EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE (ECUS)
ANNUAL REPORT 2013-14

Committee Name: Executive Committee of the University Senate

Academic Year: 2013-14

Committee Charge:
V.Section1.B. The Executive Committee shall meet as needed throughout the year to facilitate the functioning of the University Senate. Meetings of the Executive Committee may be called by the Chair, the University President, or by written request from a majority of the Executive Committee membership. A majority of the Executive Committee membership shall constitute a quorum.

V.Section1.C. The duties of the Executive Committee shall include the following:

V.Section1.C.1. The elected members of the Executive Committee shall constitute an advisory committee of the faculty to the University President.

V.Section1.C.2. The Executive Committee shall set the agenda for regular meetings of the University Senate
in compliance with II.Section3.A.4.

V.Section1.C.3. The Executive Committee shall, as the need arises, appoint not less than three nor more than five impartial faculty members to serve as the informal body of inquiry (the "body of inquiry"), as described in the Policy Manual of the Board of Regents (803.1102), to mitigate the removal of any tenured or non-tenured faculty member. This body of inquiry shall be responsible for the determination of confidentiality relating to such informal inquiries, especially when sensitive information about particular individuals would be otherwise revealed. Should this body of inquiry fail to effect an adjustment (e.g. be unable to negotiate a resolution), they shall advise the University President whether dismissal proceedings should be undertaken. The body of inquiry's recommendation shall not be binding on the University President.

V.Section1.C.4. Except when the University Senate gives specific directions, the Executive Committee shall, when consideration is being given to referring any matter to a standing committee, determine the standing committee that shall have jurisdiction; provided, however, that nothing in this responsibility shall challenge the University President's authority and responsibility for interpretation of the Statutes and bylaws or for determining ultimate jurisdiction when conflicts arise.

V.Section1.C.5. The Executive Committee may make editorial suggestions to the language of any motion, including a resolution, that is submitted for 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.

V.Section1.C.6. The Executive Committee shall appoint a Committee on Nominations as specified in V.Section1.D.1.

V.Section1.C.7. The Executive Committee may recommend to the University Senate for their consideration and approval such standing and/or special committees as it deems necessary.

V.Section1.C.8. The Executive Committee may consider and recommend to the University Senate any matters that are within the powers of the University Senate.

V.Section1.C.9. The Executive Committee shall have the responsibility for initiating and maintaining a system of overlapping terms for elected University Senators.

V.Section1.C.10. The Executive Committee shall ensure that up-to-date versions of any documents (e.g. statutes, bylaws, policy manuals, handbooks) that define or reference the governance structure in any unit of the University are archived in both "hard" and "electronic" format to facilitate access.

V.Section1.C.11. The Executive Committee shall be responsible for maintaining a calendar of governance meetings.

V.Section1.C.12. The Executive Committee shall ensure that its own minutes as well as those of the University Senate including all standing committees, sub-committees, and ad hoc committees of the University Senate are accessible to all members of the University Community

V.Section1.C.13. The Archivist of the University Senate shall be the University Archivist. In the absence of a University Archivist, the Executive Committee shall appoint an Archivist of the University Senate. The Archivist shall maintain a historical record of University Senate activity both on paper and electronically and make the electronic version of this archive available to the University Community.

V.Section1.C.14. The Executive Committee shall meet regularly with the Standing Committee Chairs to facilitate communication among the committees of the University Senate.

V.Section1.C.15. The Executive Committee shall ensure that these bylaws are followed.

V.Section1.C.16. The Executive Committee shall be responsible for operational matters of the University Senate including, but not limited to, consulted for Presidential Appointees (II.Section1.A.1), receive Corps of Instruction List (II.Section2.A.1), apportion elected faculty senator positions (II.Section2.A.2), receive election/selection procedures and results and announce results for academic units (II.Section2.A.3), Staff Council (II.Section1.A.3), students (II.Section1.A.4), conduct at-large elections (II.Section2.A.4), name a parliamentarian (II.Section3.B.3), receive operating procedures of committees (III.Section1), is one source that can initiate standing committee business (IV.Section1), receive motion text and disseminate agenda for Senate meetings (IV.Section2), receive and archive committee annual reports (IV.Section2), name facilitator and necessary voting proxies for standing committee chair elections (IV.Section3.A), receive committee composition report from Subcommittee on Nominations (V.Section1.D.2.d), receive or make motions for the addition of permanent subcommittees (V.Section2.A.3.a), and receive ad hoc committee charters (V.Section2.A.3.b).

