The regular meeting of the University Senate Executive Committee was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:05 p.m. on Tuesday, March 2, 2004 in Schofield Hall, Room 202.

1. Minutes of February 17, 2004 approved as distributed

2. Open Forum
   - Academic staff senator raised possibility of scheduling senate agenda items with business academic staff senators could vote on conducted first so they might excuse themselves at its completion
   - Most business seems to be for faculty consideration in their role as ‘producers’ at university
   - Seems waste of two hours when have no say in matters anyway – just looking to make better use of time
   - Too late to change this year, but could consider when set order of business for 41st session of senate next year
   - Believe that is bad idea – we remain a University Senate
     - Allows people on this campus to get a better big picture than those on campuses with separate academic staff and faculty senates
     - Too many times focus on own issues and put blinders on; combination and hearing other issues allows understanding of what university about
     - Whether discussing academic staff or faculty issues, educational process works in both directions
     - No restriction on involvement in discussion on any issue; can add insight into discussion, just cannot vote
     - Adds perspective to University Senate – attendance whether voting or not, makes sense
       - All about issues from university perspective – informed community best prepared for shared governance
       - Chancellor could also ask why consult when those consulting know less about issue
       - Chancellor never votes, would mean he should not attend either

3. Review of tentative agenda for March 9, 2004 meeting of University Senate
   - Consensus to approve tentative agenda as distributed

4. Possibilities for Open Discussion scheduled for Tuesday, March 30, 2004
   - Could hold additional University Senate meeting on that date to take place of one not being held over spring break
     - Only four senate meetings left for rest of academic year
     - Have been hearing lists of items being discussed by committees
     - To fit two readings in for all those items may be problematic
     - Also short timeline for senate chair election if changes are instituted in faculty representative elections
• Have not heard of any hot topics that need discussion at previously scheduled fifth Tuesday Open Discussion
• Consensus to schedule regular University Senate meeting for March 30, 2004

5. Miscellaneous Business
• Concern expressed about email request from Senate Office for possible amendments to program review motion to be submitted in advance for distribution prior to meeting
  • Seemed to set precedent that amendments must be printed (on blue paper) to be considered
  • Also concerned about amendment distributed prior to motion that was to be amended introduced
    • Understand desire for time to think through possible changes
    • Still think strange to have amendment out before motion on the floor
• Letter from department chairs against program review revisions disseminated in similar manner
  • See difference because information, not amendment
• Also were amendments distributed that were not even made
• Would like to set standard procedure to deal with amendments and their distribution
  • Much easier to consider when able to read off paper rather than just hearing changes
  • Especially important if making substantial changes
• Also accessibility issues – when papers handed out during meeting, are those who cannot read them
• One more reason to adhere to two readings procedure
  • Concern expressed before, but continue to suspend rules with regularity
• See problem when something complex is amended on floor of Senate – even in second reading
  • Substantial changes can be made without being able to think about or consult about issues
  • Would favor having those amendments in writing and out as soon as possible
• Concerned precedent of having amendments written up intimidates people so don’t make amendments because not fully prepared in writing
  • Might inhibit open discussion and revisions
• According to Robert’s Rules of Order, sheets of paper are part of discussion
  • No rule about what can be printed, but anything that would tend to impede open discussion should not be allowed
    • Seems circulating blue sheet at beginning instead of in midst of debate would tend to do that
  • Apart from Robert’s Rules, intuitively give standing to amendments passed out in advance in written form
    • Handing out in advance gives credence prematurely
• Chair of senate does have prerogative as to what gets distributed; also chair’s responsibility to seek out verbal amendments
• Could require amendments be copied to chair in written form for accuracy
• If amendment were to change whole substance of motion, would be a separate motion
• Can always move to postpone vote to next meeting
• Consensus to leave distribution of amendments up to individual senator

6. Announcements - None

Meeting adjourned at 3:31 p.m.

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate