COMMITTEE NAME: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE (ECUS) **MEETING DATE & TIME:** 26 OCT 2012; 2:00 –3:15 **MEETING LOCATION:** PARKS ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, ROOM 301

ATTENDANCE:

Мем	MEMBERS "P" denotes Present, "A" denotes Absent, "R" denotes Regrets				
Р	Janet Clark (CoAS, ECUS Chair Emeritus)	Р	Deborah MacMillan (CoHS)		
Р	Steve Dorman (University President)	Р	Lyndall Muschell (CoE, ECUS Vice-Chair)		
Р	Joshua Kitchens (Library)	Р	Craig Turner (CoAS, ECUS Secretary)		
Р	Matthew Liao-Troth (Interim Provost)	Р	Catherine Whelan (CoB, ECUS Chair)		
	GUESTS: Matthew Williams (Graduate Assistant of the 2012-2013 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 2:03 pm by Catherine Whelan (Chair).		
II. Approval of Agenda	A motion to approve the agenda was made and seconded.	The agenda was approved as circulated.	
III. Approval of Minutes	A motion to consider the 5 Oct 2012 ECUS- SCC minutes was made and seconded. 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 5 Oct 2012 ECUS-SCC minutes were approved as presently posted, so no additional action was required.	

IV. Reports		
President's Report	President Dorman had no items to report	
•	beyond the detailed and comprehensive	
Steve Dorman	update he had provided at the 19 Oct 2012	
	meeting of the University Senate. President	
	Dorman did invite questions and none were	
	forthcoming. In short, no President's Report.	
Provost's Report	1. NCATE	
•	a. National Council for Accreditation of	
Matthew Liao-Troth	Teacher Education (NCATE) site	
	reaffirmation visit for the John H.	
	Lounsbury College of Education had	
	occurred on 22-23 Oct 2012 and Dr.	
	Liao-Troth deferred the reporting of	
	the details to Lyndall Muschell.	
	b. Lyndall Muschell indicated that the	
	preliminary findings of the NCATE	
	review team were overall positive. In	
	addition, the items against which the	
	college should continue to develop	
	that were identified by the NCATE	
	review team had been anticipated by	
	the college and came as no surprise.	
	Among these items was diversity of	
	students and faculty.	
	2. <u>Common Meeting Time</u>	
	a. Interim Provost Liao-Troth is	
	codifying procedures for the	
	implementation of the common	
	meeting time and class scheduling.	
	He invited input from the other	
	members of the committee on one	
	aspect: the transparency of the	
	justifications for exceptions to	
	scheduling classes "on the grid," A	
	brief conversation ensued to clarify	
	the details of this request.	

	 b. Upon completion of drafting these procedures, Interim Provost Liao- Troth intends to circulate the draft to the members of the committee for review and will invite additional feedback at some future meeting of the Executive Committee. 		
Subcommittee on	<u>28 Sep 2012</u>	<u>28 Sep 2012</u>	<u>28 Sep 2012</u>
Nominations (SCoN)	1. <u>FAPC Vacancy</u> : Lyndall Muschell noted	1. <u>FAPC Vacancy</u> : Section	1. <u>FAPC Vacancy</u> :
Lyndall Muschell	 that the vacancy on the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee (FAPC) in the position held by David Connolly, who was no longer working at Georgia College, had been filled. As the library was the only academic unit that did not have a representative on FAPC, Lyndall had asked Josh Kitchens to seek a volunteer from the corps of instruction library faculty. Beth Broyles would shift as a volunteer on the Student Affairs Policy Committee (SAPC) to fill the vacancy as a volunteer on FAPC and Liz Thompson would fill the position on SAPC vacated by Beth Broyles. These modifications maintained compliance with all bylaws requirements on the composition of the university senate committees and were effective with the 28 Sep 2012 committee meetings. 2. <u>Apportionment</u>: Lyndall Muschell thanked Craig Turner for preparing the draft apportionment document for committee review. Craig Turner noted 	 II.1.B of the University Senate Bylaws requires that vacancies or resignations that occur during a term of service shall be filled for the remainder of that term following the process used in the original election, selection or appointment. This requirement calls for a SCoN motion for consideration by the university senate at its next (19 Oct 2012) meeting detailing the changes in memberships made to the committee composition to fill the vacancy on FAPC. 2. <u>Apportionment</u>: Section II.2.A.2 of the University Senate bylaws requires that the exact number of elected faculty senator positions apportioned to each academic unit shall be determined by 	 Lyndall Muschell and Catherine Whelan will ensure that the SCoN motion text as well as the relevant supporting documents are entered into the online motion database in time for consideration by the university senate at its 19 Oct 2012 meeting. <u>Apportionment</u>: Catherine Whelan will ensure that the apportionment is announced to the University Senate by 1 Oct 2012 to comply with the relevant bylaw. <u>Contacting Deans</u>: Catherine Whelan will provide the
	that the apportionment was unchanged from the previous year. The committee accepted the draft apportionment report to be the official apportionment of the	 the Executive Committee and announced to the University Senate by October 1. <u>Contacting Deans</u>: The 	deans a heads up at the next academic leadership meeting that each should

