Members in attendance: Dr. Allison Abbott, Dr. Kimo Ah Yun, Ms. Katie Blank, Ms. Rebecca Blemberg, Dr. Heidi Bostic, Dr. Noelle Brigden, Dr. Joshua Burns, Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay, Dr. Alexandra Crampton, Mr. Michael Danduran, Dr. Joseph Domblesky, Dr. Michael Donoghue, Mr. Atiba Ellis, Dr. Kim Factor, Dr. Marilyn Frenn, Dr. Arndt Guentsch, Mr. Tim Houge, Dr. Yasser Khaled, Dr. Chima Korieh, Dr. William Lobb, Mr. Patrick Loftis, Dr. Tim Melchert, Dr. Michelle Mynlieff, Dr. Lars Olson, Ms. Samari Price, Ms. Taylor Ralph, Dr. Madeline Schmidt, Dr. John Su, Ms. Regina Vela-Mesta, Mr. A. Jay Wagner, Dr. Doris Walker-Dalhouse, Dr. Miao (Grace) Wang, Dr. David Wangrow, Mrs. Janice Welburn, Dr. Amber Wichowsky, Ms. Mary Jo Wiemiller, Dr. Doug Woods

Members excused:

Members not present:

Guests: see spreadsheet for full attendance list

I. The Chair observed a quorum and called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

II. Reflection was given by Dr. Amber Wichowsky

III. Approval of November 16, 2020 meeting minutes (Att. III)
   - Motion to approve: Dr. Doris Walker-Dalhouse
   - Second: Dr. Marilyn Frenn
   - Passed without objection

IV. Chair’s Report – Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay
   - We met last Wednesday for the special session of the Senate in which the work groups presented their recommendations and feedback was solicited. We heard interest in getting more student feedback into the process, so we are working on that and will share more information in the following days. To note, we do have faculty representation in all of the work groups, and I will be representing UAS in the final discussions.
   - Dr. Alex Crampton (representing Faculty Council), Ms. Cliona Draper (representing Staff Senate) and I (representing Academic Senate) interviewed ELT last week. We asked them questions that were sent to us by faculty and staff. This video has been posted to the Economic Planning website. It has also been posted to the UAS Teams website.
   - Reminder to complete the faculty academic instruction survey by Tuesday, December 15. The survey generates some valuable data for campus. I can send you the link if you need it.

V. Vice Chair’s Report – Dr. Allison Abbott
   - One of my roles as Vice Chair is to serve as a liaison between Senate and Faculty Council. Faculty Council is one of the standing committees that reports to UAS. It comprises 12 faculty members who provide representation from each of the colleges as well as the library. It has three main roles: 1) monitors academic governance issues, 2) pursues planning in regard to the academic mission and can be tasked with addressing specific issues or policy objectives by UAS or Provost, and 3) provides consultation in regard to faculty welfare.
   - Faculty Council has received numerous emails from faculty who have voiced concerns about the academic planning and budgeting process; therefore, Faculty Council put forth an open letter that incorporates many of these concerns. However, we recognize this does not represent all faculty perspectives. We ask that all faculty submit their input to us, so we are aware of all viewpoints.
   - Faculty concerns are also represented in the proposed resolution from the Marquette chapter of the AAUP. Faculty Council has been in discussion and supports the UAS taking up the resolution today for discussion with voting in January. We will report formally in January where we are in the endorsement process of this resolution.
   - A key concern in Faculty Council is about the timing and process for inclusion of faculty in what has been a difficult process. Faculty Council does have representation within all of the planning work groups. The Faculty Council Chair and Vice Chair have been included in the academic planning leaders’ meetings as well given access to the work group Teams site. During the second week in January, the Faculty Council Executive Committee and UAS Executive Committee will receive the Provost’s integrated recommendations and will be able to provide feedback. We continue to work collaboratively to support faculty and the academic mission at Marquette.
VI. Secretary’s Report – Ms. Rebecca Blemberg
   o Call for nominations for spring elections shortly after return from break: two at-large faculty openings, one part-time at-large position, as well as a few openings on faculty hearing committee. Please let me know if you are interested or if you would like to nominate a colleague.

