The regular meeting of the University Senate Executive Committee was called to order by Interim-Chair Harrison at 3:02 p.m. on Tuesday, March 3, 2009 in the Alumni Room of Davies Center.

1. Minutes of February 17, 2009 approved as distributed

2. Open Forum
   - Concern was brought to Craig Mey about the amount of recent spam
   - You have to remove yourself/the email address that remains sent as an email address and not a person as a safe sender to stop the spam emails

3. Review of tentative agenda for March 10, 2009 meeting of the University Senate
   - Approved with minor revisions

4. Discussion of Proposed Mission Statement
   - University Planning Committee is thankful for all the email comments but due to the high quantity of the email comments this Special Report has been removed from the agenda as more time is needed to rewrite
   - The last time the Mission Statement was rewritten it did not go to the faculty and academic staff so it is not pertinent that it be completed by April, but rather by May

Without objection, agenda item #6 was discussed prior to agenda item #5

6. Voting Role of the Provost
   - When Provost candidates were asked if they thought it was important for the Provost to have a voting role some said no
   - Like that UWEC is not so adversarial
   - Having the Provost as a voting member is a unique expression of our culture at UWEC
   - Nice to have the Provost present at the meetings
   - Discussions seem to be different when the Provost/Chancellor are present
   - Nice to hear how the Provost votes as it can say a lot
   - Provost may feel pressure to attend if it is required
   - Value symbolic separation
   - Chancellor can veto anything anyway
   - Candidates state that a voting role makes them uncomfortable
   - Nice to have their presence and contribution
   - Good to have sharing between the faculty and administration
   - Think that the candidates are reflecting their past experience from other states but it is not like that on this campus
   - UWEC is a shared governance campus
   - May be talking about program closures in the next few years and the Provost will have a voice when it goes to the Chancellor’s office for signature
   - Provost already has a significant voice
It is nice to have them as nonvoting so people think that they are being heard and that the decisions are not already made

**Vote on Motion:** Motion PASSED by a vote of 10 for to 1 against

Recommends that three references to the voting status of the Provost and Vice Chancellor be changed, as shown, in three locations of the Handbook:
1. Article Three: University Senate, Section B Membership: 3. Administrative Senators
2. Bylaws of the University Senate, Membership of University Senate 1.; and
3. – Description of the Executive Committee Membership.

Article Three: University Senate, Section B Membership: 3. Administrative Senators
The Chancellor and the Provost and Vice Chancellor are **non-voting** members of the Senate, with the Chancellor being a non-voting member.

Bylaws of the University Senate, Membership of University Senate, 1.
The voting members of the University Senate include:

1. **Provost and Vice Chancellor**

... The Chancellor and the Provost and Vice Chancellor shall be non-voting members of the University Senate.

1. The Executive Committee a. Membership: The committee shall include ten University Faculty, four University Academic Staff, the Chancellor, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor. ... The Chancellor and the Provost and Vice Chancellor shall be non-voting members of the Executive Committee.

5. Senate Representation Discussion

- When looking at Instructional Academic Staff, both with and without faculty status, it doesn’t mean that those that are here in the fall will also necessarily be here in the spring
- Currently 2 of 54 senators are IAS with faculty status and this motion would put 6 on
- Questioning if we are guaranteeing the right group
- IAS are those with the least amount of power at the University so they need to be better represented
- IAS are not required in their contract to serve
- Suggestion that since the elimination of the Provost/VC voting rights, then a bullet should be created to give IAS without faculty status from any area an additional spot
- Suggestion to undelete the first 4 bullets
- Suggestion for this to be brought back after looking at Spring frozen file numbers
- Seeing a real and dangerous shift/trend from faculty to IAS with faculty status
- Suggestion of 1 from each department with 4 or more IAS with faculty status

7. Standing Committee Constitution Change

- Constitution should state what committees should be; the argument is what is to be kept in the constitution versus the bylaws
- Bylaws include function and membership
- The constitution freezes the committees
- Faculty and academic staff senators can make changes for the greater good
- Physical Plant Planning Committee should be kept in
- Standing Committees have continued existence where Ad Hoc committees are created for a specific purpose and when that task is completed then committee is no more
- The constitution says that these committees are important to us
- If included into the bylaws then a minimal statement should be included stating membership
- One watching could request any change to be discussed to be at a full university-wide meeting
- The constitution can have as much or as little as one wants
- Suggestion to include as a safeguard language that requires at least one from each college on the committee
- Not a problem to move language to the bylaws with safeguards
- To be looked at again
8. Miscellaneous Business
   • Something to think about
     • Should faculty status be granted at the University level or the department level

9. Announcements - None

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Submitted by,

Tanya Kenney
Secretary of the University Senate