elected faculty senator positions.	committee agreed that	expect a visit from a
3. <u>Contacting Deans</u> : Lyndall Muschell	Catherine Whelan should	member of the
noted that the next step in the elected	provide the heads up and that	Executive
faculty senator election process for 2012-	Lyndall Muschell and Craig	Committee to
2013 was for the designated members (to	Turner should draft an	provide details to
be determined at a future meeting) of the	elected faculty senator	inform elected
Executive Committee to meet with their	election information	faculty senator
respective deans to share information to	document.	elections.
inform elections of successors for elected		• Lyndall Muschell
faculty senators with terms of service	<u>05 Oct 2012</u>	and Craig Turner
ending in April 2013. Catherine Whelan	1. FAPC Vacancy: As was	will draft an elected
noted that she could provide the deans a	noted at the 28 Sep 2012	faculty senator
heads up at the academic leadership	meeting, Section II.1.B of the	election information
meeting that each should expect a visit	University Senate Bylaws	document.
from a member of the Executive	requires that vacancies or	4. Catherine Whelan will
Committee to provide details to inform	resignations that occur	place this item on the
elected faculty senator elections. Lyndall	during a term of service shall	agenda of a future
Muschell indicated that she and Craig	be filled for the remainder of	ECUS or ECUS-SCC
Turner would draft a document with	that term following the	meeting so that
election information for the designated	process used in the original	designees can be
ECUS members to share with their	election, selection or	named to meet with
deans.	appointment. This	deans armed with the
	requirement calls for a SCoN	elected faculty senator
<u>05 Oct 2012</u>	motion for consideration by	information document.
1. FAPC Vacancy: Lyndall Muschell	the university senate at its	5
repeated the report from the 28 Sep 2012	next (19 Oct 2012) meeting	<u>05 Oct 2012</u>
ECUS meeting noting that the vacancy on	detailing the changes in	1. FAPC Vacancy:
the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee	memberships made to the	Lyndall Muschell and
(FAPC) in the position held by David	committee composition to fill	Catherine Whelan will
Connolly, who was no longer working at	the vacancy on FAPC.	ensure that the SCoN
Georgia College, had been filled. As the	2. <u>Letters to Deans</u> : Agreed	motion text as well as
library was the only academic unit that	a. Catherine Whelan will	the relevant
did not have a representative on FAPC,	make the change to the	supporting documents
Lyndall had asked Josh Kitchens to seek	email contact information	are entered into the
a volunteer from the corps of instruction	in the letters / appendices	online motion
library faculty. Beth Broyles would shift	and share this information	database in time for
as a volunteer on the Student Affairs	with deans at the next	consideration by the
Policy Committee (SAPC) to fill the	academic leadership	university senate at its

r			
	as a volunteer on FAPC and Liz	meeting.	19 Oct 2012 meeting.
-	on would fill the position on	b. Catherine Whelan will	2. <u>Apportionment</u> :
SAPC vc	acated by Beth Broyles. These	aggregate the election	Catherine Whelan did
	ations maintained compliance	information from all the	email apportionment
with all	bylaws requirements on the	deans and circulate it to	to the university senate
composi	ition of the university senate	the committee.	on 01 Oct 2012.
committe	ees and were effective with the 28		3. Contacting Deans:
Sep 2012	2 committee meetings.		Catherine Whelan
2. <u>Letters t</u>	t <mark>o Deans</mark> : Lyndall Muschell had		to update the email
distribut	ted the drafts of elected faculty		contact information
election	letters to deans with appendices		ecus@list.gcsu.edu
A-E to th	hose present prior to the meeting.		to senate@gcsu.edu
These dr	rafts were drafted collaboratively		in elected faculty
by Lynde	all Muschell and Craig Turner.		election letters to
One edit	torial change was recommended		deans and distribute
to the do	ocuments, specifically to update		these letters with
the emai	il contact information from the		the appendices A-E
committe	ee list (ecus@list.gcsu.edu) to an		to deans at the next
email ad	ldress (senate@gcsu.edu) that		academic
will be r	eceived by only Presiding Officer		leadership meeting.
Catherir	ne Whelan. This will reduce the		Lyndall Muschell
amount	of email received by all members		and Craig Turner
of the co	mmittee and allow Catherine to		did prepare letters
aggrega	te the elected faculty senator		and the appendices
	information from deans before		for ECUS review
	ing it to the committee via email.		including appendix
	<u> </u>		C which houses the
26 Oct 2012	2		elected faculty
1. Catherin	he Whelan provided an update to		senator information
	mittee on this matter, indicating		document they were
	had circulated the elected faculty		charged to draft.
senator i	information to the deans. Some of		4. Catherine Whelan did
the dean	s had provided elected faculty		place this item on the
	information to Catherine already.		05 Oct 2012 agenda.
	5		
	Cohs had the elected faculty		5. Catherine Whelan will
senator t	l CoHS had the elected faculty topic on their tentative agendas		5. Catherine Whelan will aggregate the elected
	topic on their tentative agendas respective college meetings that		5. Catherine Whelan will aggregate the elected faculty senator

	3. Catherine Whelan indicated that she		from deans and
	would follow-up as necessary with the		circulate it to the
	deans and she reminded the committee		committee via email.
	that the deadline for the submission of		
	election procedures and apportionment		26 Oct 2012
	(designation of constituencies)		1. Catherine Whelan did
	information was 1 Dec 2012.		update the email
	4. Craig Turner sought clarification on		contact information
	whether the deans were expecting to have		ecus@list.gcsu.edu to
	a follow-up meeting from the elected		senate@gcsu.edu in
	faculty senator member of ECUS from		elected faculty election
	their respective academic unit. Catherine		letters to deans and
	Whelan indicated that when she had		distributed these letters
	spoken to the deans, she told them that		with the appendices A-
	she would act on the behalf of the		E to deans at one of
	Executive Committee on this matter.		the recent academic
	Catherine noted that she might call on an		 leadership meetings. Catherine Whelan is
	ECUS member to follow-up with their		
	respective dean in the future but did not		aggregating the elected
	anticipate that need at this time.		faculty senator
			election information as
			she receives it from
			deans and will
			circulate the aggregate
			information to the
			committee once it is
			complete.
Governance Retreat	<u>28 Sep 2012</u>	<u>28 Sep 2012</u>	<u>28 Sep 2012</u>
Planning Committee	Catherine Whelan circulated a DRAFT	It was noted that other members	1. Catherine Whelan will
	report for the 2011-2012 Governance	of the 2011-2012 Governance	send the draft report of
Catherine Whelan	Retreat Planning Committee and invited	Retreat Planning Committee	to the other members of
	ECUS members to read the draft over the	should be given the opportunity	the retreat planning
	coming calendar week and offer feedback by	to provide feedback on the report.	committee, Dean Baker
	email, particularly on the recommendations		and Monica Starley,
	section. She noted in particular that one of		inviting their feedback.
	the recommendations in the report was that		2. Catherine Whelan will
	the 2012-2013 governance retreat planning		receive and incorporate
	committee (this group plans the 2013 retreat)		feedback into the draft

Actions/Recommendations	V. Information Items	be identified no later than the end of the fall 2012 semester. <u>05 Oct 2012</u> Catherine Whelan had circulated this report as a supporting document with the tentative agenda prior to this meeting. No additional editorial suggestions were offered at this meeting. It was acknowledged that ECUS (not only Catherine) has the responsibility to ensure that the 2012-2013 governance retreat planning committee is formed by the end fall 2012 semester. Catherine Whelan indicated her intent to share this report as information with university senators at their 19 Oct 2012 meeting.		 report. 3. ECUS will ensure that the 2012-2013 governance retreat planning committee is formed no later than the end of the fall 2012 semester. 05 Oct 2012 Catherine Whelan did circulate the report to other members of the retreat planning committee inviting their feedback. Catherine Whelan did receive and incorporate feedback into the draft report. Catherine Whelan will provide this report as an information item to the university senate at its 19 Oct 2012 meeting. 26 Oct 2012 Catherine Whelan did provide this report as an information item to the university senate at its 19 Oct 2012 meeting.
-------------------------	----------------------	--	--	--