VII. Provost’s Report – Dr. Kimo Ah Yun, Provost
   o Provost Ah Yun thanks everyone who has been engaged in this process. He has been listening to the voices in the campus community through virtual coffee chats and direct work with the UAS, and has recently become more engaged with the Faculty Council. Additionally, the provost has gotten involved in smaller group conversations and has found these very useful. He receives a considerable number of emails as well.
   o We know we have some difficult challenges ahead of us, and that will force us to think about how to best serve our mission with the different resources available to us and how to best protect the most important aspects. People continue to be concerned about the nonacademic side, and the provost continues to monitor that. There will be substantial reductions on the nonacademic side. People can continue to provide feedback about the nonacademic side through the portal on the economic planning website. Continue to stay involved and stay connected so I can hear you; this will help me.
   o Enrollment is the major driver of the financial challenge we find ourselves in. We are still early in the enrollment process, and we are tracking against our current 1650-student class. We have a target to get to 1770 to start next fall. We would absolutely like this number to be higher, and we are continually monitoring it. As of today, we have 2.1% fewer applications than we had last year at this time. We are down 0.6% in completed applications. We are up 7.6% in admitted individuals. However, the most important element is deposits, and we are down 11.4% (this represents who we know will come to Marquette). Remember that we are benchmarking this against our 1650 class from this AY, and what we are looking for is a 1770 class. This means that we need to have 7% more deposits in comparison to last year to be able to hit our 1770 mark. The gap for deposits of where we are at now versus where we need to be is 18.4%; we are below pace. It is early in the process and we are doing everything we can to convert our applications into deposits, and we will continue to work on this. I wanted to keep you all posted about where we are with enrollment.

VIII. University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure – Dr. Gary Meyer, Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

   Motion to approve: Statutes on Faculty Appointment, Promotion and Tenure changes, Chapters 304.02 (Att. Villa) and 302.03 (Att. Villa)
   o The last time I was with you, I suggested some proposed changes to 304.02 to the faculty handbook as well as a small change to 302.03 section 1b1, which is where that last paragraph first reference ‘terminal degree’. The basic premise is to remove language from the faculty handbook that moves faculty to a tenured rank without an evaluation, which is inconsistent with our general philosophy as well as other parts of the faculty handbook. This comes to you from the University Committee for Faculty Promotion & Tenure. We identified this as being problematic and contradictory in April or May of 2020, and now it comes before you.

   o Discussion/Questions:
     • Senate Chair – are there any questions for Gary? We did have a discussion about this change and talked about the need for it at the last meeting.
     • Q: Is the Senate voting on this today? Will there be discussion first?
       ▪ A: Sumana – yes, we will be voting on it today. Once we have the motion we will also have a discussion on it.
     • Q: Is tabling an option? I have not had time to think about this with everything else going on. Any change to the faculty handbook needs very serious consideration, because the language that has been cited here has its origins from language that comes from the AAUP from the 1940 statement. I would approach this with extreme caution before making any changes. I have not looked into the implications of changing this language.
       ▪ A: Sumana – it depends upon what the Senators say. If you have comments, please share. If I may call on Tim Melchert to talk about this because he explained this well at the last meeting.
       ▪ A: Tim – I came to Marquette as a new department chair in 1998 and I noticed that this language appeared in our statutes and conflicted with the necessity for going through the normal tenure and promotion review. I asked about it at that time and was basically told to ignore it. It is clearly outdated, no one knows the origin of this, and it has not been the practice for many decades. It happens in statutes that things become outdated and people don’t remove language...
when new procedures replace it. I have been asking about this for decades and no one has been able to clarify it any more than that.

- Gary – this comes from a 1940s statement from the AAUP, and I had mentioned that the last time we met. We had noted on the university committee that part of the problem is that this language came about before such things as parental leaves or COVID leaves. What we do now is grant leaves to our pre-tenured faculty in order to recognize that they need some time based upon circumstances. If we were to live by this language, we would have many faculty promoted without any evaluation whatsoever. That is not what any of us intended to happen. If you look at 304.08, it says the opposite. If we don’t want to vote on this, then how do we reconcile the contradictory language in the faculty handbook? Version one eliminates this language and makes it clean. Version two provides an alternative. It leaves the language in there but rectifies that contradictory language by advancing the number of years equal to the number of leaves that a faculty member has received. The university Committee on Faculty Promotion and Tenure recommends version one but provides version two as an alternative. Version one is the much cleaner version of this.

