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

II. Reflection was given by Dr. William Lobb

III. Approval of September 16, 2019 minutes
  o Motion to approve: Dr. Tim Melchert
  o Second: Ms. Katie Blank
  o Passed by voice vote.

IV. Chair’s Report – Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay
  o Update on UPP 6-11 Demonstration Policy
    • Thanks to all who sent feedback
    • Feedback provided to Faculty Council; working to incorporate thoughts from emails and the discussion on Senate floor. Faculty Council meeting later in the month to work on the draft.
    • Staff Senate and MUSG are also considering policy.
    • Feedback from all will go to a group within the Office of General Counsel. University’s UPP committee will review and then forward to Kimo and Joel. Will come back to Senate in the future.
    • General process for policy review to be discussed later in this meeting.
  o Notification on UPP 6-10 Non-Permanent Signage Policy
    • Policy was created last year. Major changes between current policy and proposed policy were shared.
    • Email to Sumana by Oct 25 with any suggested ideas/changes so that she can submit to UPP review committee.
    • These are the proposed changes; have not yet gone into effect.
  o College of Education update
    • Senate received an email from Sumana; College has just asked that UAS be kept in the loop
    • A task force has been formed to review the College and plans for future
  o Faculty Council update
    • Working on demonstration policy
    • Will help with statutes for a policy review committee, pending outcome of later agenda item
  o All Senate members are invited for meetings with provost search finalists. Hope to have as many Senators as possible participate in this process. Watch for meeting invitations.

V. Report from the Participating Faculty Task Force – Mr. Patrick Loftis, Task Force Co-chair
  o Report of the work that was done over the summer. As a NTT faculty member that has been around for some time, he was asked to serve on the task force.
  o Convened in May – provost shared charge and composition; charged to review and make recommendations.
  o In order to get information in an efficient manner, set up several listening lunches; five were well attended and in total, 27 participating faculty attended; 67 people responded to an anonymous online questionnaire.
Task Force was given access to the results of a 2015 survey of part-time faculty.

Dean’s office reps produced policies and procedures across all colleges and schools pertaining to treatment of participating and part-time faculty.

Obtained comparative data from 18 peer, aspirational, and local universities, and also the CUPAHR study.

Findings of lived experience showed inconsistency and inequity in matters related to contract length, renewal notification, compensation, titles, performance evaluations, promotion opportunities, recognition, and respect/inclusion.

- This varied from terribly unhappy to things are great/I don’t want to change anything.
- Policies and procedures are well aligned with other institutions, but some are missing or need work.
- Benefits are generally on par
- Compensation was mixed; part-time participating faculty are in line with peers; salaries of some full-time participating faculty were below the median.

Recommendations were grouped into five general areas and shared with the provost:

- Contract terms
  - Standardization, centralization, revise policy on multi-year contracts, timing of contract notification/course cancellation
- Compensation and total rewards
  - Develop plan to address those paid below the median; promotion standards and salary increases; standardized compensation policy and assess regularly; online teaching opportunities; parking rate options for part-time faculty
- Performance evaluation and promotion
  - Formal evaluation annually for full time, every two to three years for part-time; titles standardized; promotion standards exist and are followed consistently.
- Professional development
  - Provide opportunities; access to funds; allow to serve as co-PIs; direct independent studies; mentorship program; onboarding process (supervisors ensure new faculty understand, etc.)
- Recognition and inclusion
  - Recognize faculty formally; include in faculty and department/college events

Recommendations recognize that there are resource restraints; implementation will require ongoing discussions with a variety of campus stakeholders.

Overall part time per credit hour is about in line with peers, but some departments are below median.

Course cancellations: Learned from listening sessions and survey that PT faculty are scheduled to teach a specific course; if enrollment is such that the course would need to be cancelled, it is sometimes within a week of classes beginning that they learn it will be cancelled; much preparation has been done and compensation anticipated.

Not much data available on the lived experience outside this organization, so difficult to know how Marquette’s data compares with peer and local data. The lived experience within MU did not necessarily match up with compensation, etc. Responses were all over the board and it seems as though there is not a Marquette-specific problem relative to lived experience.

Graduate Student workforce is totally different from these PT/FT – so will be addressed separately in the future.