	There were no information items on the		
	agenda of the 26 Oct 2012 ECUS meeting.		
VI. Unfinished Business			
Review of Action &			
Recommendations, Provide updates (if any) to Follow-up			
1. Broadcasting University	28 Sep 2012:	28 Sep 2012:	28 Sep 2012:
Senate Meetings	The exploration of feasibility and desirability	There was general agreement	1. Catherine Whelan will
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	of making the viewing of a live broadcast of	that	consult with university
	meetings of the University Senate available	a) implementation of this	television personnel to
	to the university community and requiring	broadcasting should be	inform deliberation.
	authentication (with the existing CAS ID and	contingent upon approval	2. Josh Kitchens will
	password if possible) to view these meetings	by the University Senate.	consult with IDEAS
	was proposed for consideration.	b) more details regarding	personnel to inform
	r r r r r r r r r r r r r r r r r r r	implementation feasibility	this deliberation.
	05 Oct 2012:	were necessary before	3. Catherine Whelan will
	Those present were provided a brief synopsis	this proposal would be	ensure that this topic
	of the issue (see above). Catherine Whelan	ready for possible	is placed on the
	indicated she would continue to gather more	presentation to the	tentative agenda of the
	information to facilitate future deliberation	University Senate. and	5 Oct 2012 ECUS-
	on this matter and invited all present to	that designated members	SCC meeting.
	"have a think" on this matter prior to the	of the Executive	
	next ECUS-SCC meeting.	Committee should seek	05 Oct 2012
		this information	1. Catherine Whelan will
	<u>26 Oct 2012</u>	c) Standing Committee	consult with university
	1. Josh Kitchens had consulted with Wesley	Chairs should inform the	television personnel to
	Smith of IDEAS and Big Blue Button	conversation on this	inform deliberation.
	was identified as one possible tool to	matter and be consulted	2. Josh Kitchens will
	implement broadcasting meetings.	at the 5 Oct 2012 ECUS-	consult with IDEAS
	2. Debby MacMillan shared her experience	SCC meeting.	personnel to inform
	with Collaborate noting its features and		this deliberation.
	in particular its automation in archiving	<u>26 Oct 2012</u>	3. Catherine Whelan will
	the recording of a meeting.	1. Josh Kitchens was asked to	ensure that this topic
	3. It was noted that there was a fee for the	follow-up with appropriate	is placed on the
	license for Collaborate and the present	IDEAS personnel on the	tentative agenda of a
	licensing agreement expired at the	details of using Big Blue	future ECUS or
	conclusion of the academic year. In	Button as a broadcasting tool.	ECUS-SCC meeting.

	<ul> <li>contrast, there was no cost in using the <i>Big Blue Button</i> software at this time. There was general agreement to explore the feasibility of the free option (<i>Big Blue Button</i>) before considering the tools for broadcasting, like <i>Collaborate</i>, with associated costs including licensing.</li> <li>4. The issue of remote participation was identified as a facet for consideration in the continuing deliberation and selection of a tool for broadcasting. Pros and cons of remote participation and attendance by university senators were briefly discussed with no clear committee consensus for or against remote participation.</li> <li>5. After additional conversation, there was general agreement to consider only audio in the broadcasting (and not video). From the experience of those in attendance, the collecting of audio at meetings was typically accomplished by having a microphone for the presenters and a second microphone for commentary and participation from the floor.</li> <li>6. There was general agreement that more detailed information was needed on this matter before making a commitment to the implementation of the broadcasting.</li> </ul>	Among the details might be remote participation, microphone logistics, and the automatic archiving that was observed in the use of the <i>Collaborate</i> tool	<ol> <li><u>26 Oct 2012</u></li> <li>Catherine Whelan did consult with university television personnel to inform deliberation.</li> <li>Josh Kitchens did consult with IDEAS personnel to inform this deliberation.</li> <li>Catherine Whelan did place this topic on the tentative agenda of the 26 Oct 2012 ECUS meeting.</li> <li>Josh Kitchens will continue to consult with IDEAS personnel for more information about <i>Big Blue Button</i> (remote participation, microphone logistics, automatic archiving, etc.) to inform this deliberation.</li> <li>Catherine Whelan will ensure that this item is placed on the tentative agenda of the 2 Nov 2012 ECUS-</li> </ol>
			tentative agenda of the 2 Nov 2012 ECUS- SCC meeting.
2. Counseling Services	28 Sep 2012	<u>28 Sep 2012</u>	<u>28 Sep 2012</u>
Referrals	With the recent move of counseling services	There was general agreement to	1. President Dorman will
	from the main campus to west campus, the	await an update on this matter	consult his executive
	referral of a student to counseling services	from President Dorman before	staff to seek resolution
	by a faculty member is now a drive or shuttle	further considering the steering	of counseling referral
	ride rather than a walk. Interest in a satellite	of this matter to a university	concern.
	office on the main campus or other means to	senate committee.	2. Catherine Whelan will

	facilitate convenience for these referrals is desirable. President Dorman indicated that he would represent this concern to his executive staff and seek a resolution of this	05 Oct 2012 There was general agreement by those present to steer this item to	ensure that this topic is placed on the tentative agenda of a future ECUS or
	<i>matter.</i> <u>05 Oct 2012</u> The email sent to faculty to indicate the current options available to faculty to refer a student to counseling services was noted by	the Student Affairs Policy Committee (SAPC) for further consideration.	ECUS-SCC meeting. <u>05 Oct 2012</u> 1. President Dorman did consult his executive staff and an email was
	those present. However, there was a desire that consideration of alternative options such as a satellite office of counseling services on the main campus or other means to facilitate convenience for these referrals is desirable.		<ul> <li>circulated to all faculty detailing the existing options for referring students to counseling services.</li> <li>2. Catherine Whelan did place this item on the tentative agenda for the 05 Oct 2012</li> </ul>
			<i>ECUS-SCC meeting.</i> 3. Catherine Whelan will steer this matter for SAPC consideration. 28 Oct 2012
			1. Catherine Whelan did steer this matter to SAPC for consideration.
3. Policies Procedures and Practices Manual (PPPM)	28 Sep 2012 Catherine Whelan indicated that she would be meeting with Mike Digby to further talk about the PPPM and would have more information to share after that meeting. 26 Oct 2012	26 Oct 2012 The PPPM Motion (26 Oct 2012) was approved.	28 Sep 2012 Catherine Whelan will ensure that this topic is placed on the tentative agenda of a future ECUS or ECUS-SCC meeting.
	<ol> <li>Catherine Whelan indicated that she had recently met with Dr. Mike Digby to</li> </ol>		26 Oct 2012 Catherine Whelan will