- Comment: I really feel like we need to go back to the provost’s numbers. We need to have discussions about this. If we have too many items to discuss, then perhaps we need to rethink the agenda.

  - Chair: thank you for your comments. There will be other opportunities to talk about this. Would anyone else like to comment on the motion?

- Q: Are we voting on accepting version one?

  - A: Gary – yes, the university committee believes this to be the best choice.

- Senate Secretary - Because this it coming from a standing committee, we just have to have to vote on the motion.

- Senate Chair – If you are voting against, please raise your hand.

- Senators vote on accepting version one as recommended by

  o Motion to approve: comes from standing committee
  o Passed with one objection from Tim Houge; all others in favor.

IX. Presentation on the Work to Date of the Student Body Work Group – Dr. William Welburn and Mr. Michael Danduran, Work Group Co-leads (3:37 to 3:52)

  - Michael shares the list of the work group members and advises that feedback can be directed to any of the members. Michael reviews the long-term charge of the work group. Through the process, the work group has received important feedback from faculty, staff and students, which has led to some global priority areas: admissions practices, diversity issues and student affairs, maintaining the Core and Jesuit ideals, high impact learning, maintaining / improving the university’s ranking. The three major areas that we have broken this down into are 1) Admissions (projections and programmatic trends), 2) Recruitment/Retention (academic/nonacademic considerations, student affairs, diversity & equity, and student experience) and 3) Mission/Values (Marquette education and Jesuit/Ignatian ideology). We are looking at enrollment and the inputs that go into the formulas, including the financial inputs and the amount of aid that can be offered. We want to look at programmatic trends at both the undergraduate and graduate level. We are also looking at destination colleges and majors and potential growth. In our last meeting we discussed whether or not we had a preference toward being a residential campus; and everything for the undergraduate experience pointed toward being residential. We also looked at the cost of educating a student and the resources that we have to support diversity and equality. What is the strain on Student Affairs right now and how does this play a role in recruitment? When potential students come to tour Marquette, they think about where they will sleep, where they will eat, and where they will experience their life on campus. Finally, all of this will play into our US News & World rankings that we need to maintain. We have to think about high-impact learning and ensuring mission-focused practices. We have met with some of the Jesuit community to help ensure that we can continue to do this. We have met with the Admissions department on numerous occasions and we are looking at OIRA data and trends, including minors. We think about financial aid in the next five to ten years and how colleges can play a supporting role in fundraising for this initiative, diversity and equity, recruitment and retention, adapting to national trends. How can we think about the delivery of the core across campus and within the majors? And how can this play into recruitment and the responsibilities of the colleges in supporting these roles? We are a long-term charge and are not making any high-level money-saving recommendations. We are trying to maintain access to high-impact learning practices; these will look different for each college and discipline. We are also looking at interprofessional and interactive experiences for students through corporate engagement, especially for low-income students who need to work multiple jobs to pay for their tuition.
Discussion/Questions:

- Q: As the GSO representative to UAS, I have to ask where is the student input and why is it not at the forefront of the decision-making? How are we fielding student ideas? What ideas do you have to circumvent student surveys (due to survey fatigue) and engage the student body?
  - A: Michael – we set up listening sessions with some student groups on campus such as the student tour guides (representing a large and diverse group of students) and student groups within certain colleges. I have also had individual conversations with students. We have looked at student data from a retention standpoint as well as admissions data for the students who chose not to come to Marquette. Finally, we have looked at graduation and exit surveys to see satisfaction scores and other things. We plan to continue to elicit feedback from students.
  - A: William – in terms of survey data from surveys, OIRA has an ample amount of useful data. I agree that it is very important to talk to students; however, the question is ‘when’? I think it is important for this committee to have a basic working knowledge of the structures that our students are engaged in so we can maximize the time we spend with them. To understand the nature of how environments are structured, which is what we are getting right now through conversations with people like Dr. Xavier Cole, is essential for us to really understand how things are working in the student experience. I agree that we need to talk to students, but we need to be prepared in order to get the most out of those opportunities.

- Q: I was curious about two things as you look forward to 2026 in terms of student enrollment: 1) the mix of Grad vs UG programming and 2) online vs in-person programming. Is there good research or other information to suggest what the mix of those might be?
  - A: Michael – I would only be guessing about the mix. I think certain programs have better opportunity to deliver online education. In my conversations with Student Affairs and other leadership, we discussed the undergraduate perspective and to maintain the Jesuit mission, the best thing for us to do is to remain a residential campus. That does not mean that we cannot explore options to expand the online educational opportunity. I think there are specific graduate programs that lend themselves very well to online education and could potentially increase the percentage of students within that model.

