I. Call to Order by Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay at 3:01 pm.

II. Reflection was given by Dr. Valerie Everard-Gigot

III. Approval of August 26, 2019 minutes
   o Motion to approve: Dr. Marilyn Frenn
   o Second: Dr. Tim Melchert
   o Passed by voice vote.

IV. Chair’s Report – Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay
   o Ad hoc committee to study and report on Intellectual Property Policy
     • Good progress has been made with this committee, consisting of faculty from several departments to provide representation from across campus. Hope to have their recommendations at the next meeting in order to further pursue policy.
   o Job reductions
     • A difficult situation for everyone; is now time to come together as a community and talk about next steps. From a faculty side, there will be more discussion and conversation about plans in the coming year.
   o Childcare center. Spoke with HR regarding an email that was sent out in August about an incident which happened in May; parents have asked why they were not notified of this before others. Normal process is that there are no notifications during an investigation until where is a formal charge. In this case, the Childcare Center immediately reported a situation but paper notification was delayed because of a holiday, resulting in a report of non-compliance because of the delay. A report of non-compliance has to be disclosed in a public notice, at which point it was decided to send an email to parents. University is taking seriously and working with consultant to study the processes and training. Questions can be forwarded to Claudia Paetsch (VPHR) or to Sumana.
   o August working group discussions
     • Many issues were suggested as possible items for discussion; will likely not be able to address all of them but will attempt to consider several.
       ▪ Faculty engagement in online education (have Senate standing committees and colleges develop a strategic
plan in this enterprise)
- Discussion of non-tenure track vs. full time faculty status in terms of proportion, rights, etc., especially in Arts & Sciences
- Demonstration policy needs to be discussed
- Presence of administrative staff in academic senate
- Have a discussion regarding shared governance and the Senate’s role in it with the campus stakeholders and the Administration
- Working on the professional conduct policy with a fraternization clause added to it
- Working on the faculty grievance policy
- Faculty Council Statutes need to be finalized and voted upon
- Public engagement and public scholarship and how they are applied in P&T discussions and get other kinds of recognition.
- Consideration of teaching faculty – creating more permanent teaching positions and working towards salary equity with peer institutions for them.
- Fixing the issues related to Virgin Pulse (e.g. privacy and hours of participation needed to get points)
- Taking measures to achieve consistency in the way we apply the Grade Appeal Policy in departments
- When sharing updated policy announcements, faculty should be able to see policies side by side.

V. Vice Chair’s Report – Dr. Yasser Khaled
  - Faculty Council
    - First meeting is Monday, Sept. 23; have a chair, still looking for a vice chair

VI. Secretary’s Report – Mr. Bruce Boyden
  - No report

VII. Update on Search for Provost – Dr. Lisa Edwards, Provost Search Committee Chair
  - Distributed search timeline and opportunity and challenge profile
    - Committed to process of finding the best possible provost for the university; great committee from across campus
    - Working with Isaacson Miller, executive search firm; they are familiar with Marquette
    - Will be an entirely closed search, throughout entire process
    - Important to have Senate involved; still working on ways to ensure that Senate interaction will take place
    - Many listening sessions were held prior to preparing opportunity and challenge profile
    - Committee members agree that the initial pool is very strong. Group is diverse across types of institutions, experience, and demographics
    - Will select semi-finalists next week and schedule off-campus meetings which will include the search committee, and possibly select representatives from colleges; President will also meet with semi-finalists off-campus
    - Goal is to have three finalists on campus; reminder that campus community will not know who finalists are.
    - Finalist on-campus visits will occur in late October; committee will meet with President to discuss candidates in early November.
    - President hoping to make an offer shortly after that.
    - Nominations are still open
  - Discussion and questions
    - Is the question of shared governance and the candidate’s commitment to that a part of the filtering process at this point?
      - A: Yes, a part of the picture; the opportunity and challenge profile includes many aspects of leadership, etc.
    - Are there specific priorities that committee feels are important to the selection process?
      - A: Profile includes many priorities (shared governance, strong value on diversity of who we are, leadership at a variety of levels, for example) which have been narrowed down into the themes seen in opportunity and challenge profile. Candidates are being evaluated based on the priorities in the profile.
    - Opportunity and challenge profile does not seem to be clear about importance of shared governance, in discussions and negotiations with budget and finance or in discussions elsewhere. Had hoped it would be more strongly stated.
      - A: Committee believes it is important and is inherent in their considerations.
    - Please explain the process of rating the candidates
      - A: Candidates will be rated relative to their performance in the various areas. The President has asked for strengths and weaknesses of candidates with some manner of rating but there will be no rank order.
• How big is the initial pool?
  ▪ A: Not comfortable with providing specific numbers, but committee feels that it is a strong pool.
• Is there any way to assess stability of the candidates? Transition every five years is difficult.
  ▪ A: Cannot be predicted. Most recent data from search firm is that provosts are in position an average of 3 to 5 years.
• Is it possible to have some kind of Q&A/interaction between the candidates and a broader audience without sharing identity?
  ▪ A: Don’t know, hadn’t really thought about it.
• Sumana Chattopadhyay reminded Senate members that she is a member of the search committee and encouraged all to reach out to her with any questions/comments.