<ul> <li>2. Mike Digby noted that he was charged to adjust an ot to rewrite. He considered this aspect when formulating the proposed implement their jointly next steps (or item) to doits (editorial changes), others are rewrites (content changes) that would require a review by other university personnel or committees.</li> <li>3. As the new software to manage the PPPM was now in place, Catherine Whelan and Mike Digby had agreed to propose the following as next steps:</li> <li>a. <u>Restructuring</u>: Modifying the existing section titles to support better indexing and to make the PPPM more user friendly with respect to the use of the final / search function to locate and identify existing policies, procedures, and practices.</li> <li>b. <u>Reformatine Policy Statements</u>: Reformat the existing university policies that are in the PPPM, as necessary, to align with the current standardized university policy format template. The current and reformatted versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformating modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicty</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion</li> </ul>	discuss the payt stops on the DDDM	inform Mike Digby of
edit and not to rewrite. He considered this       2012) authorizing him to         aspect when formulating the proposed       implement their jointly         next steps (in item 3 below). Some of the       proposed next steps on the         changes), others are rewrites (content       changes), others are rewrites (content         changes) that would require a review by       other new software to manage the         PPPM was now in place. Catherine       Whelan and Mike Digby had agreed to         propose the following as next steps:       a.         a.       Restructuring: Modifying the         existing section titles to support better       indexting and to make the PPPM more         user friendly with respect to the use       of the full sections;         of the full section indexting and to make the PPPM, as       necessary, to align with the current standardized university policies,         procedures, and practices.       b.       Reformatting POIcy Statements;         Reformating POIcy Statements;       Reformating to other individuals         and committees for review. The       review in this case would be asking if the reformating modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated         policy statement and its associated       procedures (if such procedures exist),         c.       Identifying / Resolving Conflicts; In some cases (such as Student Oprinion	-	÷.
<ul> <li>aspect when formulating the proposed next steps (in item 3 below). Some of the next steps (or iterspond to edits (editorial changes), others are rewrites (content changes) that would require a review by other university personnel or committees.</li> <li>3. As the new software to manage the PPPM was now in place, Catherine Whelan and Mike Digby had agreed to propose the following as next steps: <ul> <li>a. <u>Restructuring</u>: Modifying the existing such that gradient is such as study with respect to the use of the find / search function to locate and identify existing policies, procedures, and practices.</li> <li>b. <u>Reformating Policy Statements</u>: Reformat the existing nuiversity policies that are in the PPPM, as necessary, to align with the current standardized university policies for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformating modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicty</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul></li></ul>	e .	
<ul> <li>next steps (in item 3 below). Some of the next steps correspond to edits (editorial changes), others are rewrites (content changes) that would require a review by other university personnel or committees.</li> <li>3. As the new software to manage the PPPM was now in place, Catherine Whelan and Mike Digby had agreed to propose the following as next steps:</li> <li>a. <u>Restructuring</u>: Modifying the existing section time is to support better indexing and to make the PPPM more user friendly with respect to the use of the find / search function to locate and identify existing policies, procedures, and practices, procedures, and practices, procedures, and practices, necessary, to align with the current standardized university policy format template. The current and reformatted versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformating modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicty</u>. In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>		
next steps correspond to edits (editorial changes), others are rewrites (content changes) that would require a review by other university personnel or committees.       PPPM.         3. As the new software to manage the PPPM was now in place, Catherine Whelan and Mike Digby had agreed to propose the following as next steps:       a.         a.       Restructuring: Modifying the existing section titles to support better indexing and to make the PPPM more user friendly with respect to the use of the find / search function to locate and identify existing policies, procedures, and practices.       b.         Reformatting Policy Statements: Reformatting Policy Statements: Reformatting Policy Statements: Reformatting Policy Statements: Reformatting Policy Statements: Reformatting the existing university policies that are in the PPPM, as necessary, to align with the current standardized university policy format template. The current and reformatted versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformating modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).       e.         c.       Identifying / Resolving Conflicts; In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions       e.		
<ul> <li>changes), others are rewrites (content changes), that would require a review by other university personnel or committees.</li> <li>3. As the new software to manage the PPPM was now in place, Catherine Whelan and Mike Digby had agreed to propose the following as next steps: <ul> <li>a. <u>Restructuring</u>: Modifying the existing section titles to support better indexing and to make the PPPM more user friendly with respect to the use of the find / search function to locate and identify existing policies, procedures, and practices.</li> <li>b. <u>Reformatting Policy Statements</u>: Reformat the existing university policies that are in the PPPM, as necessary, to align with the current standardized university policy format template. The current and reformatted versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformating modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> </ul> </li> <li>c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicts</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>	· · ·	
<ul> <li>changes) that would require a review by other university personnel or committees.</li> <li>3. As the new software to manage the PPPM was now in place, Catherine Whelan and Mike Digby had agreed to propose the following as next steps: <ul> <li>a. <u>Restructuring</u>: Modifying the existing section tiles to support better indexing and to make the PPPM more user friendly with respect to the use of the find / search function to locate and identify existing policies, procedures, and practices.</li> <li>b. <u>Reformatting Policy Statements</u>: Reformat the existing university policies that are in the PPPM, as necessary, to align with the current standardized university policy format template. The current and reformatted versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformatting modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicts</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		PPPM.
other university personnel or committees.         3. As the new software to manage the PPPPM was now in place. Catherine Whelan and Mike Digby had agreed to propose the following as next steps:         a. <b>Restructuring</b> : Modifying the existing section titles to support better indexing and to make the PPPM more user friendly with respect to the use of the find / search function to locate and identify existing policies, procedures, and practices.         b. <b>Reformating Policy Statements</b> : Reformat the existing university policies that are in the PPPM, as necessary, to align with the current standardized university policy format template. The current and reformated versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformating modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).         c. <b>Identifying / Resolving Conflicts</b> : In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions		
<ul> <li>3. As the new software to manage the PPPM was now in place, Catherine Whelan and Mike Digby had agreed to propose the following as next steps: <ul> <li>a. <u>Restructuring</u>: Modifying the existing section titles to support better indexing and to make the PPPM more user friendly with respect to the use of the find / search function to locate and identify existing policies, procedures, and practices.</li> <li>b. <u>Reformatting Policy Statements</u>: Reformat the PPPM, as necessary, to align with the current standardized university policy format template. The current and reformatted versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformating modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicts</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion</li> </ul></li></ul>		
<ul> <li>PPPM was now in place, Catherine</li> <li>Whelan and Mike Digby had agreed to</li> <li>propose the following as next steps: <ul> <li>a. <u>Restructuring</u>: Modifying the</li> <li>existing section titles to support better</li> <li>indexing and to make the PPPM more</li> <li>user friendly with respect to the use</li> <li>of the find / search function to locate</li> <li>and identify existing policies,</li> <li>procedures, and practices.</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. <u>Reformatting Policy Statements:</u></li> <li>Reformat the existing university</li> <li>policies that are in the PPPM, as</li> <li>necessary, to align with the current</li> <li>standardized university policy format</li> <li>template. The current and reformatted</li> <li>versions will be referred to ECUS for</li> <li>steering to itself or other individuals</li> <li>and committees for review. The</li> <li>review in this case would be asking if</li> <li>the reformatting modifies the intent</li> <li>of the language that articulates the</li> <li>policy statement and its associated</li> <li>procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> </ul> <li>c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicty</u>: In</li> <li>some cases (such as Student Opinion</li> <li>Surveys), there are multiple versions</li>		
