Present: Ralph Anzivino, Said Audi, Alan Burkard, Michael Class, S.J., Kerry Egdorf (guest), Kim Factor, Marilyn Frenn, Kurt Gering, Jim Richie, Dawn Smith, Sid Syam, Lynn Whittenberger (chair)

Came to order 1:00 PM

I. Minutes approved

II. Forum:
- Dawn and Lynn are going to meet with Brad Stratton on 3/14 to go over questions and go over the structure of forum. Different from last year, we would like to see a forum that is conversational and does not involve multiple presenters. They will pass along that information during the meeting. They will also meet with UAS beforehand. President Lovell will get the questions in about one month so he can be prepared.
- To date, only five questions have been submitted. Dawn and Lynn will meet to formalize them. If FC has questions, we can add them. We are to encourage our departments to come up with some.
- There was discussion on whether we should have all questions answered first, then a time for open questions, or ask one question followed by Q&A, 2nd question followed by Q&A, etc.
  - Need time limit per question for 2nd option
  - Find a moderator who can feels comfortable in diplomatically enforcing the time limit
  - Want open mike, so need to be careful that answers to given questions do not take up the Q&A time
  - Have seed questions ready ahead of time in case there are lags where no one asks questions
- Are people adequately informed? (Kurt) May not be getting the emailed information that we want questions for the forum
- Last year, there was no write up regarding answers to questions (some 25 questions that got whittled down to 15 – 20). Last year, the forum was recorded and placed on a link that people could access. This year, we should also have a link.
- Mike Gousha of the Law School is a professional moderator, and it was suggested that we see if he is available for the forum.
- People said they wanted to hear President Lovell answer the questions rather than have him bring up others to answer them.
  - More of a presentation last year. It was informative, but the forum is not necessarily the place for that method
  - From a practical standpoint this year, if we have several questions, there may not be time to have different people answering questions
- Lynn and Dawn will reach out to part-timers to solicit questions, as they were not contacted on this. Lynn will look into why that happened.
• Other people not on the list either; administrators, those in areas outside academia, part-time instructors who are automatically put into an “administrative” placement in the email system will not receive the emails
• It was agreed that we would put forth the format: Answer one question followed by Q&A, and repeat
• Questions will be rewritten by FC officials to create themes
• Extend deadline to March 4 to receive questions
• Last year, the questions were prioritized. They didn’t get to the ones at the end, but it went well. It takes some time for people to warm up and they tend to not ask questions right away.

Part-time faculty audit
• Should we audit full-time regular faculty?
  o What sparked the charge—we need to find out what the reason is in order to approach the solution correctly
• Kurt: Start with numbers
• Full-time regular faculty are given different titles in different departments, so we cannot access the numbers of full-time regular faculty members using their titles. No good answer yet as to how to get to them
• It was mentioned that long-term contracts for full-time regular faculty are rumored to be discontinued; this would be done pursuant to an edict from the Provost’s office, if true
• When discussing how to find out, the follow question came up: Where is the procedure for extended-year contacts? No one had any idea. It was noted that they are briefly discussed in the Faculty Handbook
• FC “should” be able to find the answer. If it is college specific, may need to go to a specific dean. So the question begets another: Who has the answer to the question as to what is the process for getting an extended-term contract?
• Apparently, some faculty members were told that their extended year contracts have been discontinued. Is it university-wide? Is it true? This should be information that is available from a university-wide standpoint. The university should have the information available even if it varies by college. It is disturbing that we were told that the Provost’s Office has done this
• Jim could go to the Executive Committee of the UAS to see if this can be put on agenda and the procedure reviewed. The Provost will be there, so he may be able to answer the questions posed in today’s meeting
• It was commented upon that this would be a good question for the forum

Skip survey...

Dean Search Protocol Discussion
• One of the first concerns brought up is whether is a closed search, there is any vehicle for student input. What can we do so student input is allowed in a closed search?

  MARQUETTE PROTOCOL FOR CONDUCTING DEAN SEARCHES
  • Marquette Protocol for Conducting Dean Searches document no longer exists on the MU website
• It was stated that the Provost picks the search committee
  o He may be open to having the members elected
  o Question is open versus closed
  o Whatever procedure a college has adopted, have faculty who are allowed to vote; vote for closed or open
  o There was discussion on whether the search firm hired by Marquette recommended closed or whether it came from prior experience
  o Additional discussion ensued on open versus closed. Since there are so many issues, perhaps this would be a good topic for the forum
• Dean search document does state that the faculty on the whole do get input. People on the search committee must go out and get faculty input, which is an indirect vehicle for input
• We would like to make sure the search committee does reflect the faculty better
• There was discussion as to whether there should be a voting process to create the search committee in a closed search, with general agreement
• Open search: Before the final decision is made, the faculty get direct input
• Kurt: UAS Statues, Article 1, Section 2.02 states «2.02 In accordance with shared governance, the UAS Executive Committee will be invited to discuss and evaluate new permanent appointments to major academic administrative positions with the Provost and/or President prior to offer being extended. “ (an issue when Pauly was made Provost). Before an offer is made, it seems to suggest that it needs to be put before the UAS. This brought up the question: Is the provost using this published model or another?
• Lynn will make changes on the document, then ask us before passing it on to the UAS.

New business
• The issue of retirees not being able to keep their Marquette email addresses came up. Further, they lose all of the emails and information they have kept over the years. When asked, Dan Meyers said this seems to not make sense, and to let him make a few phone calls. He is looking into it.

Next meeting: 3/14, 1:00 PM