VIII. Provost’s Report – Dr. Kimo Ah Yun, Acting Provost

• Update on leadership searches
  • VP Finance: off-site interviews to be conducted soon; expect finalists in early October
  • VP Mission/Ministry: two finalists visited campus. Assuming a positive outcome from those visits, expect to have a recommendation soon.
  • Dean of Business Administration: lagging the Provost search to be certain new provost has some input. Search is moving forward; chair Felicia Miller will present info at the next meeting. Assuming provost search concludes on schedule, will hope to name a business dean in mid-December.
  • Dean of Arts & Sciences: similar lag as business; all aspects are in progress as anticipated with plans to finish on schedule; Chair Rosemary Stuart will present to Senate later in fall; anticipating an offer/announcement in mid-February.

• Cost management exercise; was a challenge to go through; done with attention to strategic plan.
  • Ombuds position
    ▪ Half-time position (teaching was other half) began in 2001
    ▪ Analysis shows that we have many support systems put in place since that time (victim advocate position, employee assistance program from HR, office of faculty affairs, and Title IX office).
    ▪ Employee Assistance Program has the same systems that were previously provided by Ombuds.

• Demonstration policy
  • University believes in everyone’s rights; listened to concerns and will continue to have this conversation.
  • Parallel conversations ongoing with staff, students, and faculty at the university.
  • UAS Executive Committee seemed to believe that policy revisions are addressing the concerns

• Provost hosts monthly lunches with small groups of faculty.
  • Send email to Deb Reeder if interested in joining these lunches

• Discussion and questions:
  • Surprised by Ombuds office going away. Possible that other services are similar on paper, but not sure they are actually doing the same things in reality. Ombuds was bound to confidence and to act on something. Feeling now is that there is no longer someone without any “horse in the race” who would actually listen to faculty and help them and find ways to solve problems or help the working place without being beholden to higher administration; that is now gone. As a faculty member, feels that a very valuable resource has been taken away. Wish there had been an opportunity to share concerns in advance. The one office people could go to is now gone. Probably needed more than ever, as we really need the trust right now.
    ▪ A: Office of Faculty Affairs – faculty regularly talk with Dr. Meyer about challenges, questions, concerns. Don’t know that folks felt beholden to him. EAP is someone that is entirely separated from the university – they are about as neutral as is possible. Important to make sure people understand the resources that are now available.
  • Who was asked that it was a redundancy; was data gathered from other perspectives?
    ▪ A: Yes – looked at what has developed since 2001; talked to HR about what else available. Consulted the map of positions that were available and spoke with representatives of faculty/academics, but never directly with faculty.
  • Who was consulted about this move? How was it decided that Ombuds was a redundancy? Financial side is confusing as don’t see how using a third party could be a better cost alternative.
    ▪ A: EAP was already in place and MU contributes to the cost. Are continuing to look at this and tracking to make sure it wasn’t costing more and is providing the same balance of services.
  • Services of EAP and Ombuds are entirely different. Ombuds provides someone who works at the university, is a part of the system and understands it. Ombuds could suggest options when someone doesn’t want to raise a ruckus through the process. EAP is different from that. Staff don’t have the advantage of tenure, and they’ve
lost that Ombuds relationship. Please reconsider.

- EAP is only covered for six consultations. After a point the faculty member would have to pay out of pocket. As a member of the Committee on Diversity and Equity very surprised, were not consulted. The Ombuds office came out of a Diversity report. The gender, race, etc. issues have been lost. Untenured faculty are not going to be interested in going to someone in faculty affairs. Please reconsider.
- Suggest that the office be temporarily reinstated while university is “continuing to look” so that we are not without during those considerations.

