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 Dombliesky, Dr. Michael Donoghue, Mr. Atiba Ellis, Dr. Marilyn Frenn, Dr. Sarah Gendron, Dr. Arndt Guentsch, Mr. Tim Houge, Dr. Yasser Khaled, Dr. Chima Koreieh, Dr. William Lobb, Mr. Patrick Loftis, Dr. Tim Melchert, Dr. Michelle Mynlief, 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 Ms. Katie Blank

III. Approval of December 9, 2020 and December 14, 2020 meeting minutes (Att. IIIa and IIIb)

   o Motion to approve: Dr. Tim Melchert
   o Second: Mr. Tim Houge
   o Passed without objection

IV. Chair’s Report – Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay

   o It has been a difficult start to the school year as we said goodbye to some of our colleagues last week. We are all in this together and we will get through this.
   o Presidential Address is Thursday, February 4 at 3p.m. – this will be an opportunity to hear about the vision for the university.
   o Changes to Faculty Handbook as related to Title IX – we had a discussion at one of our meetings last semester about the change in federal policy and need to update the part of the handbook that addresses faculty grievances. No changes are being made to non-Title IX related grievances. The changes have formally been reflected in the handbook which can be viewed on the Office of the Provost website.
   o We have senators in both the academic and nonacademic long-term workstreams which are meeting throughout the spring semester. I have been in contact with leadership from both GSO and MUSG, and we will be trying to create more communication pathways for the students. Finally, I attended various work group leaders’ meetings last semester as well as the concluding meeting when the final recommendations were shared with ELT.

   o Discussion/Questions:
     • Q: Senate Chair – for the next academic year, would the senators prefer to be online or in-person? We will need to let AMU know if we will be utilizing the space.
       • A: Predominant votes in chat are for online preference. This will be for the fall at this time only. Spring meetings will be determined at a later meeting.

V. Vice Chair’s Report – Dr. Allison Abbott

   o Reminder that I have continued to serve as the Senate liaison to the COVID-19 response committee. We have worked on a range of issues. Please let me know if you’d like me to bring more information to this group or if you have suggestions you would like me to bring back to that committee.
   o The Faculty Council (FC) members did attend the half-day retreat with Provost Ah Yun to hear the final workstream recommendations.
   o We have also voted in FC on the AAUP Resolution. I will speak more about the FC vote when we teach that item in the agenda.
VI. Secretary’s Report – Ms. Rebecca Blemberg
   - Election update: if you are interested in running for an at-large senate position, please let me know now. Openings include two regular faculty, one participating faculty, and one part-time faculty. I need a short biographical statement if you are interested. The election will run through the COCE from late February to early/mid-March. We also have two openings on the Faculty Hearing Council. Those positions need to be filled by tenured faculty. Please let me know if you are interested.
   - We have a new senator – Welcome Dr. Sarah Gendron from Arts & Sciences.

VII. Provost’s Report – Dr. Kimo Ah Yun, Provost
   - Provost Ah Yun welcomes and thanks everyone. He offers particular gratitude to the faculty who have been involved in the shared governance process this past semester. He has been working on shared governance with UAS since he came to his position in December of 2019. The Provost thanks the Senate Chair for her willingness to be available as well as her assistance in moving the university forward. He also offers thanks to UAS EC members Amber Wichowsky and Allison Abbott, as well as Alex Crampton and Jeff Berry from Faculty Council. Finally, Provost Ah Yun thanks those who have attended his coffee chats to offer input.
   - How do we preserve our Catholic and Jesuit values in the face of our present challenges? The future of Marquette continues to be guided by our mission, vision, and values. We serve God by serving our students and contributing to the advancement of knowledge (mission statement). Graduates will be problem-solvers and agents for change (vision statement). Create bold, ambitious plans enacted with agility, authentic accountability and a commitment to the greater good (guiding values). We will maintain a strong liberal arts foundation.
   - Today we are looking at a $45mil shortfall for FY22. This has nothing to do with COVID-19 or Grawe’s demographic shift. Rather, we have lower student enrollment (~350 from FY21 and possibly larger numbers going forward). We need to increase discount rate to attract more students, and tuition has been kept flat. We also have a Board mandate around our operating budget, and leadership has embraced this. This helps us reinvest in the university and withstand things that will be coming in the future.
   - What is the process that we need to follow in order to engage connecting to the campus community? Provost Ah Yun highlights the process of shared governance decision-making that began in April 2020. There were 80+ members involved in the process and over 1600 community touchpoints. Provost Ah Yun states that he spent the Christmas break thinking about the recommendations and he gave a presentation in early January to the UAS EC, FC, deans and work group leaders to solicit feedback. He changed some actions based on that feedback and had further conversations with the Senate Chair. The final group at the table on January 15 with ELT was Sumana, Jeanne Hossenlopp, and Fr. Jim Voiss. There were 77 work group recommendations that fit into six major buckets; none of the recommendations were rejected by the Provost. The faculty will continue to work with their respective deans to work through the recommendations to create a plan to move forward.
   - On the nonacademic side, work groups have reached their targets. Within this, there were three vice president roles eliminated on the nonacademic side. There were fewer positions lost on the academic side than the nonacademic side. Three important highlights on the academic side: 1) no tenured or TT faculty will be affected by this, 2) no sabbatical policy changes will occur, and 3) diversity initiatives were protected. Examples of how diversity initiatives are being protected: 1) the operation budget for VP of Inclusive Excellence is unchanged, 2) EOP was shielded from budget cuts and staff reductions, 3) REIS program has been preserved (and a director will be hired soon), 4) all recently-hired TT faculty retained, and 5) all Grad School diversity fellowships retained. Additionally, a director of Black Student Initiatives is being hired and we will also have a director for Native American student initiatives too. This is in addition to the individual we currently have who focuses on our LatinX students.
   - Actions to retain current personnel: 1) cut operations budget by 22%, 2) enhanced tenure buyout program, 3) created voluntary staff retirement program, 4) swept open lines, 5) shifted salaries to endowment. This resulted in $20.4mil found prior to staff actions. The staff actions resulted in 39 positions eliminated (total of $1.6mil). Eight of these staff reductions were positions in colleges/schools; however, four of the eight colleges/schools did not have to do any staff reductions at all. Today we are still $4mil short of our $26mil target for Academic Affairs.
   - Next steps: 1) instructional demand analysis, 2) administrative reduction, 3) department and program discussions.
   - We will receive $6.4mil in stimulus money for the FY21 budget. There are federal restrictions that limit the use of these COVID-related funds, but the time allotted to use the funds is unsure at this time.