Committee Calendar:

Regular Committee Meetings
Day: Friday
Time: 2:00-3:15pm
Location: Parks Hall 301
Dates: 2013 - August 24, October 4, November 15
                2014 - January 24, February 28, April 4

Meetings of Standing Committee Chairs with ECUS
Day: Friday
Time: 3:30-4:45pm
Location: Parks Hall 301
Dates: 2013 - August 24, October 4, November 15
                2014 - January 24, February 28, April 4

Executive Summary:

Recurring Tasks	Accomplishments Unique to this Year	Tasks to Be Continued

• facilitation of officer elections and organizational meetings for the 2013-14 senate committees
• named a parliamentarian for the university senate meetings
• named a graduate assistant for the 2013-2014 academic year
• planning/facilitation of standing committee officer orientation
• named chair/membership of the Subcommittee on Nominations
• steered matters to appropriate university senate committees for deliberation
• received operating procedures of standing committees
• prepared and disseminated the agenda for ECUS, ECUS SCC, and university senate meetings
• completed apportionment of elected faculty senators to the academic units
• oversight of
  ○ elected faculty, selected student, and selected staff senators
  ○ student government and staff council appointees to SAPC and RPIPC
  ○ Presidential appointees to university senate
  ○ Chief Officer designees to APC, CAPC, FAPC, RPIPC, SAPC, and SoCC
• completed the at-large election
• received the governance retreat planning committee report
• prepared and shared the 2014-15 governance calendar
• established planning committee for the 2014 governance retreat
• recognitions of the outgoing leaders, volunteers, senators
• set template and due date of annual reports with SCC's
• received and archived committee annual reports
	• established tentative guidelines for the newly established university senate budget
	• reviewed procedure of "mug shots" for university senator database
	• reviewed some communication concerns including
	  ○ use of undefined terms such as "GC Leadership Team"
	  ○ new and revised policies placed in PPPM
	  ○ respect of governance calendar (scheduling of meetings coincident with university senate that cause senators to extend regrets)
	• endorsements conversation led to a desire of being proactive, rather than reactive on university-wide initiatives
	• task force representatives of university senate (as needed)
	• electronic tool fixes: exploring options of means by which this can happen
	• celebrating ten years of shared governance
	• motion of SoCC bylaws revisions was sponsored and passed
	
	To be archived
	• "mug shot" process
	• post-tenure review to FAPC
	• reimburse USGFC travel from the university senate budget
	• process for ensuring that new and revisions to policies (if approved) are placed into PPPM
	• university senate presiding officer to meet with direct reports of university president to be proactive with university-wide initiatives
	• celebrate ten years of shared governance
		• seek "fixes" for the electronic tools that are incorporated into the university senate website
		• establish an electronic "face" for the university senate through website modifications
		• collaborate with CAPC on a proposal for revision to the bylaws related to the oversight (arbiter for appeals) of SoCC
		• follow up items related to PPPM
		  ○ communication of the process to ensure that revisions to existing policies or new policies are placed into the PPPM;
		  ○ investigate and resolve broken links in the PPPM
		  ○ resolve the conflicting policies on Student Opinion Surveys,
		  ○ establish a process for archiving the PPPM

Committee Membership and Record of Attendance:
COMMITTEE OFFICERS: LYNDALL MUSCHELL (CHAIR), SUSAN STEELE (VICE-CHAIR), CRAIG TURNER (SECRETARY)
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 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
Kelli Brown Provost	P	P	Cancelled	R	P	P
Steve Dorman University President	R	P	Cancelled	R	P	R
Joshua Kitchens EFS; Library	P	P	Cancelled	P	P	P
Lyndall Muschell EFS; CoE; ECUS Chair	P	P	Cancelled	P	P	P
Susan Steele EFS; CoHS; ECUS Vice-Chair	P	P	Cancelled	P	P	P
Craig Turner EFS; CoAS; ECUS Secretary	P	P	Cancelled	P	P	P
Catherine Whelan EFS; CoB, ECUS Chair Emeritus	P	P	Cancelled	P	R	P

