wide initiatives (see the discussion) to the ECUS calendar and checklists document.</p>
--	--	--	--

*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**

	<p><i>to determine which initiatives might warrant consideration of the university senate.</i></p> <p><b><u>04 Apr 2014</u></b>  As part of “minutes cleanup,” discussion of the closure of this matter for the 2013-14 academic year was considered.  The primary discussion point was how best to archive a record of the agreement that the University Senate Presiding Officer routinely meet with direct reports of the University President to determine if there is intent to launch any university-wide initiatives (See discussion above). The general agreement was to work this into the ECUS calendar and checklists document. The details of how to do that were left to the discretion of Lyndall Muschell, though suggestions were for the addition of a presiding officer checklist.  This discussion brings closure to the 2013-2014 ECUS consideration of this matter.</p>		
<p><b>Apportionment of Elected Faculty Senators</b></p>	<p><b><u>4 Oct 2013</u></b>  <i>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 senators were being apportioned to the academic units (library, colleges), a recurring ECUS function.</i></p> <p><i>Craig Turner provided the following update:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The recent emergence of a “College of Administration” in the Corps of</i></li> </ul>	<p><b><u>4 Oct 2013</u></b>  <i>The apportionment motion was approved with no discussion.</i></p>	<p><b><u>4 Oct 2013</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Provost Brown indicated her intent to consult with Neil Jones, who prepares the Corps of Instruction list, to obtain historical information on the presence of the “College of Administration.”</i></li> <li>2. <i>Lyndall Muschell will announce the number of elected faculty senators that were</i></li> </ol>

	<p><i>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.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>There were seven (7) individuals in the College of Administration in the 2013-2014 Corps of Instruction List. They are:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>CoAS (1): Steven Jones;</i></li> <li>○ <i>CoE (4): Paul Jones, Sharon Jones, Charlie Martin, Cara Meade;</i></li> <li>○ <i>CoHS (2): Kelli Brown, Tom Ormond.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>The Huntington-Hill method of apportionment is used. This method has been in use by the United States Congress since 1941.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>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).</i></li> <li>○ <i>Specifically the geometric mean (square root of the product) of the lower and upper quotas for an academic unit is used as the threshold.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>In neither version did the number apportioned to each academic unit</i></li> </ul>		<p><i>apportioned to each of the academic units (library, colleges) to the members of the University Senate.</i></p> <p><b><u>04 Apr 2014</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Provost Brown did consult with Neil Jones, who prepares the Corps of Instruction list, to obtain historical information on the presence of the “College of Administration.”</i></li> <li>2. <i>Lyndall Muschell did 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.</i></li> </ol>
--	---	--	--

*(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.*

**04 Apr 2014**

As part of "minutes cleanup," discussion of the closure of this matter for the 2013-14 academic year was considered.

The primary matter that required resolution was the practice to include an academic unit designated as "College of Administration" in the Corps of Instruction report produced annually by the Office of Academic Affairs. The Provost indicated that the perception on the part of Mr. Neil Jones, who prepares the Corps of Instruction report, was that this was created at the request of the university senate to explicitly identify the individuals on the corps of instruction list who had full-time administrative responsibilities and did not teach courses. After some discussion, there was agreement to discontinue the use of the



	<p>“College of Administration” and include these individuals in the academic unit to which they are assigned. There was consensus that this should be the practice used going forward. The university senate bylaws deadline of 15 Sep for delivery of this corps of instruction list from the Office of Academic Affairs to the Executive Committee was provided at the request of Provost Brown.</p> <p>This discussion brings closure to the 2013-2014 ECUS consideration of this matter.</p>		
--	--	--	--

