I. Call to Order – Chairperson, Dr. James South

II. Reflection – Dr. Sandra Hunter

III. Approval of February 20, 2012 Minutes

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes with the following change:

Under VII, Provost Report, Arts and Sciences Dean Search Update,
write a new sentence after the fifth bullet to read “The response of the Provost raised secondary issues”.

The motion carried.

IV. Action Items

a. University Board of Undergraduate Studies

A motion was made to approve revising the UAS Statutes, Article 4, Section 4: Membership of the Board of Undergraduate Studies (UBUS). Approval of this motion would add the Director of the University Common Core of Common Studies to UBUS as an ex-officio, non-voting member. This item was discussed at the February meeting and generated no discussion. The motion carried.

b. University Board of Graduate Studies – Dr. Robert Griffin, Chairperson

A motion was made to approve a Certificate in Non-Profit Sector Administration in the College of Professional Studies. The University Board of Graduate Studies has reviewed this proposal and voted unanimously to support. A vote was taken and the motion carried.

c. Committee on Faculty Welfare – Dr. John Cotton, Chairperson

A proposal was introduced to revise the UAS Statutes – Article Four, Section 3.02: Subcommittee on Equity to become a Standing Committee and be renamed the Committee on Equity. A discussion ensued. Dr. Cotton did not feel that the work of the Committee on Faculty Welfare would change with this proposal to make the Subcommittee a Committee and noted that the Committee on Faculty Welfare voted unanimously for this change. A member of the Faculty Welfare Committee noted that the Subcommittee had done a lot of work in putting forth this revision which they feel would enhance their work by eliminating road blocks that they
encounter when trying to complete assignments. The new committee would include Dr. William Welburn to assist them in matters of diversity.

One Senator noted that all other standing committees are general purpose groups whereas this Subcommittee is a single issue committee. A Senator wondered how members would be chosen to serve on this Committee when it is hard to secure a full ballot for elections for current positions. The Provost noted that this change holds value and allows the group to position themselves in the governance structure although he although stated that the change in structure will not necessarily allow access to additional information.

Discussion began to center on the issue of diversity vs. equity and should the Subcommittee review the purpose of the new committee to incorporate diversity if they wish to become a Standing Committee. In addition, it was suggested that the group look at the role of the Faculty Welfare Committee for areas of duplication. A suggestion was made that this item be sent back to the current subcommittee for clearer wording on the focus, the composition of the membership, and how members will be selected to serve. It was noted that currently part-time faculty issues are not addressed by this subcommittee and they may want to consider this as they review their purpose. The Subcommittee was asked to bring back this proposal directly to the University Academic Senate. A suggestion was made that the group seek outside counsel (UAS Executive Committee, Director of Diversity) in helping them clearly articulate the focus of this committee.

V. Chairperson’s Report – Dr. James South

College elections are currently underway. In addition, Drs. Acord, Jones and Su are in charge of soliciting nominations for “at-large” positions for the UAS, Faculty Welfare Committee, Faculty Council, and Faculty Hearing Committee. An email to the University faculty will be going out this week to encourage faculty members to nominate themselves and/or others for the open positions.

VI. Provost’s Report – Dr. John Pauly
   a. Arts & Sciences Dean Search Update
      Proposals have gone out to search firms to provide expertise in the search process. Fr. Pilarz and the Provost have drafted a protocol for the search process, including membership on the committee, although membership has not yet been finalized. Provost Pauly is optimistic that the group will be ready to proceed with the search in August.
   
   b. Enrollment Update
      • Freshmen applications number 22,723 which is 3% ahead of last year at this time.
      • May 1st is the national “Reply Date” for new Freshmen – we are running even with last year in terms of deposits to date (302)
      • We will have an overnight visit program for admitted students April 15 and 16
      • Spring Open House is April 21
      • Ignatius Scholars Dinner is March 27
   
   c. State of the University – Discussion
      At the last UAS meeting, the VP for Finance reported an increase in the salary pool of $4.8 million of which $3.2 million was earmarked for merit increases. The Provost was asked to indicate where the $1.6 million is going. The Provost indicated that the $1.6 million covers both the academic and administrative sides of the house, although most of it went to academics. On the administrative side, some portion went to fund the new chief of staff
position and some expenses related to the new Lacrosse team. On the academic side, $400,000 is going to support the part time salary pool in dentistry (remedying an accounting change we made some years ago in response to changes in state support), $190k to supplement part-time budgets in six colleges, $271,000 to regularize four positions in the College of Business Administration in response to accreditation issues, $138,000 to lift graduate stipends in Engineering and Nursing and a new line in Economics. A small pool was held back to assist deans in making equity salary adjustments.