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

Acronyms	EFS=Elected Faculty 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	1-24-14	02-28-14	04-04-14
Alex Blazer EFS; CoAS; FAPC Chair	P	P	P	P	P	P
Kelli Brown Provost	R	P	R	R	P	R
Steve Dorman University President	R	P	R	R	P	R
Maureen Horgan EFS; CoAS; RPIPC Chair	P	P	P	P	P	P
Joshua Kitchens EFS; Library	P	P	R	P	P	P
Lyndall Muschell EFS; CoE; ECUS Chair	P	P	P	P	P	P
Cara Meade EFS; CoE; CAPC Chair	P	P	R	P	R	P
Dee Sams EFS; CoB; SAPC Chair	P	P	R	R	P	R
Susan Steele EFS; CoHS; ECUS Vice-Chair	P	P	P	P	P	P
Craig Turner EFS; CoAS; ECUS Secretary	P	P	P	P	P	P
Catherine Whelan EFS; CoB; ECUS Chair Emeritus	P	P	P	P	R	P
Howard Woodard EFS; CoB; APC Chair	P	P	R	P	P	R
John Swinton EFS; CoB; SoCC Chair	P	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	R
Elizabeth McCauley Staff Council Chair	R	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	R
Victoria Ferree SGA President	R	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	R

Note: Part of the 23 Aug 2013 and 4 April 2014 meetings were meetings of the Subcommittee on Nominations.

Motions Brought to the Senate Floor: One motion was sponsored by the 2013-2014 ECUS.

Motion 1314.EC.001.B - Proposed Bylaws Revision (Language Pertaining to SoCC)
Motion Text: *To approve the proposed revisions to the University Senate Bylaws as articulated in the supporting document entitled "SoCC Bylaw Revisions with Rationale."*
First Reading of the Motion: March 28, 2014 meeting of the University Senate
Second Reading of the Motion: April 25, 2014 meeting of the University Senate
Motion Action: Passed (2/3 majority of those casting votes was required.)

24 January 2014
1. Mary Magoulick had sent to Lyndall Muschell a document providing some proposed revisions to University Senate bylaws pertaining to SoCC with rationale. This document was circulated to ECUS by email by Lyndall Muschell and is attached to these minutes *as SoCC Bylaws Revisions with Rationale*.
2. Craig Turner had circulated by email the results of a review of the draft revisions (by Ken Farr and Craig Turner) with suggested revised language to improve clarity and align the language with similar language elsewhere in the University Senate bylaws. This document is attached to these minutes as *SoCC Bylaws Revisions with Rationale SUGGESTIONS*.
3. A distillation of the discussion among the members of ECUS follows.
   a. All SUGGESTIONS offered by Craig Turner and Ken Farr were endorsed unanimously by ECUS.
   b. It was noted that the relevant bylaw required ECUS to direct any suggestions to the source (in this case CAPC and SoCC) for "acceptance" of the ECUS suggestions. The relevant bylaw (V.Section 1.C.5) is quoted below. See in particular the blue highlighted portion.
   c. Two other matters emerged during discussion.
      i. Given there is a separate teaching representative for areas C1 and C2 of the core, why not separate teaching representatives for D1, D2, D3 representing Math, Science, and Technology? ECUS suggests either shoring up the rationale on this matter or adding D1, D2, and D3 teaching representatives to the draft bylaw revisions on SoCC composition.
      ii. ECUS recommends consideration by CAPC and SoCC of eligibility language for SoCC chair:
         Only elected faculty senators or teaching representatives are eligible to serve as the committee chair, but any member of the committee is eligible to serve as vice chair or secretary.
      iii. Lyndall Muschell was charged by ECUS to share this information with Cara Meade and Mary Magoulick to seek CAPC and SoCC feedback, respectively.

V.Section1.C.5. *Motion Review*. The Executive Committee may make editorial suggestions to the language of any motion, including a resolution, that is submitted for University Senate consideration. The Executive Committee should apply this responsibility judiciously, noting that the purpose of this review is to improve clarity, remove ambiguity, and identify inconsistencies with superseding policy. Any such editorial suggestions are incorporated only after review and approval by the body submitting the motion.

28 February 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.
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.

28 March 2014 – University Senate Meeting
MOTION 1314.EC.001.B (PROPOSED BYLAWS REVISION (LANGUAGE PERTAINING TO SOCC)) On behalf of the committee, Lyndall Muschell presented the motion: *To approve the proposed revisions to the University Senate Bylaws as articulated in the supporting document entitled "SoCC Bylaw Revisions with Rationale."*
SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS Supporting documentation for Motion 1314.EC.001.B, accessible in the online motion database, was displayed on the big screen. There were two supporting documents provided.

1) *SoCC Bylaw Revisions with Rationale (ms word)*A Microsoft Word file providing the text of the current SoCC language in the University Senate bylaws, the proposed revisions to the SoCC language in the University Senate bylaws as well as detailed rationale for these proposed revisions
2) *SoCC Bylaw Revisions with Rationale (pdf)*A pdf file providing the text of the current SoCC language in the University Senate bylaws, the proposed revisions to the SoCC language in the University Senate bylaws as well as detailed rationale for these proposed revisions

CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION Lyndall Muschell shared the following information.

1) The motion was a proposed revision to the University Senate bylaws that was classified as a non-editorial change by the members of the Executive Committee as it proposes changes to the composition (membership) and chair eligibility of the Subcommittee on the Core Curriculum.
2) The University Senate bylaws process required for proposed revisions that are deemed non-editorial.

Full discussion notes can be found in the 28 March 2014 Minutes of the University Senate.

25 April 2014
MOTION 1314.EC.001.B (PROPOSED BYLAWS REVISION (LANGUAGE PERTAINING TO SoCC)) On behalf of the committee, Lyndall Muschell presented the motion: *To approve the proposed revisions to the University Senate Bylaws as articulated in the supporting document entitled "SoCC Bylaw Revisions with Rationale."*

CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION In accordance with the University Senate Bylaws, the motion to revise the bylaws pertaining to SoCC was presented to the University Senate for its second reading.

Full discussion notes can be found in the 25 April 2014 Minutes of the University Senate.

SENATE ACTION The motion passed with a 2/3 majority of those casting votes with 22 for and 11 against.

Other Significant Deliberation (Non-Motions):

University Senate Endorsements
04 October 2014
The email conversation regarding the steering of the University Senate endorsement request of the QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan) Theme and Goals sparked interest in an agenda item for a conversation on University Senate endorsements in general. Among the conversation points were the following: 1) 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. 2) A recollection that in the past, there have been some administrators that have "commanded" an endorsement by University Senate (or one of its committees) and received such endorsement, only to use it as a response to faculty pushback – and be able to say something to the effect "wait .wait … this was endorsed by *your* University Senate." This was a source of concern to some. 3) A perception by some who provide input into a review process that if their input is not incorporated it was not heard.

Relative to the QEP there were the following suggestions: 1) The University Senate should be asked to endorse the process rather than particular aspects of the QEP. There was no objection by those present for such an endorsement request to be made of the University Senate. Some of those present may choose to collaborate to author such an endorsement request for the 25 Oct 2013 meeting of the University Senate. The QEP Theme and Goals might be reported to University Senate as an information item rather than an endorsement request.

There was discussion to clarify the contextual meaning of certain words – approval, endorsement, support. The point was 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. 1) An approval is an action the University Senate applies or fails to apply to a policy. The University Senate operational definition of 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*. 2) 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.* 3) Support is not as clearly established as a formal action by the University Senate.

A suggestion was made 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 the Presiding Officer of the University Senate meeting with direct reports of the University President to determine if there is intent to launch any university-wide initiatives. The Presiding Officer may choose to consult with the Executive Committee to determine which initiatives might warrant consideration of the University Senate.

04 April 2014

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.

University Senate Budget

23 August 2014

This is the first year that University Senate has received a budget allocation. There are two accounts: $5000 in state funds (no rollover) and $3500 in foundation (no rollover). It is not known whether funds could be encumbered – for example to support the 2014 Governance Retreat.

USGFC Travel Request - 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.

A **MOTION** *to adopt a standing practice to reimburse costs (mileage, hotel, registration, etc.) incurred by the Presiding Officer Elect to attend and participate as a voting member of the USGFC was made and seconded.*

Other ideas for possible funding to further consider included social events for faculty, higher education brown bags (civic leaders). It was recommended that Lyndall Muschell invite feedback from University Senators by email and at their 13 Sep 2013 meeting.