X. University Board of Undergraduate Studies – Dr. John Su, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
Informed on decision: Changes to Section 10 of the Academic Approval Process related to Approval/Review for changes other than modification (Att. X)

- What comes before you is an informed on decision which does not require your vote. This was evaluated first by UBGS and subsequently UBUS, and I am presenting on their behalf. The change comes in section 10 of the academic program guidelines on the provost’s website and focuses on a narrow addition. It essentially indicates that vice provost of graduate and professional studies / dean of graduate school evaluates the accelerated degree programs and will be able to consult with both UBUS and UBGS. The reason for the change is that previously ADPs had been evaluated exclusively through UBGS and the vice provost for graduate and professional studies / dean of the graduate school. As we are increasing looking toward ADPs as a recruiting tool for undergraduates and the implications for undergraduate curricula, our colleagues felt it was important to add this additional line so that we are having a good consultation and communication across our committees.

XI. University Board of Undergraduate Studies and University Board of Graduate Studies – Dr. John Su, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs; and Dr. Douglas Woods, Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Studies
Informed on decision: Department name change from Clinical Laboratory Science to Medical Laboratory Science (Att. XI)

- On behalf of the UBGS and UBUS, this is an informed on decision which does not require your vote. The decision was made for the department name change from Clinical Laboratory Science to Medical Laboratory Science. We have reviewed practices across all colleges at the undergraduate and graduate level and felt this decision makes a lot of sense.

XII. University Board of Graduate Studies – Dr. Douglas Woods, Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Studies (4:00 to 4:05)
Informed on decision: New Accelerated Degree Program in Master of Science in Data Science (Att. Xila)

- Doug – as you know the last senate meeting, the Senate approved the Master of Science in Data Science. The
degree passed the BOT at the last meeting. The department has requested the creation, based on that degree, of an accelerated degree option for that Masters. The colleges approved of the ADP pathway, and the MS in Data Science was approved by UBGS.

Informed on decision: Termination of PHIL-MA/JD Dual Degree Program (Att. XIIib)
- The termination of this program is coming at the request of the Dean of the College of A&S and the Dean of the Law School. They are recommending termination of the program because no one has been enrolled in the program for the last 35 years. UBGS is informing the Senate of the termination of this program.

XIII. Committee on Research – Presentation of Letter of Resolution on the Importance of Research and Scholarship at Marquette – Dr. Amy Van Hecke, Chair (4:05 to 4:20) (Att. XIII)
- COR is a committee that works in the background and we have a charge from UAS to do activities related to research (reviewing internal grants, steering the university in terms of its impact with research, etc.). It became apparent to us, in light of some of the changes we are experiencing, that we needed a formal statement about research at Marquette. Highlights: research has a very important impact on educational opportunities at Marquette. The modern student today is in need of high-impact experiential learning practices; research is used in this function. These learning opportunities are not otherwise available in other forms. Research informs our teaching, aids in recruitment and retention of students and contributes to their futures. Research-active faculty impact our rankings and reputation, and provide for collaborative experiences for students, like the COVID research initiative that was predominant this summer. Research has an impact on our community. As a Jesuit institution, we recognize that research finds solutions to help society, gives access to programs and knowledge, and contributes to the formation of a more just society. Our vision is that we are committing to Marquette being an active research university, engaging scholars, and improving students’ and community members’ lives. This statement was developed in the spirit of shared governance. We will be posting this to a new COR website for members of the community to sign as well.

- Motion to endorse the letter: Noelle Brigden
- Second: Amber Wichowsky
- Passed.