<ul> <li>Whelan and Mike Digby had agreed to propose the following as next steps:</li> <li>a. <u>Restructuring</u>: Modifying the existing section tilles to support better indexing and to make the PPPM more user friendly with respect to the use of the find / search function to locate and identify existing policies, procedures, and practices.</li> <li>b. <u>Reformatting Policy Statements</u>: Reformat the existing university policies that are in the PPPM, as necessary, to align with the current standardized university policy format template. The current and reformatted versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformatting modifies the intent of the language that incluates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicty</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>	e	
propose the following as next steps:a.Restructuring: Modifying theexisting section titles to support betterindexing and to make the PPPM moreuser friendly with respect to the useof the find / search function to locateand identify existing policies,procedures, and practices.b.Reformat the existing universitypolicies that are in the PPPM, asnecessary, to align with the currentstandardized university policy formattemplate. The current and reformattedversions will be referred to ECUS forsteering to itself or other individualsand committees for review. Thereview in this case would be asking ifthe reformating modifies the intentof the language that articulates thepolicy statement and its associatedprocedures (if such procedures exist).c.Identifying Conflicts: Insome cases (such as Student OpinionSurveys), there are multiple versions		
<ul> <li>a. <u>Restructuring</u>: Modifying the existing section tiles to support better indexing and to make the PPPM more user friendly with respect to the use of the find / search function to locate and identify existing policies, procedures, and practices.</li> <li>b. <u>Reformatting Policy Statements</u>: Reformat the existing university policies that are in the PPPM, as necessary, to align with the current standardized university policy format template. The current and reformatted versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformatting modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicts</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>existing section titles to support better indexing and to make the PPPM more user friendly with respect to the use of the find / search function to locate and identify existing policies, procedures, and practices.</li> <li>b. <u>Reformating Policy Statements</u>: Reformat the existing university policies that are in the PPPM, as necessary, to align with the current standardized university policy format template. The current and reformatted versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking iff the reformatting modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifying Resolving Conflicts</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>indexing and to make the PPPM more user friendly with respect to the use of the find / search function to locate and identify existing policies, procedures, and practices.</li> <li>b. <u>Reformatting Policy Statements</u>: Reformat the existing university policies that are in the PPPM, as necessary, to align with the current standardized university policy format template. The current and reformatted versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformatting modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicts</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>user friendly with respect to the use of the find / search function to locate and identify existing policies, procedures, and practices.</li> <li>b. Reformatting Policy Statements: Reformat the existing university policies that are in the PPPM, as necessary, to align with the current standardized university policy format template. The current and reformatted versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformatting modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. Identifying / Resolving Conflicts: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>	•	
<ul> <li>of the find / search function to locate and identify existing policies, procedures, and practices.</li> <li>b. <u>Reformatting Policy Statements</u>: Reformat the existing university policies that are in the PPPM, as necessary, to align with the current standardized university policy format template. The current and reformatted versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformatting modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifving / Resolving Conflicts</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>	e	
and identify existing policies, procedures, and practices.b.Reformatting Policy Statements: Reformat the existing university policies that are in the PPPM, as necessary, to align with the current standardized university policy format template. The current and reformatted versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformatting modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).c.Identifying / Resolving Conflicts: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions	user friendly with respect to the use	
<ul> <li>procedures, and practices.</li> <li>b. <u>Reformatting Policy Statements</u>: Reformat the existing university policies that are in the PPPM, as necessary, to align with the current standardized university policy format template. The current and reformatted versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformatting modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicts</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>	of the find / search function to locate	
<ul> <li>b. Reformatting Policy Statements: Reformat the existing university policies that are in the PPPM, as necessary, to align with the current standardized university policy format template. The current and reformatted versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformatting modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. Identifying / Resolving Conflicts: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>	and identify existing policies,	
Reformat the existing university policies that are in the PPPM, as necessary, to align with the current standardized university policy format template. The current and reformatted versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformatting modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).c.Identifying / Resolving Conflicts: Surveys), there are multiple versions	procedures, and practices.	
<ul> <li>policies that are in the PPPM, as necessary, to align with the current standardized university policy format template. The current and reformatted versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformatting modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicts</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>	b. Reformatting Policy Statements:	
<ul> <li>necessary, to align with the current standardized university policy format template. The current and reformatted versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformatting modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifving / Resolving Conflicts</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>	Reformat the existing university	
<ul> <li>standardized university policy format template. The current and reformatted versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformatting modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicts</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>	policies that are in the PPPM, as	
<ul> <li>template. The current and reformatted versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformatting modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicts</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>	necessary, to align with the current	
<ul> <li>versions will be referred to ECUS for steering to itself or other individuals and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformatting modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicts</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>	standardized university policy format	
<ul> <li>steering to itself or other individuals</li> <li>and committees for review. The</li> <li>review in this case would be asking if</li> <li>the reformatting modifies the intent</li> <li>of the language that articulates the</li> <li>policy statement and its associated</li> <li>procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. Identifying / Resolving Conflicts: In</li> <li>some cases (such as Student Opinion</li> <li>Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformatting modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicts</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>	versions will be referred to ECUS for	
<ul> <li>and committees for review. The review in this case would be asking if the reformatting modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicts</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>	steering to itself or other individuals	
<ul> <li>the reformatting modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. Identifying / Resolving Conflicts: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>	and committees for review. The	
<ul> <li>the reformatting modifies the intent of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. Identifying / Resolving Conflicts: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>	review in this case would be asking if	
<ul> <li>of the language that articulates the policy statement and its associated procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicts</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>	e	
<ul> <li>procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicts</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>	e	
<ul> <li>procedures (if such procedures exist).</li> <li>c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicts</u>: In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions</li> </ul>	6 6	
c. <u>Identifying / Resolving Conflicts</u> : In some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions		
some cases (such as Student Opinion Surveys), there are multiple versions	1 1 7	
Surveys), there are multiple versions		
	of a policy statement that contain	