04 October 2014

Lyndall Muschell provided an update on the University Senate budget. As requested by ECUS at the last 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.

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: 1) to work with the President's Office to co-host the upcoming faculty Friday (social/reception) event on October 25 and 2) to sponsor a drop by event for coffee and a snack during the week of finals.

04 April 2014

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 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.

Electronic Tools – "Fixes"

23 August 2013

At the 2013 governance retreat, Doc St. Clair (from IT) indicated to Craig Turner that he was planning to oversee "fixes" to some the electronic tools of the University Senate. This might include the agenda tool and the motion database. His plan was to check with Tanya Goette, Chair of Information Systems & Computer Science, to see if she had any students that were able to assist in any of the necessary programming changes that support the tools. At present, this consultation is still in progress. More information on this matter will be forthcoming as it becomes available.

04 October 2013

Craig Turner provided an informational update on this agenda item. Doc St. Clair (from IT) continues to oversee the "fixes" to some of the electronic tools of the University Senate. Doc had decided to start with the online motion database and had met with relevant university personnel to determine the server that is hosting the tool and the existing glitches. The most glaring glitch is the fact that once motion text is submitted, it is not possible for the text to be edited – even by the individual who entered it, the Presiding Officer, or any of the System Administrators. The only way to change the motion text field is to manually change it in the database and only individuals with direct access to the file may amend it. This is undesirable and there is a Serve ticket (work order) indicating that this glaring glitch is presently under review for possible repair.

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

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

President Dorman and Provost Brown were supportive of the recoding of the program. President Dorman inquired if commercial software was available that could be purchased. Craig Turner indicated that this software was not commercially available (to his knowledge) and that such motion tracking utilities are typically homegrown within the institution at which they are implemented as had been done here. President Dorman noted that this venture may lead to a product (an online motion database system) that could be marketable to other universities and colleges and become a source of revenue for this institution. Craig Turner pointed out that in the recent past, another institution had expressed interest in procuring the current software and explored with individuals on campus the possibility of purchasing it.

There was uncertainty as to whether the cost of fixing glitches (if any) and the cost of the reprogramming would come out of the budget of the university senate or some other funding source. While nothing was settled, there was a general observation that the university senate budget was provided with recurring annual costs in mind and that this reprogramming would be more of a one-time cost so it was not unreasonable to keep open the possibility of alternate funding options.

More information on this matter will be forthcoming as it becomes available including but not limited to the cost estimate of the reprogramming.

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

Kelly Rickman was the one who processed our SERVE ticket and reviewed the existing senate electronic tools - senate website and online motion database. The bottom line is that there is no easy "fix" for the inability to edit the motion text field in the online motion database. There is not programming to support all the functionality suggested on the front end (that a user of the program sees). The recommendation is to perform a rebuild (rewrite the code), and this rebuild would not be considered "soon" (for a couple months) given the current IT project load. This rebuild might (at least in part) be implementable via students (via a course project and/or via student workers).

04 April 2014
After Craig Turner provided a brief summary of the current status of this matter 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 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.
4. There was consensus that this matter be recommended to the 2014-2015 ECUS for further consideration.
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.

PPPM
23 August 2013
Catherine Whelan reported that updates to the PPPM had been made and these were in compliance with the ECUS guidance to Mike Digby during 2012-2013. These included replacing any language that was a copy of BoR Policy Language with a link to BoR Policy. Mike Digby did a vast amount of work during 2012-2013 in reviewing the academic sections of the PPPM. Student Opinion

Surveys and Student Opinion Forms need to be collated and reviewed for consistency. The "new" (revised & reformatted) version of the PPPM is still lurking in the background and its launch is anticipated soon.

04 October 2014
Catherine Whelan reported that the "new" (revised & reformatted) version of the PPPM is about to go live. Mike Digby is reviewing the changes he was authorized by the 2012-2013 ECUS to make including links to BoR policy to replace quotes of BoR policy, update procedures to reflect current practice, update titles to make them more index-friendly, complete edit to make searching more convenient for PPPM users, and identify policies where there are conflicting versions present in the manual. The only policy of this type is for the topic of Student Opinion Surveys – two versions (with conflicting language) presently exist. Mike Digby, Tom Ormord, and Catherine Whelan are preparing proposed revisions that, upon completion, will be submitted to the Executive Committee for steering to the relevant committee of the university senate for review. Josh Kitchens, University Archivist, reminded those present of the intent to make an annual pdf snapshot of the PPPM for University Archives. This reminder received a favorable review from those present.