A follow-up question was asked about whether the University Budget Committee (UBC) had a say in the merit raise pool. Provost Pauly indicated that the UBC was not involved in this decision. He clarified that the UBC helps set large parameters like what should the tuition hike be, how much should be set aside for salary purposes, etc. The decision about how to use any new salary, operating, or capital money on the academic side came through a planning process he conducted with the deans in which each was invited to bring forward their full range of needs and prioritize them. In addition, he and the deans discussed the principles to be followed in making budget decisions.

Dr. South indicated that he had received several emails regarding the amount of money spent on the basketball program – especially as it relates to what is reported that our peer institutions spend. In response to this question, Provost Pauly stated that the revenues from the men’s basketball program help fund nearly everything else in our sports program. In addition there are also apparently some discrepancies in how expenses are reported across universities. That is, a number of other schools may be spending more but disguise those costs through various informal, on-the-side arrangements that need not be reported. He stated that it is fair to conclude that we spend a significant amount but that the comparison figures with other institutions may not be totally accurate.

d. Other - Donation/Gift Update
   - Eight scholarship gifts in the amount of $50,000 or more totaling in excess of $2.8 million, including recent gifts of $800,000 and $200,000 to endowed scholarships.
   - A $300,000 gift toward the College of Nursing’s Simulation Lab and a $250,000 gift to the Dental School.
   - Three gifts, totaling $1.27 million were made in support of faculty development, primarily toward the Accounting Department in the College of Business Administration.
   - A gift of $50,000 was made to the Restorative Justice Scholarship Fund.

VII. Vice Chairperson’s Report – Prof. Patricia Cervenka

The following report will be posted directly to the UAS Website.

To: Members of the University Academic Senate
From: Faculty Council
Re: Progress in shared governance
Date: March 19, 2012

Faculty Council was charged with monitoring shared governance for the current academic year. The Council reviewed the Faculty Council’s recommendations from the last two academic years as well as the 2004 NCA report and the Final Report of the Joint Academic Senate/Committee on Faculty Task Force on Shared Governance submitted to the Academic Senate in May, 2007. Major change is never linear. Even as we see two steps forward
and one step back, it is important to stay focused on the vision we have for shared governance and continue working in that direction.

Shared governance works when individuals and groups affected by a decision participate in the decision-making process. Its functioning involves, among other things, (1) providing to all participants information necessary to make decisions; (2) ensuring that the participants' contribution is taken into account; and (3) communicating to the participants how their "input affected the decision" (Tina Nabatchi, A Manager’s Guide to Evaluating Citizen Participation, http://www.businessofgovernment.org, p. 6). The decision-making culture at Marquette has yet to be changed to effectively implement shared governance.

In response to the 2004 concerns raised by the NCA visit, structural improvements were instituted in the restructuring of the University Academic Senate (UAS): designating the Chair to be a member of the faculty, rather than having the Provost act as Chair; establishing a better ratio of faculty/administrators as required by the UAS statutes (i.e. reduction of Deans’ membership on the UAS from the previous high number to the current number of 5); and creating enhanced representation of part-time faculty on the UAS.

In 2009, Faculty Council members and Senators held discussions with academic deans, department chairs, and section heads regarding shared governance. Summaries of the meetings were presented to the UAS and discussed at a UAS meeting. An executive summary of the discussions was posted on the UAS website. In addition, the current UAS Secretary compiled a summary report of all UAS motions recently passed and posted the report on the UAS website. That canvassing of MU faculty revealed a common perception that shared governance required trust, transparency, communication, and accountability—all four of which were described as lacking.