conflicting information. In these
cases, the multiple versions will be
identified, collated, and referred to
ECUS for steering to the appropriate
individual or policy committee for
review and conflict resolution.
d. Authorizing Procedure / Practice:
Some procedures and practices that
are included in the PPPM are dated
(inconsistent with perceived current
procedure and practice) and some do
not identify an individual (position)
responsible and authorized for their
maintenance. Such practices and
procedures will be identified and
referred to ECUS for steering to the
appropriate individual or committee
for review.
4. <b><u>PPPM Motion (26 Oct 2012)</u></b> : A motion
To acknowledge the excellent work on the
PPPM by Dr. Mike Digby and authorize
him to take the proposed next steps, to
a. modify section titles to support better
indexing and facilitate the search/find
function of the PPPM
b. <i>coordinate the reformatting of</i>
existing policy statements in the
PPPM, as necessary, to align them
with the current standardized
university policy format template and
refer the existing and reformatted
versions to ECUS for steering to itself
or other university personnel or
committees to review the reformatted
versions with respect to modification
(if any) to the intent of the language
articulating the policy statement or
its associated procedure (if such

		procedures are present),		
		c. <i>identify and collate conflicting</i>		
		versions of policies and refer these to		
		ECUS for steering to the appropriate		
		individual or policy committee for		
		review and conflict resolution. and		
		d. <i>identify the practices and procedures</i>		
		that are either inconsistent with the		
		perceived current practice or		
		procedure and/or for which there is		
		no individual (position) responsible		
		and authorized for their maintenance		
		and refer these to ECUS for steering		
		to appropriate individuals or		
		committees for review		
		was made and seconded.		
		5. Change Log: Catherine Whelan noted		
		that Mike Digby is maintaining a Change		
		Log for the PPPM that will document the		
		editorial changes that he is making as		
		well as those changes that he is proposing		
		for consideration and review by others.		
4.	Emergencies and	<u>28 Sep 2012</u>	<u>28 Sep 2012</u>	<u>28 Sep 2012</u>
	Communication	A proposal to explore the feasibility of	There was general agreement to	1. President Dorman to
	Channels in Classrooms	having communication channels available in	seek additional information on	provide updates on the
		classrooms was made. Such channels might	this matter including existing best	possible use and
		facilitate contact of information technology	practices.	feasibility of VOIP.
		assistance for projection systems or contact		2. Catherine Whelan will
		of public safety in an emergency. Josh		gather information to
		Kitchens noted that the Student Technology		inform deliberation.
		Fee Committee was considering an intercom		<i>3. Catherine Whelan will</i>
		system for classrooms in consultation with		ensure that this topic
		Chief Information Officer Bob Orr. Other		is on the tentative
		channel options were proposed including		agenda of a future
		Voice Over Internet Protocol (VOIP) or		ECUS or ECUS-SCC
		telephones. President Dorman indicated that		meeting.
		exploration of the feasibility of VOIP as a		05.0.0010
		possible replacement for existing phone		<u>05 Oct 2012</u>

		service as a cost-saving measure was in progress. Catherine Whelan agreed to seek more information on this concern for the next meeting. <u>05 Oct 2012</u> Those present were provided a brief synopsis of the issue (see above). Catherine Whelan indicated she would continue to gather more information to facilitate future deliberation on this matter.		<ol> <li>President Dorman to provide updates on the possible use and feasibility of VOIP.</li> <li>Catherine Whelan will gather information to inform deliberation.</li> <li>Catherine Whelan did place this on the 05 Oct 2012 agenda and will ensure that this topic is on the tentative agenda of a future ECUS or ECUS-SCC meeting.</li> </ol>
5.	Faculty Development opportunities to assist faculty in working with Students with Disabilities	28 Sep 2012 Students with disabilities are increasingly common. Faculty training opportunities for dealing with the variety of disabilities, such as high functioning autism and Asperger's, is desirable. This may be particularly relevant if the disability could be disruptive to the classroom learning of other students. <u>05 Oct 2012</u> Those present were provided a brief synopsis of the issue (see above). Catherine Whelan indicated she would continue to gather more information to facilitate future deliboration	28 Sep 2012 There was general agreement to seek additional information on this matter including existing best practices.	<ol> <li><u>28 Sep 2012</u></li> <li>Catherine Whelan will gather information to inform deliberation.</li> <li>Catherine Whelan will ensure that this topic is on the tentative agenda of a future ECUS or ECUS-SCC meeting</li> <li><u>05 Oct and 26 Oct 2012</u></li> <li>Catherine Whelan will gather information to</li> </ol>
		<ul> <li><i>information to facilitate future deliberation</i> <i>on this matter.</i></li> <li><u>26 Oct 2012</u></li> <li>Catherine Whelan indicated that she has been attempting to identify a time to consult with the appropriate Disability Services personnel and anticipates finding time in the week of Oct 29 – Nov 2 to make this consultation.</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>gather information to inform deliberation.</li> <li>2. Catherine Whelan will ensure that this topic is on the tentative agenda of a future ECUS or ECUS-SCC meeting.</li> </ul>