04 April 2014
Catherine Whelan has recently spoken to Tom Ormond on this matter and indicated the following items in her committee update. 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. Catherine Whelan has noticed some broken links in the PPPM that need resolution. 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 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.
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.

Ad Hoc Committees and Other Groups:
Governance Retreat Planning Committee
Celebration (of Ten Years of Shared Governance) Committee

Committee Reflections:
- Most of the Standing Committee Chairs (SCC) and ECUS members supported the continuation of scheduling the ECUS-SCC meeting immediately following meetings of committees and so this was incorporated into the 2014-2015 Governance Calendar.
- Steering items by email between meetings (when feasible) was generally well received.
- The consultative manner in which we operated and the participation of all members in all deliberations strengthened the effectiveness of the committee.
- ECUS made efficient use of meeting time and had individual committee members tend to most of the recurring tasks between meetings.
- Add an agenda item for the Executive Committee meetings to allow time for reports such as the Presiding Officer's attendance at any administrative meetings on behalf of Senate.
- Add an agenda item to the University Senate Meeting agenda to allow time for reports of senators who are appointed to represent the Senate on university-wide task forces or committees. A short written report could be submitted for inclusion in the minutes.
- Consider inviting SGA leadership to the ECUS/SCC meeting.

Committee Recommendations:
- Provide regular campus-wide communication from the University Senate with updates of upcoming motions and committee deliberations.
- Clarify with the administrative assistants for the President and the Provost of the attendance requirement at both the ECUS and ECUS SCC meetings.
- Review the job responsibilities for the graduate assistant (noting they were established in April 2007).
- Explore ways with ECUS SCC to more fully utilize the time allotment of the graduate assistant.
- Request that in their oral reports to university senate, the committee chairs provide only a brief summary of their committee's activities, focusing primarily on motions and main topics of committee deliberations.
- Consult with the administrative assistants in the President's office regarding the use and amounts of budget allocations.

- See the *Tasks to Be Continued* column and *To Be Archived* items (column two) in the Executive Summary Section of this report.

Recommended Items for Consideration at the Governance Retreat:

From the 2013 Governance Retreat:
- Continue to provide the University Senate Handbook. It was well received by the participants at the 2013 Governance Retreat.
- Organize breakout sessions by committee.
- Provide a session which allows committees to begin work on their operating procedures. Support this by providing copies of the past year's operating procedures to each committee.
- Continue to provide guidance for breakout group discussions with the opportunity to report out.
- Include the mock Senate meeting even though this was cancelled for the 2013 Governance Retreat due an extended Q&A session related to the Program Prioritization Initiative.
- Continue the practice of inviting Elected Faculty Senators, Volunteers, Appointments, and Designees.
- Continue to utilize the process of online registration.

From the Executive Committee:
- Invite the President or the Provost to speak regarding the results of the Program Prioritization Initiative.
- Explore possible uses for the University Senate budget.
- Have the Governance Retreat participants prioritize the "nonessential" agenda items. The essential items might be the breakout sessions for discussing shared governance and committee operating procedures and the "mock" Senate meeting.

Appendix A: Committee Operating Procedures

2013-2014 ECUS OPERATING PROCEDURES
Adopted 8/14/13

1. The Executive Committee of the University Senate
   • is a faculty advisory body to the University President,
   • sets the agenda for regular meetings of the University Senate,
   • is the steering committee of the University Senate,
   • reviews motions and resolutions submitted for University Senate consideration,
   • is responsible for ensuring the implementation of the nomination and (s)election processes for senators, appointees, volunteers, and standing committee officers,
   • is responsible for the maintenance and dissemination of meeting minutes,
   • ensures that governance documents are up-to-date and accessible (including statutes, bylaws, handbooks, and calendars), and
   • archives records of University Senate activities in coordination with the University Archivist.