Comments from the Provost:

- Thanks to the task force, especially to co-chairs Pat Loftis and Gary Meyer
- Was able to sit in on listening sessions and appreciated the information that was shared
- Those who served on the Task Force and are interested in doing so, will continue to serve in the future.
- Provost asked the Task Force to determine the most pressing of the 22 recommendations that were presented to him. Task force identified the following recommendations as those to address first:
  - Multi-year contracts for participating/full-time faculty
  - Timely communication around contract renewals and course cancellations
  - Compensation – where are we? Have discovered that we are doing well in some areas and in others not so well. OIRA will begin looking at information in order to create a true compensation study.
  - Professional Development -- $5,000 has been set aside immediately for professional development of non-tenure track faculty. There is some variation across colleges as some colleges provide funds already. Will work to determine what should be the appropriate limits.
  - Will have regular outlets (social gatherings, lunches, etc.) to hear from participating faculty so we can continue to understand the challenges they face.
- Will begin immediate work on the five recommendations suggested and continue to consider the other recommendations moving forward.
VII. Introduction of Registrar Seth Zlotocha and Articulation of Priorities for AY2019-20

- Spent 14 years at UW-Milwaukee, the last 6 years as Registrar. Mission-driven nature of institution is what attracted him to Marquette.

- Office of the Registrar is part of enrollment management; traditional focus on maintaining the student’s record. In recent years, Registrars have had a more active role in facilitating student enrollment and success. Taking a campus-level view to issues on campus and finding efficiencies.

- Areas of focus for coming year will be on transfer policies (new enrollment markets/ streamline processes) and curriculum (facilitate time to degree / flexible and responsive processes).

- Way in which transfer credits, etc. are evaluated will be critical as we go forward; don’t want to create barriers for students. Reviewing transfer credit policy and the ways in which we evaluate credit.

- Will look at how we streamline processes – transfer students often make decisions in a more compressed timeframe than traditional students entering as freshmen.

- Curricular discussions are broad and center around how we list/schedule/define courses, etc. Value and time to degree is important to students today.

Discussion/Questions

- Q: Is there any way to help compensate or increase financial aid to students, especially transfer students, in fields that don’t have a high starting salary?
  - A: That comes from financial aid, not the registrar. Provost added that VPEM looks at funding and aid as
packages; works with a company that helps us shape classes and address needs. Have regular conversations regarding how we keep tuitions as low as possible and still have enough money to run the university.

- Q: Are we looking at dual-enrollment?
  - A: Yes, will be looking at that as part of the process; can help with time to degree. Has great advantages for students.

- Q: In talking with people in the colleges that do data management and course scheduling, it seems as though maybe we don’t have the tools and processes in place to make that process as efficient as possible. Can you talk about your experience with various systems?
  - A: Today we don’t really have a specific system in place for those processes; the move to vendor-based systems has eliminated some of the more institution-specific aids to the process. Are trying to integrate and streamline processes to make the systems the best possible.

VIII. Report from ad hoc committee on Marquette Intellectual Property Policy and Report Discussion – Professors Kali Murray and Bruce Boyden

**Motion to approve**: To approve replacing Marquette’s current Intellectual Property Policy with a revised policy

- Later agenda item will discuss how the university keeps itself informed about policy changes. Committee considering this policy believed important to have a mechanism in place for considering these types of changes.
- Review committee was formed to consider this policy after many comments and concerns. Thank you to Jessica Franken of Office of General Counsel for her work on this policy.
- Committee’s motion is whether the Senate should approve the revised IP policy.
  - In short, the revised policy has several changes to clarify language.
  - It is a shorter and more concise policy.
  - Most significant changes are relative to university use of faculty-prepared material in the classroom. Added a sentence at the beginning to make it clear what this provision does.
  - Important clarifications on limitations:
    - Committee had discussion about how the assertion of time limit would occur. Electronic courses are handled separately; this language has always been in the policy. Policy links the language to that which covers online courses; they are handled and addressed separately.
  - Worth noting that the current license provision is much broader than the newly suggested policy.
- Review committee recommends that Senate adopt the provisions proposed.
- **Discussion/Questions**
  - Q: Why is there no compensation for faculty that develop material.
    - A: *This provision intended to ensure that we have consistency across sections; the language in IV.B.3.b allows faculty to retain ownership of unique courses. The university needs a viable way to ensure consistency across sections. Faculty previously did not have an idea of what was owned and what was not owned. This policy actually makes things much clearer.*
  - Q: Infers that the 5 years is a change to the policy.
    - A: Yes, it is.
  - Q: Why five years?
    - A: *Did not want it to be perpetual. Five years seems to be pretty consistent across peer institutions; a good, middle-of-the-road time period.*
  - Q: Relative to record-keeping, University Archives can still keep that material, right? Is there any problem with the 5-year limit? For an example, if an alum asks for a past syllabus, want to make sure there are no problems with providing that information.
    - A: *There are exceptions for libraries that pertain to archival of materials.*

**Motion to approve** the university’s adoption of this revised IP policy in its October 7, 2019 form is on the table.

Second of motion: Dr. Lars Olson

**Passed** by unanimous voice vote with no abstentions.

- Kali Murray, Bruce Boyden, and the committee that worked to review this policy were thanked for the quick work and turnaround.