<p><b>University Senate Bylaws Revisions (SoCC)</b></p>	<p><b><u>24 Jan 2014</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>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.</i></li> <li>2. <i>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.</i></li> <li>3. <i>A distillation of the discussion among the members of ECUS follows.</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <i>All SUGGESTIONS offered by Craig Turner and Ken Farr were endorsed unanimously by ECUS.</i></li> <li>b. <i>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 I.C.5) is quoted below. See in particular the blue highlighted portion.</i></li> <li>c. <i>Two other matters emerged</i></li> </ol> </li> </ol>		<p><b><u>24 Jan 2014</u></b></p> <p><i>Lyndall Muschell to share this information with Cara Meade and Mary Magoulick to seek CAPC and SoCC feedback, respectively.</i></p> <p><b><u>28 Feb 2014</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Lyndall Muschell did share this information with Cara Meade and Mary Magoulick to seek CAPC and SoCC feedback, respectively.</i></li> <li>2. <i>Lyndall Muschell to ensure that the proposed revisions to the university senate bylaws are entered into the online motion database as a motion for university senate consideration at its 28 Mar 2014 meeting.</i></li> </ol> <p><b><u>04 Apr 2014</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Lyndall Muschell did ensure that the proposed revisions to the university senate bylaws were entered into the online motion database as a motion for university senate consideration at its 28 Mar 2014 meeting.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>Note: Lyndall Muschell</i></p>
---	---	--	---

during discussion.

- 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

did share orally the ECUS suggestions regarding the definition of the term teaching representatives with Cara (Meade) Smith at the 4 Apr 2014 meeting of ECUS with standing committee chairs.

*seek CAPC and SoCC feedback, respectively.*

**V.Section 1.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.*

**28 Feb 2014**

1. *Subcommittee on the Core Curriculum members reviewed the suggestions from the 24 Jan 2014 meeting of the Executive Committee (as noted above) endorsing a draft with the following changes:*
  - a. *all suggested edits offered to improve clarity and align the language with similar language elsewhere in the university senate bylaws were adopted,*
  - b. *the suggested eligibility for the chair position was adopted*
  - c. *the suggested review of teaching representatives for area D resulted in replacing the single area D teaching representative with two teaching representations referenced as D1 (science) and D3 (technology)*
  - d. *as a result of item c, increased the committee minimum size from ten to eleven and the committee maximum*

*size from fifteen to sixteen.*

- 2. The ECUS members present agreed that these proposed revisions to the university senate bylaws were non-editorial and thus required a first and second reading, and will submit these proposed revisions as a motion for the consideration of the university senate at its 28 March 2014 meeting.*

**04 Apr 2014**

Given the deliberation this item received at the 28 Mar 2014 meeting of the university senate, Lyndall Muschell added a “Bylaws Revisions – Next Steps” item to the agenda of the 04 Apr 2014 ECUS meeting. In particular, she wanted to check in with members of ECUS to see if there should be any actions taken by ECUS to facilitate the second reading of the motion.

After a brief discussion, the primary point of concern was the lack of a clear definition of the term “teaching representative” yet ECUS did not feel that its role as motion sponsor included responsibility for drafting the definition of this term.

The consensus was that as a courtesy, ECUS suggest to the originators (Mary Magoulick and Cara (Meade) Smith) of the proposed revisions to the SoCC language that they consider

1. preparing a definition of the term “teaching representative”
2. how best to incorporate that definition into the current proposed university senate bylaws language under consideration
3. sharing their intentions– possibly to

	<p>offer a motion to amend the language at the 25 Apr 2014 meeting of the university senate – with university senators via the email list <a href="mailto:us@list.gcsu.edu">us@list.gcsu.edu</a> prior to the 25 Apr 2014 meeting of the university senate.</p> <p>There was general consensus to leave the implementation of these suggestions to the discretion of the aforementioned originators</p> <p>This discussion brings closure to the 2013-2014 ECUS consideration of this matter.</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p><b>Task Force Recommendations</b></p>	<p><b><u>24 Jan 2014</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b><u>Graduate Education Task Force</u></b> <i>Four self-nominations were received. The nominee selected was Catherine Whelan.</i></li> <li>2. <b><u>Space Utilization Task Force</u></b> <i>No self-nominations were received. What to do?</i></li> <li>3. <b><u>Technology Assisted Task Force</u></b> <i>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?</i></li> <li>4. <i>What to do?</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <i>Lyndall Muschell to forward Catherine Whelan as the university senate representative to serve on the Graduate Education Task Force.</i></li> <li>b. <i>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.</i></li> <li>c. <i>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.</i></li> <li>d. <i>If not able to identify a</i></li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p><b><u>24 Jan 2014</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Lyndall Muschell to forward Catherine Whelan as the university senate representative to serve on the Graduate Education Task Force.</i></li> <li>2. <i>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.</i></li> <li>3. <i>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</i></li> <li>4. <i>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-</i></li> </ol>
--	---	---