XIV. Honoring Marquette’s Promise of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion: A Joint Statement from the Committee on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion and the Committee on Teaching – Ms. Kali Murray, Chair, Committee on Diversity and Equity; and Dr. Cynthia Ellwood, Chair, Committee on Teaching (4:20 to 4:35) (Att. XIV)
- Cynthia – we are asking for UAS endorsement of the joint statement of the two committees honoring Marquette’s promise of equity, diversity and inclusion. Recognizing that we have a way to go as a university to fully honor our mission and our identity as an institution committed to justice, we have still made some progress and some promises in recent years with regard to diverse students, faculty, administration and staff, as well as scholarship opportunity. We believe that to not go forward on diversity, equity and inclusion is to go backwards. We believe in order to go forward, we need to center diversity, equity and inclusion.
- Kali – as we think about a process for planning that engages centrally with diversity, equity and inclusion, there are three key points as to why we would like a work group established in the economic planning process that would explicitly consider DEI. 1) The university has made normative commitments to DEI (examples: CORE, our series of commitments to African American students as well as Native American students, Beyond Boundaries, and large-scale cluster hires for REIS). We are concerned the Economic planning process is moving forward without an explicit consideration of these promises that we have made to our students. Any type of commitments made by current administration is built upon those made by previous administrations, and we want to make sure that these promises are met. Promises made should be promises kept. 2) There is a practical and legal risk to not having a DEI process. I have been at Marquette for thirteen years and too often DEI has been forgotten. I think we are now on our fourth or fifth affirmative plan. Regarding the legal aspect, there is sustained legal risk on a number of fronts not to have a group focused in on DEI. Risks may include significant gender harms, significant issues with recruitment and retention of African American and Latino faculty. There needs to be a process in which the Director of Affirmative Action reviews and analyzes the types of cuts. One of the real changes since the drafting of our faculty handbook and the last major revision is that the DOE and EOEC have increasingly treated universities as workplaces subject to employment discrimination laws. 3) An equitable process builds trust across communities. DEI is not simply an outcome; it is a process. Equitable processes lead to better results. There has been an erosion of trust within the last three to six months. We have the goals of a Jesuit university which are different than that of a corporation. We need a process that is grounded in DEI to more accurately and more faithfully fulfill the goals.
This case, I would like somebody.

XV. Proposed Resolution on Shared Governance – Mr. Doug Smith, President of Marquette University AAUP Chapter (4:35 to 5:00) (Att. XV)

- Senate Chair – the president of AAUP came to UAS EC with a request to present this proposed resolution, and we did approve the request to present. We will not vote today to take action on the resolution, but we can discuss it after we have received a motion to do so.
- Motion to discuss: John Su
- Second: Michael Donoghue

- Doug introduces himself as a fulltime NTT faculty member in COBA. The AAUP, including the Marquette chapter, is about shared governance which is a process in which faculty contribute to good decision-making. Faculty live and breathe the university mission every day through their teaching, research, and service; therefore, they know the academic mission better than anyone else on campus. You might be comfortable with the suggestions that a future Marquette University will no longer stand unreservedly for academic excellence and the liberal arts. These are the ideals that have helped Marquette survive every economic downturn since 1881. You might be comfortable with an economic planning process that has been so rushed and restricted in scope that the academic work groups could make almost no recommendations in time for last week’s presentation. You might be comfortable with the decision to eliminate faculty and staff in the middle of a pandemic and an economic recession to generate funds for unspecified future investments after years of failing to prepare for economic impacts. If you are comfortable with all of that, then you vote against this resolution. My colleagues and I who belong to and support the AAUP chapter (more than 65 of us) see a different path forward. A robust shared governance process is not an exercise in power transfer; it is not just a way to correct bad decisions before they are made. It is an important way for us to build community between administration and faculty by showing respect to one another as well as providing direction to live up to the university mission. In our view, if the UAS allows the economic planning process to move forward as it is currently designed without objection, the president and the board of trustees will take that acquiescence as permission to continue doing what they’ve already done. It is only faculty input that has resulted in some recent changes. If you believe that Marquette’s commitment to academic excellence and its Jesuit mission are not just important but paramount, that the university’s process for determining Marquette’s future is rushed and insufficient for meaningful shared governance, then you owe it to the institution and your fellow faculty who have placed you in this position to call on university administration to pause the process, reason together, redesign the process, and create one that will deliver a sound financial future that is consistent with our mission and our Catholic Jesuit identity. We need you to step up and say that this process is not designed to get us where we need to be.

