

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY

Office of the Provost

Academic Senate Minutes
October 18, 2004

1. Call to Order/Invocation

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 pm. Dr. Wake led the prayer

2. Approval of Minutes of September 20, 2004

Members Present: Dr. Lea Acord, Dr. Janet Boles, Dr. Jack Brooks, Dr. Nicholas Burckel, Prof. Patricia Cervenka, Dr. Sharon Chubbuck, Dr. Robert Deahl, Mr. Thomas Dolce, Rev. John Donnelly, Dr. Thomas Eddinger, Dr. Marilyn Frenn, Dr. Carla Hay, Mr. Jacob Held, Dr. Peter Jones, Dr. John Krugler, Mr. Timothy Lefeber, Dr. William Lobb, Dr. Michael McKinney, Dr. Sarah Peck, Dr. Gregory Porter, Dr. James Rice, Dr. William Starr, Dr. Madeline Wake, Dr. Marianne Weiss, Dr. Wanda Zemler-Cizewski

Not-Voting Member Present: Dr. Margaret Bloom

Guest Present: Dr. Rita Burns, Dr. Doug Day, Ms. Kimberly Newman, Ms. Stephanie Russell, Mr. Steve Schultz, Sister Carol Ann Smith, S.H.C.J., Dr. Nancy Snow

Members Excused: Dr. William Elliott, Dr Dan Griffiths, Mr. Jay Kirk, Dr. Guy Simoneau

Members Absence:

The following corrections were noted to the September 20, 2004 minutes.

#5. Title should read “Task Force” not Committee. Second sentence, second word should be replaced with “task force.

#7. First paragraph second sentence should read: Dr. Krugler indicated that the ad hoc group had much work to do prior to do doing a test.

Second paragraph second sentence the word ‘need’ should be “needed”

Third paragraph four sentence the word ‘had’ should be “has”.

With the above noted corrections the minutes were approved.

Dr. Bloom was welcomed as a nonvoting member of the Academic Senate. Dr. Bloom will chair the Academic Senate if Dr. Wake is unable to attend.

3. Provost Report

- A. Academic Goals for 2003-04 (Att 3A) The group was given to time to read them.
Goal 3 – The faculty will help to make determination on how to share the million.
Committee on Faculty will also be consulted.
Goal 5 – Dr. Doug Day will report at a later date

B. Way-Klinger Awards

Interdisciplinary projects across colleges or areas in arts and sciences are especially important in line with academic goals. Stipend went up \$5500 for summer faculty fellowships regardless of rank. Committee on Research looking at all applications. Start up money may be used to attract new faculty and is often part of negotiations. Dr. Brooks indicated that he has found that faculty will not apply for open positions

if there is not a possibility of this money. Dr. Brooks noted that this investment that the university makes in the faculty is usually paid back in the form of grants received. College of Business may use this money to purchase data that is necessary for research.

4. A Proposal for Faculty Evaluation of Academic Support Units – T. Eddinger (Att 4)

Are units providing academic support doing an effective job? Does feedback get to the areas that can make changes? The ones in bold on the handout were mentioned most frequently as units that might be reviewed by faculty. Graduate students would review the graduate school. Faculty would like input in designing the questions.

Dr. Boles indicated that the University bookstore has done surveys in the past by email. The bookstore is an area that is used more often than other areas.

Dr. Peck requested that Career Services and University Advancement be added to the list of the areas to be reviewed. Dr. Deahl requested that Public Affairs be also added.

A culture needs to be created for helpful criticism rather than another layer of performance evaluations. Culture of productiveness.

Dr. Acord feels review of support units is important for quality improvements. These evaluations also deal with the faculty governance issue.

Dr. Jones indicated that faculty may be unaware of what is done in areas such as Advancement and that it would be hard for faculty to provide feedback on the units performance. Dr. Peck wondered if ignorance is a good thing to measure.

Dr. Hay suggested that possibly a system be set up so that during a designated time a chat room could be used to voice observations.

Dr. Wake asked Dr. Day to comment on the evaluation plan. Dr. Day noted that the committee is being established to look at something coherent and this may be a matter that they look at.

Dr. Taft indicated that it would be easier to evaluate these units if faculty understood their individual strategic goals. Dr. Eddinger agrees that there needs to be a mechanism to look at these goals.

Dr. Cervenka felt that maybe Town Hall meetings would be a quick way to get ideas from the faculty.

Dr. Hay wondered if Committee on Faculty could promote themselves so that more faculty felt comfortable bringing issues to them.

The Academic Senate then held an executive session.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 PM.