	<p><i>representative to one or more of task forces by taking the actions above, Lyndall Muschell to check with university senators for self-nominations again.</i></p> <p><b><u>04 Apr 2014</u></b> This item received closure of consideration by the 2013-2014 ECUS.</p>		<p><i>nominations again.</i></p> <p><b><u>28 Feb 2014</u></b> <i>Lyndall Muschell tended to each of the actions charged to her on 24 Jan 2014 and ensured that each task force received a representative for the university senate.</i></p>
--	--	--	---



<p><b>At-Large Election</b></p>	<p><b><u>24 Jan 2014</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Nominations: Feb 3-Feb 14</li> <li>b. Vote: Feb 19-Feb 26</li> <li>c. Results: Mar 1</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. The proposed process was endorsed unanimously by ECUS members.</li> <li>3. Emails used for implementation of nomination and ballot and results during last year will serve as models for this year.</li> </ol> <p><b><u>28 Feb 2014</u></b></p> <p>Lyndall Muschell noted that the at-large election had been implemented and that Ben McMillan had been elected as an at-large elected faculty senator with a 2014-2017 term of service.</p> <p><b><u>04 Apr 2014</u></b></p> <p>This item received closure of consideration by the 2013-2014 ECUS.</p>		<p><b><u>24 Jan 2014</u></b></p> <p>Catherine Whelan and Lyndall Muschell to ensure the at-large election procedures are archived in the appropriate format and implemented.</p> <p><b><u>28 Feb 2014</u></b></p> <p>Catherine Whelan and Lyndall Muschell did ensure the at-large election procedures are archived in the appropriate format and implemented.</p>
<p><b>Recognitions</b></p>	<p><b><u>24 Jan 2014</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>Question</u> Who is recognized with a certificate?</li> </ol> </li> </ol>		<p><b><u>24 Jan 2014</u></b></p> <p>Lyndall Muschell and Carly Jara to prepare the recognition certificates for the 2013-2014 academic year.</p> <p><b><u>04 Apr 2014</u></b></p> <p>Lyndall Muschell and Carly Jara did prepare the</p>

*Answer 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. Question When should the recognitions occur?*

*c. Answer Most recognitions 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.*

recognition certificates for the 2013-2014 academic year.

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.

**04 Apr 2014**

This item received closure of consideration by the 2013-2014 ECUS. See the details in the information item “Status of Recognitions (Certificates)” provided above as part of the minutes for the 04 Apr 2014 ECUS meeting.

<p><b>SoCC Advisory Issue</b></p>	<p><b><u>24 Jan 2014</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?”</li> <li>2. After some discussion, the ECUS consensus was that <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Lyndall Muschell should reply to John Swinton with guidance to consider this within academic affairs.</li> </ol> </li> <li>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.</li> </ol> <p><b><u>04 Apr 2014</u></b></p> <p>This item received closure of consideration by the 2013-2014 ECUS.</p>		<p><b><u>24 Jan 2014</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lyndall Muschell to reply to John Swinton with guidance to consider this within academic affairs.</li> <li>2. Lyndall Muschell to contact Associate Provost Tom Ormond who has oversight over the matter in dispute (under appeal) within academic affairs.</li> </ol> <p><b><u>28 Feb 2014</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lyndall Muschell did reply to John Swinton with guidance to consider this within academic affairs.</li> <li>2. Lyndall Muschell did contact Associate Provost Tom Ormond who has oversight over the matter in dispute (under appeal) within academic affairs.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Post-Tenure Review (Portfolio Retention)</b></p>	<p><b><u>28 Feb 2014</u></b></p> <p>Craig Turner sought guidance from the committee on a risk management issue in the context of post-tenure reviews. Specifically, the issue was the final repository of the post-tenure review portfolio. In the current policy, the language articulates that the post-tenure</p>		<p><b><u>28 Feb 2014</u></b></p> <p>Craig Turner to consult with Associate General Counsel Qiana Wilson to obtain guidance on the recommended practice for the retention of post-</p>