IX. Presentation on BookMarq – Ms. Jenny Alexander, Director of Purchasing and Mr. Pete Fronk, BookMarq Manager
  - BookMarq transition to Barnes & Noble College began in June; were open and ready for semester.
  - Pete Fronk has been with Barnes & Noble campus for 14 years. B&N started as a campus bookstore. Have a team of incredible staff and are starting to settle in.
  - Reaching out to departments to discuss items and needs, including coursepacks and non-textbook course materials. Whatever is needed, faculty should contact them.
  - Plans to organize a Bookstore Innovation Group (BIG) consisting of half students and half faculty/staff to discuss their needs and concerns. Watch for that – would love volunteers.
  - Affordability and convenience are most important. Beginning with adoption of textbooks for next semester, will have a portal, Adoption Insights Portal (AIP), in place. Provided handout of some basic information with more information to come. AIP is not hands-off but will make the process more seamless.
  - Important to get orders in early, to avoid any problems.
    - Is there an AIP link/webpage?
      - A: Not right now, but will be very soon
    - For next semester, are both old system and AIP being used?
      - A: Will solicit submissions for those are ready now but are waiting for the launch of AIP in October. After that, the AIP system will be used.
  - For courses where there is not a traditional textbook, coursepacks are prepared with Xanadu. Suggest reaching out to B&N directly with those questions.
  - Intend to communicate this broadly to campus. Archival and sharing of information should really help lower costs to our students and is one of the main reasons B&N was chosen.

X. Presentation on HR’s Priorities for AY2019-20 and Update on Virgin Pulse/Wellness – Ms. Claudia Paetsch, Vice President for Human Resources
  - During first weeks on campus asked many areas for their impressions of HR and learned that those impressions vary widely across campus. Few people have experienced the entirety of HR. Believes there is a great opportunity to educate campus on what HR is and what it isn’t.
  - Some opportunity is very aspirational, while some is not yet formed in her mind; bring thoughts, concerns, comments to her attention.
  - Forming objectives that intend to use HR structures, processes and competencies to align with Beyond Boundaries Priorities/Pillars and Strategies to achieve Marquette’s mission and vision.
    - A: One example is the effort to provide meaningful and holistic total rewards, including health and well-being, pay, family & work-life balance, additional programs, financial security, and development & growth.
  - Explanation of what to expect in Wellness Program Changes for 2020 (Virgin Pulse)
    - Understand that Virgin Pulse was a 180-degree change from the previous wellness program. The health care task force learned very late in the process that our previous vendor had been sold to Virgin Pulse and are now in a 3-year commitment to that program.
    - HR has heard the concerns voiced about the program and has made some changes for next year.
    - Beginning in January 2020, spouses will earn points separately, points requirements have been lowered, and there will be more and more varied opportunities to earn significant points.
    - Beginning in January 2020, the program timeframe has been shortened to 9 months which will ultimately align better with the enrollment period.
  - Discussion and Questions
    - Will health risk assessments and biometric screening remain part of the program?
      - A: The association between wellness and saving money is difficult to prove. The benefit of a wellness program is about engagement and awareness. Healthcare costs in Milwaukee are higher than the national average. HR trying to manage this as much as possible.
    - Concern that wellness policy discriminates based on marital status depending on whether both spouses participate and earn points in the wellness program.
A: Beginning in January 2020, each spouse will separately earn points toward the $250 on the plan.

- Research indicates that employee wellness programs have no significant affect in lowering healthcare costs. What is the rationale for the program to be used if we are trying to reduce costs? Wellness that promises more about become more active and promotes participation is the good outcome.
  - A: The rationale is that it is primarily about engaging people.
- Why don’t we do things that have been shown to work in other organizations such as reduced-price bus passes, gym memberships, etc.?
  - A: As review of Total Rewards program, will consider all of those things.
- How does the wellness program work for employees with disabilities who cannot necessarily do the same activities as others?
  - A: There is a waiver process available for those employees. Contact HR Benefits for more information.

- Reach out to Claudia with other questions.

**XI. University Board of Graduate Studies – Dr. Ed Blumenthal, Chair**

Informed on motion (to be voted on at next meeting): To approve the proposed changes to the University Academic Senate statutes related to the University Board of Graduate Studies (Article 4, Section 2.03)

- Three changes proposed
  - Creates efficiency in process – rationale is that there is a process for program assessment; UBGS interested in program assessment but not necessary for them to do assessments on their own.
  - Program review process in place to consider graduate program quality
  - Splits up current statute 4 regarding interdisciplinary doctorate programs.