In response to the 2009 report, several more changes were initiated. These changes included an improved and more accessible UAS website, regular e-mail communication of UAS agenda to the entire faculty, a one-course release for the UAS Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary during their term of service, and improving the election process for filling committee vacancies. It was also recommended that all Chairs of committees establish regular meeting times to improve the recruitment of new members. This has happened with some, but not all the committees. In addition, the UAS Chair and Vice-Chair began attending University Leadership Council and Dean’s Council meetings in 2012. Another concern was the lack of faculty participation in the budgetary process. During the current academic year, an effort toward transparency was made with the addition of two faculty members to the University Budget Committee though some concern still exists as to how much of the true process was actually revealed and the extent of real influence in the budgeting process.

Other recommendations to improve the quality of shared governance, however, have not been implemented. One recommendation that did not happen was an August or September orientation of the Executive Board, new senators, committee chairs, and committee members to provide continuity for Senate business. This has not occurred, and the responsibility appears to lie with the UAS faculty leadership, rather than the administrative leaders. In addition, based on a Faculty Council sponsored faculty forum with the trustee chair of the Subcommittee on Academic Excellence and Enrollment, Fall 2010, it was recommended that the Chair and the Vice Chair of UAS should meet with the Subcommittee on a regular basis. This has not happened. It is not clear if this is the fault of the UAS faculty leadership for not initiating this meeting or the fault of administration for discouraging interaction between faculty and trustees. Similarly, it was also recommended that the UAS Executive Committee appoint other faculty members to meet with this Trustees’ Committee in May for better follow through and to plan how to make the best use of time with the Trustees. This has not happened.

In addition to failure to implement recommended changes, a major concern focuses on both recent Vice-Provost and Vice-President appointments done without consultation with the UAS as well as the lack of a clear procedure for the future selection of academic deans. "Trust" was deemed to be a critical ingredient in the success of shared governance at Marquette. Recent events have tarnished the first buds of an uneasy trust, and it must be tended
before it wilts, taking with it some hard-won victories. Choking the growth is a misrepresentation of statutes by those whose duty it is to uphold them. Statutes are not in existence just when they are convenient--by their nature, they are often NOT convenient--they are designed for the good of all as opposed to the imagined good of just a few, or one.

While some structural changes have occurred to address those concerns, fundamental flaws at significant levels in each category of concern—trust, communication, transparency, and accountability—remain and may be worsening. Attention to the latter two—transparency and accountability—seems at times to be flagrantly disregarded by administrators. The result is a deep deterioration in trust. The trajectory at this point suggests that faculty will experience increasing disillusionment as they watch the deterioration of the positive steps toward shared governance made in the past.

The Faculty remain suspicious of the administration's commitment to shared governance. Faculty members perceive that the administration has not made a sustained, genuine and overt commitment to shared governance. Various actions of the administration are interpreted as contrary to shared governance. Faculty members perceive that the administration is suspicious of shared governance and that this suspicion is impeding the development of trust, accountability and transparency.

Shared governance at Marquette, as it is currently structured, requires all parties to act in good faith, and for everyone to see and feel that all parties are sincerely trying to make shared governance work. Unfortunately, events of the past few years have shown that this is not the case. Shared governance at Marquette is continuing to be a struggle. One of the reasons for that struggle is that the administrative side of the university has not been living up to agreements set out in the UAS statutes, and to promises made with UAS and its Executive Committee. This is not to say that progress has not been made, there has been progress in many areas, and we can see that the climate under Fr. Pilarz is more open and transparent than it has been in the past. However, if the UAS (and by extension the faculty) cannot trust that university administration is communicating honestly with the Senate, and honestly reporting Senate communications to the broader university administration; and if UAS cannot trust that university administration will follow through on promises made to the Senate, then there is no shared governance at Marquette.

VIII. Other Business

A motion was made and seconded for the UAS to go into Executive Session to discuss the role of the UAS in Dean Searches.

IX. Motion to Adjourn

The UAS adjourned at 5:00PM

The next meeting of the UAS will be Monday, April 16th at 3:00 pm in AMU Ballroom E.

Respectfully submitted:
Lea Acord, Secretary