	<p><i>review portfolio is returned to the candidate at the conclusion of her/his post-tenure review, yet the University System of Georgia Records Retention Schedule indicates that dossiers pertaining to matters of tenure may be retained for seven years after the end of employment. Both Provost Brown and President Dorman agreed that this was a matter of risk management and both recommended that Craig Turner consult with Associate General Counsel Qiana Wilson for guidance on this matter. Provost Brown indicated her intent to alert Qiana Wilson to expect such a consultation.</i></p>		<p><i>tenure review portfolios.</i></p> <p><b><u>04 Apr 2014</u></b>  Craig Turner did consult with Associate General Counsel Qiana Wilson to obtain guidance on the recommended practice for the retention of post-tenure review portfolios. This action brings closure to the 2013-2014 ECUS consideration of this matter.</p>
<p><b>VII. New Business</b>  Actions/Recommendations</p>			

<p><b>Bylaws Revisions pertaining to CAPC as SoCC Arbiter (Proposed by CAPC)</b></p>	<p>Lyndall Muschell had received an email from Cara (Meade) Smith, who serves as Chair of the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Committee (CAPC). The content of the email was the proposal</p> <p>.</p> <p>SoCC requests CAPC add to V.Section 2.c.2.b (before the final sentence) language such as: This committee will provide oversight to the Subcommittee on Core Curriculum (SoCC) and serve as an arbiter if disputes arise over the designation of any course as either a core course or a course carrying any university-designated overlay.</p> <p>The members of the Executive Committee noted this proposed revision was a non-editorial change and thus subject to consideration by the University Senate with first and second readings at consecutive scheduled meetings. Since there was only one scheduled meeting of the 2013-2014 University Senate remaining in the academic year and because the proposed language was still in the “such as” stage (not proposed as final language), those members of ECUS present thought it best if</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) further consideration of the proposal was postponed for consideration by the 2014-2015 Executive Committee at its earliest convenience</li> <li>(2) as a stop gap measure, the 2014-2015 CAPC be asked to place language</li> </ol>		<p><i>Note: Lyndall Muschell included in her ECUS report at the 4 Apr 2014 meeting of the ECUS with the Standing Committee Chair a distillation of the recommendations offered by ECUS on the matter of proposed bylaws language that CAPC serve as arbiter of SoCC decisions.</i></p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>addressing this role of SoCC arbiter in its committee operating procedures</p> <p>(3) specific language that articulates the recommendation with precision, and ideally in a form suitable for use in bylaws, be developed by the proposer (CAPC on behalf of SoCC).</p> <p>(4) Cara (Meade) Smith is asked to arrange for this information to be communicated to the 2014-2015 CAPC, perhaps via the committee recommendations section of the 2013-2014 CAPC annual report.</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p><b>Communication Concerns</b></p>	<p>Three communications concerns were raised for discussion.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) The use of the not clearly defined term of “GC Leadership Team” in a recent (Tu 11 Mar 2014) email from John Hachtel apologizing on behalf of the GC Leadership Team noting “students experienced significant problems when attempting to register for summer and fall courses” due to an unscheduled shutdown of the registration system from 7:01am to 7:45am. The primary concern was the use of the term GC Leadership Team with neither articulation of the membership of this team nor a resource where the membership of this team could be determined.</li> <li>(2) Respecting the Governance Calendar as there are some university senators who express regrets from meetings of the university senate as they are called to attend other meetings in their college, department, etc. Other senators choose to attend the meeting of the university senate and miss the opportunity to attend such meetings and inform the deliberation on matters that are relevant to them.</li> <li>(3) Policies emerging from university senate motions of Type P (policy) that receive approval of the university president not being placed into the Policies, Procedures and Practices Manual (PPPM) in a timely manner.</li> </ol>	<p>There was a lively discussion on the use of the GC Leadership Team with the main discussion points being that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) members of ECUS agreeing that the term was not well-defined</li> <li>(2) to promote the governing concept of transparency, there be a resource (possibly a website) that provides the membership of such bodies. This resource might include The Executive Cabinet, The Academic Leadership Team and/or other such bodies that may “huddle” (meet and consult) to address and resolve concerns.</li> <li>(3) Provost Brown indicated her intent to communicate with John Hachtel and discourage the use of the term “GC Leadership Team” in the future.</li> </ol> <p>While there was recognition of the respect of the governance calendar as a valid concern, no particular strategies for its resolution were offered.</p> <p>Relative to the policies recommended by the university senate that receive approval of the University President not</p>	
--------------------------------------	---	--	--