IX. Revision to Statutes from Executive Committee – Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay, Senate Chair and Professor Bruce Boyden, Senate Secretary

**Motion to charge**: To task the Faculty Council with drafting a proposed revision to the UAS Statutes to form a new standing committee of the Senate, tentatively titled the Senate Policy Committee, patterned after statutes at Emory
University and Indiana University, that will have as its charge the review of new or existing policies relating to matters that affect the interests of University faculty.

- Following recent proposed policy changes (specifically the IP policy), University Academic Senate Executive Committee had discussions about how Senate can keep itself informed of proposed policy changes. Some universities have a policy review committee as a part of their faculty council/senate.
- Executive Committee is hesitant to create another committee which adds another service commitment for university faculty. Seems as though this might be a good thing to investigate and consider.
- Important to shared governance; have purview over academic policies but don't always know what else is going on relative to policies and procedures. A policy review committee might be more efficient and assist in being informed of things being considered on campus.
- Until a policy review body is in place for UAS, Senate Executive Committee will consider what things are important for Senate consider.

Motion to charge the Faculty Council with drafting a proposed revision to the UAS statutes is on the table. Second of motion: Dr. Tim Melchert
Passed by unanimous voice vote with no abstentions.

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

Motion to approve: To approve the proposed changes to the University Academic Senate statutes related to the University Board of Graduate Studies (Article 4, Section 2.03)

- Gives primary responsibility for assessment to the assessment committee; program review to program review committee, etc.
- No questions
Passed by unanimous voice vote with no abstentions.

Motion to approve: To approve the proposed change to the Transfer of Credit policies that govern credits taken as part of a graduate certificate a Marquette. Change to the Graduate School Bulletin.

- Does not apply to everything and there may be a broader version in the future
- This change takes care of a glaring hole in the transfer policy that we would like to close.
- No questions
Passed by unanimous voice vote with no abstentions.

Informed on motion: Change to the Faculty Credentialing Policy on the Office of the Provost’s website regarding the composition of Master’s thesis committees, stating that each committee much be chaired or co-chaired by a regular faculty member.

- Previously considered a question indicating that emeritus or participating faculty could co-chair dissertation committees.
- This change addresses the similar situation of service as co-chair of master’s thesis committees.
- No questions

XI. Committee on Diversity and Equity – Position Statement on Ombuds Office – Dr. Monica Adya, Committee Chair

- After becoming aware of the September 10 closing of the Office of the Ombuds, the Committee on Diversity and Equity drafted a memo sharing concerns about the decision and sent a memo to the President and Provost on October 17 (copies distributed).
- It was learned through communication with Dr. Kerry Egdorf that the office had been terminated and an automated email response listed other parties that could be consulted.
- There are concerns about the fact that the entities indicated as possible alternatives were not necessarily “neutral” parties and were not internal to Marquette, giving them an understanding of the specifics of our institution. At least one is a third party. Many are tightly staffed and are primarily focused on students; supporting faculty and staff would diminish their ability to support our students.
- Concerns were also expressed about the reporting structure of various resources noted.
- The elimination of the Office of the Ombuds means we have lost a designated neutral office within the university.
- Broader communication to campus is needed.
- Concerns that closing of this office seemed to be a message that a holistic view of the campus was ignored.
- Memo asks if it is possible to reconsider this decision.

XII. Discussion of Office of the Ombuds Closing – Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay, Senate Chair
For the purposes of discussion, agenda items XI and XII are combined.