- Motion to endorse the statement: Katie Blank
- Second: Noelle Brigden
- Passed without abstention

XV. Proposed Resolution on Shared Governance – Mr. Doug Smith, President of Marquette University AAUP Chapter (4:35 to 5:00) (Att. XV)
get my tenure buyout. I have received many emails from A&S (senator represents A&S), and every last one is in support of this resolution. I wish we were voting today because I would do what I was voted in to do and represent the people who have reached out to me and vote for it. I hope my replacement will do the same. I have been trying to get sit-ins and all sorts of things going for twenty years and have not been able to do it. We finally have something where people are rising up. I am tired of faculty members getting put on committees after something happens. We need to have faculty on committees before the decisions are made.

- Senator comment: I have received scores of very impassioned emails, overwhelming in support for slowing this process down and giving greater shared governance to faculty, Faculty Council, and particularly the NTT instructors. We seem to be getting differing information as well as changing numbers for the budget. Even though it doesn’t look as dire as it did a couple of months ago they want to maintain the same level of cuts apparently. Why aren’t the cuts being lowered if the budget is not as bad as originally thought? I want to express the heartfelt feelings of the faculty, staff, and NTT instructors to try to put the brakes on this and get more voices included in this process.

- Senator and Faculty Council representative comment: I want to push back a little in how this was set up; it is not quite so binary as Doug presented it as being on either side of this resolution. There are many points in this resolution that I am in support of, and there are many issues that we have put forth from Faculty Council in open letters that we continue to advocate for. I want to provide more room in the middle to allow for people to agree with some aspects of the resolution but not for all. It seems that this keeps getting rewritten and it is a moving target, but I do believe this has been done in a collaborative spirit with increased faculty participation. For example, Sumana and Alix were invited to be a part of the final half-day retreat where a lot of these decisions will be worked on then. I just want to make sure there is room for a spectrum of support rather than just being for us or against us. There can be more of a shade of grey for this resolution.

  - A: Senate Chair comment: this is what I have been hearing from people as well. I would like to hear from people who are not from A&S too. This is what I have been hearing from people who have been calling me – the AAUP chapter has a lot of A&S faculty in it; so I would also like to hear from people who are not from A&S. Don’t just call me; please speak up today.

- Comment: the reason why I think the resolution is worth supporting is because shared governance has meaning. It often is a term that is really vague, but the AAUP is trying to articulate what that means. It would be worth hearing from the people involved in the work groups to understand if they felt they had meaningful influence on the decisions. When you look at the process, faculty need to be an early part of it rather than just being consulted at some later point.

- Senator comment: I am a senator elected at-large, so I represent all of the faculty, so I second the call to hear from faculty outside of A&S as to their attitude toward this resolution. I would like to thank my colleagues in A&S who have sent me emails. I am deeply concerned about the concerns expressed (i.e., erosion of trust between certain members of the faculty and our administration). I call for improved shared governance. I am grateful for the authors of this resolution for putting these concerns into writing and coming before the Senate. I agree with Allison and I am deeply concerned as well that this approach is not actually going to resolve those issues for us. Ultimately this resolution as well as every resolution that comes before Senate is directed toward our BOT because they are the ones who allow us to do what we do via shared governance. The rhetorical question I have is: Would this resolution help or would it make these goals of improved shared governance and restoration of trust that much more difficult to obtain?

- Comment: Doug – to address Allison’s point, I don’t think it is possible for anyone to draft a resolution in advance that would have correctly predicted what all of the members of the UAS would want to see in a resolution. That is what the amendment process is for. I would expect if there are senators who disagree with one or more parts of the resolution would propose an amendment for it. The amendment would be debated and considered and voted upon. This would set the direction for going forward.

  - A: Senate Chair – that is correct. If you have suggestions to amend the language, please bring that forward before we vote on it in January.

- Senator comment: I have received many emails from faculty who I represent as a senator. I am very intrigued to hear what other faculty members outside of A&S have to say because the A&S faculty have been emailing me. But even in the feedback portal for the work groups, I feel the feedback is overwhelmingly A&S, and I really would like to hear more from the other colleges. As far as the resolution goes, there are certain aspects I agree with, but there has been really good work in the groups with
faculty involved. I believe the biggest issue is the lack of time and fast-paced nature of this. Whether or not faculty have a vote or whether or not our work is appreciated, we will not know until we see what they do with this information we are drafting. I don’t want to make an assumption that the administration will just ditch everything I did. I really hope they don’t. You also have to be a little careful here too. We want faculty involvement, but you have to understand the time commitment too. I have a very large work group and I cannot get everyone at the same committee meeting due to demanding schedules. The other thing that did not happen with this process was to look at faculty expertise. I had a phenomenal sub-group that looked at our mission statement, but the rest of the stuff we have to do is very data-dense. There was a lot of data that we had to go through and some faculty are just not good with data or do not have the time to parse through it.