- **Discussion / Questions**
  - Regarding interdisciplinary degrees, is there sufficient representation on UBGS for the normal primary users?
    - A: UBGS has representation from across all colleges. Does not necessarily reflect the departments that are the heaviest users, but there is broad representation across disciplines/colleges.

**XII. Discussion of Demonstration Policy UPP – Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay, Chair**

- Draft of work-in-progress document was circulated, including a “track-changes” review.
- Side-by-side comparison was presented reflecting the changes between the current policy and the proposed draft.
- Recommendations to make changes/comments on this proposed draft (Draft of 9-9-19) should be sent to Sumana Chattopadhyay for sharing.

- **Discussion / Questions**
  - Who all worked on the proposed new policy?
    - A: Many different offices on campus – provost, HR, OGC, Senate Executive Committee, student government
  - Was the intent to make the policy something that didn’t make any substantive changes?
    - A: Intent was not that it be viewed as inflammatory; correct that much of the revision is not a substantive change.
  - Challenge the logic of the policy in the first place as it seems the policy was designed to respond to activities of our non-tenure track faculty. The ability of the university to implement a policy that restricts the faculty without the input of the faculty...how is that shared governance? If the goal of the policy is to balance competing rights, could we not achieve that with the safety issue? Seems there is no need to also limit locations.
    - A: Heard from faculty that the process violated trust. Administration needs to gain that trust back. Provost has already engaged with faculty senate. How do we create the time when we are able to have the broader conversation and about what items. For example, considering the inclement weather policy. Is that something that needs to be considered by the full faculty? Are looking at ways to make it better going forward.
  - Entirely in support of the idea of balancing conflicting rights. On page 5, stated policy would seem to be a blanket permission to the university to surveil any kind of demonstrations with recorded equipment. Are there any limits to that? Do demonstrators have any right to privacy?
    - A: At any time, there may be cameras; similar to media being present at any time.
  - This process is not necessarily to provide answers, but rather we are soliciting feedback. It is an ongoing conversation and the feedback is helpful. Please forward!
  - The transparency question about this policy is about whether what is designated “offensive” is come to by a fair process as opposed to a biased process.
  - Seems like a lot of what is in the process could be incorporated into what MU has in its public safety policy? Is it important to have a policy that specifically targets speech? If the speech becomes a nuisance, it could be policed at that point in time.
A: Demonstration policy has been in place for decades. This is more about the spaces. People don’t need to get prior approval for those public spaces. We value free expression, but we encourage you to express yourself in the most visible public spaces.

- Have been many conversations locally about demonstrations, especially with DNC coming. Are we putting MUPD in a position that is not in the same vein as local conversations.
- Faculty Handbook has a whole description of how shared governance is supposed to work. We seem to be losing our way – perhaps we could get back to the basics.
- University has been placed in a bad light. We seem to have enacted a policy that has been run through by an interim leadership.

Discussion of the demonstration policy included the following comments regarding the College of Education and shared governance in general.

- As a student, keeps hearing “what’s going on at Marquette;” it is hard to keep hearing that being asked.
- Was stated that the College of Education was seeing some “major changes.” College students, faculty and staff have not been updated. What is the administration actually trying to do to increase transparency?
  
  - A: Conversation began with the dean some time ago; are constantly monitoring ways to keep costs down for students and how do we make certain that faculty have necessary resources; have met with faculty and explained. What makes us great? Is it about supporting faculty, students, best programs, etc.? Is it the organizational structure itself or the people and content of the programs.

- In response to your answer about the College of Education, your job as provost is to ask what makes a program great. The real question is who you ask that question to? That’s a transparency question/issue.

Chair thanked everyone for their comments and questions. The questions regarding shared governance are valid. Don’t have control of this kind of policy in the Senate by-laws. These are the kind of conversations we want to have.

- There are questions of policies over which the Senate should have purview. Members can expect to see further discussion and a motion at an upcoming meeting.

XIII. Adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

- Motion to adjourn: Dr. Lars Olsen
- Second: Dr. Kim Factor
- Passed by voice vote

Respectfully submitted,
Mr. Bruce Boyden
UAS Secretary

The next meeting will be Monday, October 21, 2019 at 3:00 p.m. in AMU Ballroom CD.