Discussion / Questions

- UAS Chair received emails from faculty who missed information about the office being closed; found out from student media.
- Title IX coordinator does not handle other kinds of cases – only those specific to Title IX.
- Should be understood that the Office of the Ombuds was created as a result of the Gender Equity Report. Many feel that diversity planning on this campus has come and gone in waves. Diversity planning and efforts need to be consistent and need to be considered in a historical context. Decision to close this office appears to have been made without being fully informed as to the history of where it came from/was developed. Important to note that Ombuds cannot disclose any facts about the value of the position due to total commitment to confidentiality.
- As women faculty, we need this position; has seen situations where individuals are in direct conflict with supervisors.
- Having an Ombuds plays a huge role in retaining (not just recruiting) diverse faculty.
- Diversity planning on campus needs to be holistic and consider the parties that are impacted by the decision. At the time the decision was made to close the office, it appears to not be well understood.
- Nothing listed here would have or could have addressed one members’ specific problem with the way she was treated, belittled, intimidated by her department chair. Ombuds can attend a meeting to make sure that those kinds of things do not happen in meetings and to make sure that folks are entitled to a space where they feel safe. Particular situation was not sex discrimination and therefore could not go to Title IX.
  - A: Provost cannot speak to what happened in past; can assure that where instances like that have happened in the last year, he has acted swiftly and without hesitation. Marquette wants to be a safe place and are trying to put the pieces in place to make sure it is a safe place.
  - Will take to President Lovell and share concerns being expressed.
  - Employee Resource Groups – there are many on campus and hope to see more in place. Those are part of the ways to be able to get some feedback for the university.
- Employee Resource Groups are affinity groups, they have no sort of power on this campus. Don’t know what mechanism they would be to bring grievances. These types of actions (cutting Ombuds) make it difficult to recruit and retain diverse candidates.
- None of these resources make faculty of color comfortable. Faculty don’t want to go to an outside resource, faculty affairs has a power position over faculty; don’t seem to see any resources that would be helpful (doesn’t see true efforts to support diversity)
  - A: Diversity and inclusion is a priority; need a plan to support faculty and students and to recruit and retain individuals. MU today has the most diverse faculty in the history of Marquette – doubled since 2002. Are making good progress in the areas of diversity.
- Diversity statistics are fine, but inclusion needs a lot of work.
- Should be equity, not just diversity and inclusion. Ombuds position is an equity position. Attempts to shift dynamic between a junior faculty and an older individual (or more senior).
- Has been an unsuccessful dynamic between male and female faculty – we have much equity that needs to be addressed – not just diversity and inclusion. Need administration to stand for equity as well.
- Point is about decision-making at highest levels of Marquette. We’ve been talking issues that are of importance to junior and other faculty. The issue is about hearing and listening to what is important to people. This is not about the 74 positions that were eliminated, it is about one part-time position. Hoping for a little more thought and consideration about what this really means to people. There is something else that is behind this that is causing people to feel so strongly about it. Difficult path ahead and without the ability to make small concessions that have a large impact on people, we aren’t going to make it. People must feel empowered to get through what we need to get through over the next 8 to 10 years. People are feeling disconnected about the way that decisions are being made.
- Doing a web search, had a hard time finding a university that didn’t have an Ombuds office – all peer institutions have one; big and mid-size large companies. There are needs to prioritize, but it seems odd that an institution of this size wouldn’t have an Ombuds – with this many employees, departments, etc. Why would we do that?
  - A: Provost just returned from a meeting of 22 of the 27 AJCU provosts. Got some insight about their Ombuds programs. Only 2 of the 22 present said they had an Ombuds. Their conversation was similar to what we have and that there are other sorts of experiences they have for their faculty.
- Regardless of what other universities are doing, there are clearly strong opinions about this. Are missing some type of university shared governance level that would allow us to have these types of discussions before decisions were made.
• Student perspective – students are terrified about what might happen to their programs. Professors don’t have an answer because there is no discussion in advance of decisions being made.
• At the last meeting of the Committee on Diversity and Equity it was determined that UAS statutes on the committee will have to be revised as the ex-officio positions are gone or renamed. Committee discussion included questions of how to plan for a process on diversity where it appears that inconsistent decisions are being made. Diversity planning has been chaotic and needs to change; faculty trying to be responsive to a chaotic situation. Diversity planning must be strategic at its core.
• UAS Chair has also received emails from individuals sharing their concerns on this matter.
• Will need a UAS volunteer for the new campus climate study.

XIII. Adjourned at 5:10 p.m.
  o Motion to adjourn: Dr. Tim Melchert
  o Second: Mr. Michael Danduran
  o Passed by voice vote

Respectfully submitted,
Mr. Bruce Boyden
UAS Secretary

The next meeting will be Monday, November 18, 2019 at 3:00 p.m. in AMU Ballroom CD.