6	University System of	28 Sep 2012	<u>28 Sep 2012</u>	28	Sep 2012
0.	University System of	*	· · · ·		÷
	Georgia Faculty Council	Given that this matter was extending the	There was general agreement	1.	Craig Turner will
	(USGFC) Representative	meeting beyond the usual adjournment time,	that Standing Committee Chairs		prepare a summary
		there was agreement the conversation would	should inform the conversation		document on this
		be brief. The current selection process of the	on this matter and be consulted at		matter to inform the
		USGFC representative was determined by	the 5 Oct 2012 ECUS-SCC	_	deliberation.
		Motion 1011.EC.001.R to be the selection of	meeting.	2.	Catherine Whelan will
		the Presiding Officer Elect of the University			ensure that this topic
		Senate. Concerns from the recent two			is on the tentative
		representatives, Jan Clark and Catherine			agenda for the 5 Oct
		Whelan, were that a term of service of a			2012 ECUS-SCC
		single year may be too brief a time to			meeting
		participate meaningfully on the USGFC.			
		Consideration of both a longer term of			Oct 2012
		service than a single year as well as the		1.	Craig Turner did
		addition of the nomination of one or more			prepare a summary
		candidates for the USGFC Representative			document on USGFC.
		position to the work of the Subcommittee on		2.	Catherine did place
		Nominations were proposed for further			this item on the
		consideration. Craig Turner who served as			tentative agenda of the
		Co-Chair of the USGFC both prior to and			05 Oct 2012 ECUS-
		during the terms of Catherine Whelan and			SCC meeting.
		Jan Clark was charged to prepare a		3.	Catherine Whelan to
		summary document providing the relevant			ensure that this topic
		details for this USGFC Representative			is placed on the
		position.			tentative agenda of the
		•			26 Oct 2012 ECUS
		<u>05 Oct 2012</u>			meeting.
		<i>Catherine Whelan provided an overview of</i>			č
		the main points in the USGFC fact sheet that		26	Oct 2012
		was prepared by Craig Turner and			Catherine Whelan did
		circulated by email prior to the meeting.			place this item on the
		Suggestions offered at the 28 Sep 2012			tentative agenda of the
		ECUS meeting (see above) were reiterated			26 Oct 2012 ECUS
		and there was no clear consensus for a			meeting.
		particular selection process. ECUS was		2.	Catherine Whelan will
		entrusted to continue the deliberation on this			ensure that this topic is
		matter and again consult Standing			on the tentative agenda
		παιτεί απα άξατη εθήδατι διαπαίης			on the tentative agenda

	Committee Chairs at its discretion.	of a future ECUS or
		ECUS-SCC meeting.
	<u>26 Oct 2012</u>	
	Given that the 27 Oct 2012 USGFC meeting	
	will be the first one attended by Lyndall	
	Muschell, there was agreement to defer the	
	deliberation on this matter so that the	
	committee can benefit from Lyndall's	
	perspective after attending a meeting. Craig	
	Turner indicated that he would be attending	
	this meeting as a guest acknowledging that	
	Lyndall Muschell is the institutional voting	
	representative to the USGFC.	
7. University Senate Agenda	<u>05 Oct 2012</u>	<u>05 Oct 2012</u>
and Minutes Review	1. Based on the committee reports given	<i>a) Catherine Whelan will</i>
	earlier in the meeting, there will be two	draft the tentative
	motions (SCoN committee replacements,	agenda of the 19 Oct
	FAPC Faculty Status Language) on the	2012 meeting of the
	agenda of the 19 Oct 2012 meeting of the	University Senate.
	University Senate. In addition, committee	b) Motions to be entered
	and administrative reports will be	into the online motion
	agenda items. Given the light agenda,	database by Leslie
	Catherine Whelan will again invite some	Moore (FAPC) and
	Directors and Deans to attend the 19 Oct	Catherine Whelan and
	2012 university senate meeting. The	Lyndall Muschell
	intent is to assist in the face to names	(SCoN).
	association of these individuals by	c) Craig Turner will
	members of the University Senate.	distribute to the
	2. A draft of the university senate minutes	university senators the
	for the 21 Sep 2012 meeting was	draft university senate
	circulated to the attendees prior to the	minutes for the 21 Sep
	meeting. The draft minutes were	2012 meeting
	approved as circulated for distribution to	providing the
	the university senators for review.	university senators an
		opportunity to review
		these minutes.
		mose minutes.
		<u>26 Oct 2012</u>

a) Catherine Whelan did draft the tentative
agenda of the 19 Oct 2012 meeting of the
University Senate.
b) Motions were entered
into the online motion
database by Leslie
Moore (FAPC) and
Catherine Whelan and
Lyndall Muschell
(SCoN).
c) Craig Turner did
distribute the draft
university senate
minutes for the 21 Sep
2012 meeting to the
university senators for
their review.

9 Haalth Cana Nataward	24 Arra 2012	24 Aug 2012	24 Aug 2012
8. Health Care Network	<u>24 Aug 2012</u>	<u>24 Aug 2012</u>	<u>24 Aug 2012</u>
	It was noted that the recent transition to a	There was agreement that this	Catherine Whelan to add
<b>I</b> 1	new health care providers network has	matter should be brought to the	this to 7 Sep 2012 agenda
	resulted in a smaller pool of in-network	attention of President Dorman	
	heath care providers for GC employees.	and revisited at the 7 Sep 2012	<u>7 Sep 2012</u>
	Question: Who should take action and what	ECUS/SCC meeting. This would	a) Catherine Whelan
	action might be taken to affect change and	facilitate the timely steering of	did add this to the
	enlarge the pool of in-network providers?	this matter to a senate committee	7 Sep 2012
	One opinion was that the USG Presidents	in the event that action by the	agenda, however
	might be the most effective ambassadors for	University Senate be deemed	the consideration
	this concern.	necessary or desirable.	of this item was
		- -	postponed to a
	28 Sep 2012		future meeting.
	As Dr. Dorman's service as University		b) Catherine Whelan
	President had begun 1 Sep 2012, he had not		to ensure this item
	been present at the 24 Aug 2012 ECUS		is added to the
	meeting. The aforementioned concern was		agenda of a future
	rearticulated at this meeting and President		ECUS meeting.
	Dorman agreed to represent this concern		
	with relevant individuals in consultation with		<u>28 Sep 2012</u>
	USG staff indicating that he has heard this		a) Catherine Whelan
	concern expressed a number of times by		did add this item to
	faculty and staff in the context of his listening		the 28 Sep 2012
	tour. In particular, President Dorman		ECUS agenda.
	mentioned the July 2012 hire of Marion		b) President Dorman
	Fedrick as USG Vice Chancellor for Human		will represent this
	Resources, noting that he planned to consult		concern in
	with her on this matter.		consultation with
			USG staff.
VII. New Business			
Actions/Recommendations			