- Senate Chair – Based on what I am hearing, the recommendations will be considered. I think the work will make a difference.

- Senator comment: in response to the resolution, all of our representatives from the various work groups have told me that they have gotten the information they asked for from administration in order to do their jobs. Certain work groups have said they needed more time for certain resolutions. It seems that may be a way to make shared governance work. I have always been a strong proponent of shared governance, and I feel that we have that representation across the university with UAS and FC. AAUP is a group of people who have decided to pay their dues. I appreciate the time they have invested in this, but I am not sure what this resolution would do in terms of decisions that need to be made quickly. The work streams are probably in the best position to determine if they need more time rather than AAUP and Senate passing a resolution. I do appreciate everyone’s time, however.

- Senator comment: I represent the COBA. I want to say within the COBA, I view my role on major issues such as this as being a representative of the college, elected by the college. I canvas people within the college, looking for input. On Friday, Dean Hanley sent out a summary of the proposal that Doug had made and asked comments to be directed to me and the other senator in the COBA. I will look to my colleagues in the COBA to direct my support. There are specific concerns that people feel this proposal may address in regards to numbers; they are contrary to what Marilyn said. I think most people who have been engaged in this process from the COBA feel that certain work groups have felt hamstrung by not having the information they have needed to do the level of analysis needed. There have been some concerns raised that we do not have an overarching strategy looking at how the different work groups fit together. Ultimately the question is what we want our Marquette graduates to look like when they come out of school. I would also say that there is concern about the possibility of greater impacts if we delay things. This is my view of where the COBA is at right now.

- Senator comment: I am speaking as a representative of the College of Communication. As my role I have heard a fair amount of unsolicited feedback and it is pretty much down the middle with regard to support and nonsupport. A few folks feel the AAUP is hijacking the faculty voice. There were also some questions about the inaccuracies [within the resolution]. Some have said they appreciated the AAUP for being progressive and pushing forward toward being an aspirational university. There is belief that a university should be forward-thinking and embrace change rather than going into a shell.

- A: Senate Chair – I am also from the College of Communication and the inaccuracies being pointed out are about some of the things that have already changed, so that can be addressed with regard to the language. Today is more about general feedback. There was a mention at one point in the resolution about the handbook not being followed in terms of consultation with Faculty Council. In terms of legal language, this is not correct because no termination decisions have been made. Our legal expert in the Senate Executive Committee said this is not legally correct. There was a discussion, however, about the spirit of shared governance and better two-way communication. There was also something else in the resolution about not having representation in the work groups, and even that has changed. Even Doug said that this is a moving target because things are evolving. But those things in the resolution will need to be amended if we vote on that because those things have changed since the resolution was originally drafted.

- Comment – I am not a representative of the law school, but I am speaking as an individual. Where I am supportive of the AAUP’s resolution as a member of the Marquette community is that I don’t think the current process has officially brought legitimacy to the interested stakeholders. I think having the AAUP’s resolution permits us as faculty to take a step back to think about what type of process we want and how to negotiate this process with the university. I think if I was an administrator I would want the AAUP to do
this because I think it will build legitimacy for decisions that need to be made. What I have observed going on is a lack of trust between all of the negotiating parties. Realistically, as a lawyer, I think there will be cuts, but I have questions about the extent and the expanse of the cuts. One of the things I really like about the AAUP proposal is that it thinks about us not just at this particular moment, but as a university that is engaged in a long-term creation of shared governance. I do think we need more robust and articulated shared governance vision at Marquette. What is happening right now is that we are conflating a larger debate about shared governance with this economic budget process, and it is creating tension. I think the AAUP proposal also helps us step back to think about what our history of shared governance is at Marquette. The AAUP is a consistent institutional player and we are going to draw on the type of work that they do throughout other college campuses to create a better process. I am actually very concerned about student voice in this process, and the ways in which we are not listening to and appreciating their voices in this process. We need a more robust and foundational structure for this budget process for the next three to four years. The AAUP proposal states that we will participate in this process as faculty which helps every interested stakeholder. Doug stated it correctly when he said that a poor process leads to poor outcomes. Everyone needs to have the same information for transparency sake, and we have to think about ways that we can get that information in order to assess it. I like Doug’s proposal because it helps us to step back and think about the larger problems in a sustained fashion.