2. The Executive Committee members will work cooperatively as a team for the good of the University, the University Senate and the Committee. To realize this objective, members should
   • attend and participate in all scheduled meetings,
   • communicate respectfully, openly, and candidly with each other,
   • seek out and identify agenda items for discussion,
   • resist communicating *on behalf of the committee* without consultation with the ECUS officers, and
   • copy the committee when communicating on its behalf.

3. Committee Officer Responsibilities
   Chair (Presiding Officer)
   • Drafts, in consultation with the committee, the tentative agenda for committee meetings
   • Distributes each tentative agenda to the committee via email prior to the committee meeting
   • Be contacted by committee members extending regrets prior to a scheduled committee meeting
   • Presides at committee meetings
   • Insuring committee motions proposed for University Senate consideration are entered into the online motion database
   • Advertising committee meeting times and meeting agenda to the university community
   • Presents the ECUS report to University Senate at scheduled University Senate meetings
   • Others as defined/assigned by the committee

   Vice-Chair (Presiding Officer Elect)
   • Assumes all duties and responsibilities of the chair in the absence of the chair
   • Others as defined/assigned by the committee

   Secretary
   • Be contacted by committee members extending regrets prior to a scheduled committee meeting
   • Drafts, in consultation with the committee, the minutes for committee meetings
   • Posts committee minutes in a manner consistent with University Senate protocol after the minutes have been reviewed by the committee – including any amendments made as a result of the review
   • Others as defined/assigned by the committee

4. Communication
   • Communicate via the ecus@list.gcsu.edu email list with the 72-hour rule – a member of the Executive Committee has 72 hours to respond to an issue/proposal to confirm receipt and communicate approval or share constructive suggestions
   • Notify the committee chair (lyndall.muschell@gcsu.edu) and secretary (craig.turner@gcsu.edu) to extend regrets prior to scheduled committee meetings.

5. Duration of Meetings
   • Committee meetings shall be no more than seventy-five (75) minutes in duration unless otherwise agreed to by a motion to extend the meeting duration

6. Agenda
- A tentative agenda for the next meeting of ECUS is drafted by the ECUS Chair and is informed by consultation with the entire committee just before adjournment of the previous meeting whenever possible.
- Agenda items will be prioritized by time-sensitivity and not necessarily reflect their relative importance.
- The tentative agenda is distributed to the committee members, and standing committee chairs when appropriate, by the ECUS Chair as early in the week of a meeting as possible and is finalized in consultation with the other members of ECUS.
- Drafts of supporting documentation for agenda items are provided to the committee members, and standing committee chairs when appropriate, prior to the meeting whenever possible to encourage and facilitate review prior to the meeting. Unless requested of the ECUS Chair or in the case where the document has not been previously distributed, members will bring their own copies of materials (agenda and supporting docs) to the meeting.

7. Deliberation and Parliamentary Authority
Deliberation is informal until there is a motion for committee consideration in which case Robert's Rules apply.
- The rules contained in the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised shall govern the Executive Committee in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with the University Senate Bylaws, these operating procedures and any special rules of order the University Senate or Executive Committee may adopt.

8. Quorum & Voting
- A majority of the Executive Committee membership shall constitute a quorum. (Article V, Section 1.B)
- Each of the ECUS members listed in the University Senate bylaws is a voting member of the committee.
- Unless otherwise determined by the committee in advance of the vote, a majority vote is necessary for committee approval.
- In all committee votes, the voting threshold is applied to the number of voting members present at the time of the vote *assuming the presence of quorum*.

9. Minutes
- ECUS members review the initial draft of the minutes of the University Senate meetings prior to distribution to the University Senate.
- The ECUS secretary shall prepare a draft of the minutes of each committee meeting and may request guidance from the committee during a meeting to inform the preparation of this draft.
- This draft of the minutes is circulated to the committee for review prior to posting.
- If suggested revisions are offered, the revised minutes are again distributed to the committee for review.
- The minutes are posted as soon as possible after the review process concludes.
- *Except for the minutes of the final meeting of the academic year, the approval of the previous meeting minutes is an item on the agenda of each ECUS meeting.*

10. Amendment of these operating procedures
- These committee operating procedures may be amended by a majority vote at any scheduled committee meeting provided that committee members receive written notification in advance of the meeting at which the proposed revision(s) is/are considered. Any such revision(s) that are approved are effective immediately following the committee vote.