Contingent Faculty	1. Craig Turner suggested that the topic of	1. Craig Turner to locate,
Participation in Shared	contingent faculty participation in shared	identify, and provide
Governance	governance receive consideration by the	information on the
	committee at some future meeting.	AAUP statements that
	2. Before consideration of acceptance of	relate to participation
	this suggestion, clarification points were	of contingent faculty
	sought and offered including:	in shared governance
	a. Who are the contingent faculty?	that might inform this
	The category of contingent faculty is	deliberation.
	used to refer to all non-tenure track	2. Catherine Whelan will
	faculty.	ensure that this topic is
	b. What is the current participation of	on the tentative agenda
	the contingent faculty in shared	of a future ECUS or
	governance? The current eligibility	ECUS-SCC meeting
	requirements for service as an elected	
	faculty senator are membership in the	
	corps of instruction and at least two	
	years at Georgia College at the start	
	of the term of service. Thus, some of	
	the existing university contingent	
	faculty are eligible to serve as elected	
	faculty senators, specifically those	
	holding appointments as lecturers,	
	senior lecturers and instructors.	
	c. Is there any external guidance on	
	best practice of such participation?	
	Yes, the American Association of	
	University Professors (AAUP) has	
	statements on contingent faculty	
	participation in shared governance	
	that could inform this deliberation.	
	3. An observation was made expressing	
	appreciation with both the current and	
	historical level of participation in the	
	university shared governance by those	
	holding the university president and	
	provost positions. In particular, there was	
	appreciation expressed to both Interim	

	Provost Liao-Troth and President		
	Dorman for their participation and		
	commitment to shared governance.		
	4. There was general agreement to accept		
	the suggestion and to further discuss the		
	topic of contingent faculty participation		
	in shared governance at some future		
	meeting.		
<b>Bobcat Merchandising:</b>	A couple committee members observed that		
Dobcat Wiel chandising.	there was no prominent presence of Bobcat		
	merchandising at the recent <i>Deep Roots</i>		
	event. There was general agreement by the		
	committee that such merchandising at Deep		
	Roots and other similar events was desirable		
	and related to the current efforts on branding		
	the university. President Dorman and Interim Provost Liao-Troth each took a note to share		
	this perception in the conversations at		
	upcoming meetings with appropriate and		
<b>X/XXX</b> NI 4 N <i>H</i> 4*	relevant university personnel.		
VIII. Next Meeting			
(Tentative Agenda, Calendar)			
1. Calendar	2 Nov 2012 @ 2pm ECUS/SCC Parks 301		
	16 Nov 2012 @ 2pm Univ. Senate A&S 2-72		
	30 Nov 2012 @ 2pm ECUS Parks 301		
2. Tentative Agenda	Some of the deliberation today generated		Catherine Whelan will
	tentative agenda items for future ECUS and		ensure that such items are
	ECUS-SCC meetings.		added to agendas of the
			appropriate ECUS and/or
			ECUS-SCC meetings.
IX. Adjournment	As there was no further business to consider,	The motion to adjourn was	
	a motion to adjourn was made and seconded.	approved and the meeting	
		adjourned at 2:57 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: CATHERINE WHELAN (CHAIR), LYNDALL MUSCHELL (VICE-CHAIR) CRAIG TURNER (SECRETARY) ACADEMIC YEAR: 2011-2012

### AGGREGATE MEMBER ATTENDANCE AT COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THE ACADEMIC YEAR: "P" denotes Present, "A" denotes Absent, "R" denotes Regrets, "N/A" denotes Not Applicable (not on committee)

Acronyms $EFS = Elected Faculty SetCoAS = College of Arts$				11051 013,				· · ·	
$\sim$ COAS = College of Alts a				ss; $CoE = Col$	llege of Educ	cation; CoHS	S = College o	of Health Scie	ences
Meeting Dates	08-24-12	09-28-12	10-26-12						
Janet Clark	Р	Р	Р						
EFS; CoAS; ECUS Chair Emeritus	1	1	1						
Steve Dorman	NT/A	Р	Р						
University President	N/A	r	r						
Paul Jones	р	NT/A	NT/A						
Interim University President	R	N/A	N/A						
Joshua Kitchens	Р	р	р						
EFS; Library	P	P	P						
Matthew Liao-Troth	Р	р	Р						
Interim Provost	P	R	P						
Deborah MacMillan	Р	Р	Р						
EFS; CoHS	Г	Г	Γ						
Lyndall Muschell	Р	Р	Р						
EFS; CoE; ECUS Vice-Chair	r	P	P						
Craig Turner	п	р	р						
EFS; CoAS; ECUS Secretary	P	P	P						
Catherine Whelan	п	п	п						
EFS; CoB; ECUS Chair	R	P	P						

# AGGREGATE ATTENDANCE RECORD FOR MEETINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIRS "P" denotes Present, "A" denotes Absent, "R" denotes Regrets

EFS = Elected Faculty Se		/	ucilotes	0					
Acronyms CoAS = College of Arts		CoB = Colleg	e of Busine	ss; CoE = C	College of Edu	cation; CoHS	S = College o	f Health Scie	ences
Meeting Dates	09-07-12	10-05-12	Date3						
Janet Clark EFS; CoAS; ECUS Chair Emeritus	Р	R							
Steve Dorman University President	Р	R							
Joshua Kitchens EFS; Library	Р	Р							
Matthew Liao-Troth Interim Provost	P	Р							
Deborah MacMillan EFS; CoHS	Р	Р							
Lyndall Muschell EFS; CoE; ECUS Vice-Chair	Р	Р							
Craig Turner EFS; CoAS; ECUS Secretary	Р	Р							
Catherine Whelan EFS; CoB; ECUS Chair	P	Р							
Bryan Marshall EFS; CoB; APC Chair	R	R							
Susan Steele EFS; CoHS; CAPC Chair	P	Р							
Leslie Moore EFS; CoHS; FAPC Chair	Р	Р							
Maureen Horgan EFS; CoAS, RPIPC Chair	Р	Р							
Dianne Chamblee EFS; CoHS, SAPC Chair	Р	Р							

CHAIRPERSON SIGNATURE

DATE _____-

(Including this Approval by chair at committee discretion