		<p>getting into the PPPM in a timely manner, the discussion points included</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Catherine Whelan had communicated this to Associate Provost Tom Ormond who has a role in administering the PPPM. Tom Ormond agreed to address this matter – by seeking to develop a communication procedure in consultation with relevant individuals – at his earliest possible convenience following the conclusion of the 7-10 April 2014 onsite visit of the SACSCOC Team.</li> <li>(2) general agreement that it was important to place such policies in the PPPM in a timely manner</li> </ul>	
<b>VIII. Next Meeting</b> (Tentative Agenda, Calendar)			
<b>1. Calendar</b>	<p>25 Apr 2014 @ 2pm Univ. Senate A&amp;S 2-72  2 May 2014 @ 2pm Organizational Meeting of the 2014-2015 University Senate and its committees in A&amp;S 2-72</p>		
<b>2. Tentative Agenda</b>	<p>Some of the deliberation today generated tentative agenda items for future ECUS and ECUS-SCC meetings.</p>		<p>Lyndall Muschell will ensure that such items are communicated to Susan Steele (possibly via the 2013-2014 ECUS Annual Report) so that they might be (if necessary) added to agendas of the appropriate ECUS and/or ECUS-SCC</p>

			meetings.
<b>IX. Adjournment</b>	As there was no further business to consider, a <b>MOTION</b> to adjourn the meeting was made and seconded.	The motion to adjourn was approved and the meeting adjourned at 3:15 pm.	

**Distribution:**

First; To Committee Membership for Review

Second: Posted to the Minutes Website

**Approved by:** \_\_\_\_\_  
 Committee Chairperson (Including this Approval by chair at committee discretion)

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

**COMMITTEE OFFICERS:** LYNDALE 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	02-28-14	04-04-14	Present	Regrets	Absent
Kelli Brown <i>Provost</i>	P	P	Meeting Cancelled	R	P	P	4	1	0
Steve Dorman <i>University President</i>	R	P	Meeting Cancelled	R	P	R	2	3	0
Joshua Kitchens <i>EFS; Library</i>	P	P	Meeting Cancelled	P	P	P	5	0	0
Lyndall Muschell <i>EFS; CoE; ECUS Chair</i>	P	P	Meeting Cancelled	P	P	P	5	0	0
Susan Steele <i>EFS; CoHS; ECUS Vice-Chair</i>	P	P	Meeting Cancelled	P	P	P	5	0	0
Craig Turner <i>EFS; CoAS; ECUS Secretary</i>	P	P	Meeting Cancelled	P	P	P	5	0	0
Catherine Whelan <i>EFS; CoB; ECUS Chair Emeritus</i>	P	P	Meeting Cancelled	P	R	P	4	1	0
			No Quorum						