- Senator comment: I am the co-chair of the discretionary expenses work group, and can give you my perspective. I would say that we have gotten very good cooperation with regard to pretty much anything we have asked for. We were given information promptly without anyone trying to get in the way; there was not a single instance in which it was difficult or slow to receive a response. As far as more time, we expected to complete our work this semester and we are on track. I don’t think we would want more time because we want to avoid micromanaging budgets across campus. We could study this and come up with highly specific recommendations, but we think that is the wrong approach. We want to give the colleges and departments the responsibility to make those detailed decisions. From my perspective, we would like to wrap up this process this semester and do not need more time.

- Senate Chair – for the last several weeks, all of the work group leaders have been meeting with the deans, so these groups have been in communication with each other. I have been able to join all of those meetings as well.

- Senator comment – I am speaking to you as a member of Academic Senate elected at large as well as a member of the executive committee of UAS, and also as a co-chair of the programs offering work group. I am really heartened by this afternoon’s discussion and hearing from colleagues engaging in this deliberation. These are really important decisions before us, so I appreciate this opportunity. I have heard from colleagues across the university in support of the AAUP resolution. I heard a lot of concerns about the budget that was released last week, particularly the $12.1mil set aside without much detail about what is informing those plans. I want to remind folks that in Dec 2019, Sumana had convened a meeting for shared governance and we recognized we did not have a representative on the university Financial Review Committee, and we wanted to make sure we had engaged faculty. The AAUP resolution addresses this concern. The second piece is about information and what access work groups have to information. I will say as a co-chair of a work group that we did solicit information. Some data we received and some we did not. Within the economic planning process, the academic work streams are just one piece of this. I have heard concerns from some of my colleagues that there is not faculty representation on any of the nonacademic work streams. When we shared these concerns with President Lovell and Provost Ah Yun last week, President Lovell seemed open to having UAS representation on those work streams, but that has not happened yet.
  - Senate Chair – I did get an email from President Lovell asking about names from the Senate, and we do have faculty in all of the groups. We will have senators in the groups soon as well; I just have to offer some names for those groups.

- Senator comments: This deliberation is moving us in a more productive direction, so that is really good. I would encourage people to read section 1 and section 1.02 of the faculty handbook that lays out what shared governance means and what are the sorts of things that faculty have input on. With regard to timeframes, I have received a lot of critical feedback from our programs offering work group presentation last week. With regard to the short-term recommendations, we did receive the data we requested and we also feel there is some urgency with the budget hole that needs to be addressed and some of these suggestions are very prudent in the short-term on a temporary basis. However, with regard to programs being closed and restructured, we need a more deliberative and reflective process. I am worried the
timeframe is rushed there. I do want to thank the AAUP for bringing this resolution to UAS.

- Senate Chair – you have three hats on so you bring a lot of perspective to the whole process, so thank you. Regarding the Finance Committee, Provost Ah Yun has asked for three nominees (ultimately will be one chosen from these) from the UAS to join this group. I have found a hard time finding someone with budget expertise who is willing to do that and is also a senator. We are working on a model right now to find someone with expertise who could be a liaison to the senators. This got buried on my to-do list due to all of the current concerns with the work groups. That is why we do not have faculty members on the finance committee right now. I did reach out to a couple of senators with budget experience, but they were not willing to take on that particular role at that point.

- Kimo – I would like to thank everyone for this conversation, and I hope as we go forward we can have a conversation about how I have attempted to work with UAS EC to get greater shared governance. Over the summer, we talked about representation of faculty on the University Budget Committee, and I have been working for a while on this. I will continue to listen and as I hear things that people talk about, I will address as appropriate.

- Chair closes discussion on the motion to discuss the AAUP resolution. Please keep an eye out for messages from us as we have a lot more meetings coming up. Chair wishes everyone a restful holiday season.

XVI. Adjourned at 5:12pm
- Motion to adjourn: Dr. Tim Melchert
- Second: Mr. Patrick Loftis
- Passed without objection

Respectfully submitted,
Ms. Rebecca Blemberg
UAS Secretary

The next meeting will be Monday, January 25, 2021 at 3:00 p.m. in Teams.