   - Discussion/Questions:
     - Q: What kinds of restrictions are there for the COVID-19 funds?
       - A: Kimo – they are obviously COVID-related and there is a short timeframe; we cannot bank the money. We have people in the Public Affairs department who are working to find out the timeline.
We are expanding our testing capacity on campus through surveillance testing; this is the type of expense that would be covered in the funding.

- Q: Senator – could you give us an update on admissions so far for next year?
  - A: Kimo – we are within a percentage point of applications from last year. We have a higher number of acceptances. We are behind in year-to-year deposits (~16%), but this is a different type of year post-COVID. We are doing our financial aid structure differently and will be awarding in February which is later than normal, so we could see some change at that point. It is still early in the game and the team is working hard to find ways to accept a greater amount of students who can be successful.

- Q: Thank you for the presentation. You mentioned that the $45mil is due neither to COVID-19 nor Grawe’s demographic shift. This was surprising to me. Where did this come from then?
  - A: Kimo: there are four factors 1) reduced enrollment (we do not know if this is COVID-related or not), 2) increase in our discount rate, 3) holding the tuition flat for all students (incoming and existing), and 4) budget margin mandated by the BOT needed to reinvest in the university. These four things create the $45mil gap. However, I agree there was confusion because the discussion initially began surrounding the demographic shift coming in 2026, but then COVID hit.

- Q: It does seem odd to me, but my greater question is why are we only hearing these factors talked about now, especially the $12mil surplus, which is new?
  - A: Kimo – I have tried to talk about these clusters of factors for quite a while now, but clearly I was not successful. The last item is related to the board's fiduciary responsibility to enact certain requirements upon the university. This is considered a best practice at other universities. When the budget was passed in December that mandate was included, but the other items have been talked about all along. Part of the confusion was that we had a lot of things happening at the same time. Some of those were COVID-related and others will stay with us. If the dip in enrollment was COVID-related, we should expect to see a massive amount of student enrolling next year, and that is not happening. The bottom line is that we have fewer tuition-paying students at Marquette.

- Q: Senator - There is concern among faculty who would like to know where the position cuts are happening. I have heard about a few of these staff cuts, and I am concerned about how this will affect our diverse students. Eliminating a large advising section in A&S is huge as well as cuts in OIE. We need more services in these areas, not less.
  - A: Kimo – I cannot get into the specifics due to privacy issues, but I can say that there were only eight individuals from the colleges/schools. Of course, retention is important, and we are looking for ways we can combine resources to do this, based on work group recommendations. We will continue to monitor and address challenges as they arise. All cuts are difficult, but we analyzed the cuts based on how we could best continue to serve our mission.

- Senator: there were some of us who viewed these staff cuts as unnecessary because we in the work groups found other ways to cut. I am deeply hurt by this. Regarding the federal stimulus money – it is clear in the federal guidance that the funding can cover payroll to preserve and retain employment. It seems strange to accept taxpayer dollars and move forward with a surplus while we are receiving these funds. I’m concerned about the narrative coming out with regard to our priorities. Can you please address what comes next re: impacts on NTT faculty, specifically the goals of the departments and programs with regard to shared governance?
  - A: Kimo re: the federal stimulus money. FY21 which we currently sit in, we are $10mil short to keep the campus running, and we are not even through the academic year. What if we have to close down the dorms? In terms of what comes next, I think I made it clear that the departments and deans will have conversations about their programs to find ways to increase revenue and decrease costs. This is based on the work group recommendations which I accepted. This believe cuts will be based on conversations within colleges and departments. We look at our NTT needs every year based on the classes we use to build the schedule. This dictates the staffing we need.

VIII. Presentation on Consensual Relationships Policy – Ms. Kristen Kreple, Title IX Coordinator

- Kristen presents a list of people who have been working on the policy. Policy objectives include 1) aligning our mission and guiding values, putting us in line with our AJCU peer institutions, 2) preventing conflicts of interest, favoritism, bias, and exploitation, 3) preserving integrity of the working and learning environments, and 4) protecting and providing clarity for those who are in relationships or who are considering being in a relationship. The policy foundation: 1) includes all employees, students and affiliates (individuals who have a non-traditional
relationship with the university), 2) addresses consensual romantic, sexual, or intimate relationships between MU individuals, 3) clarifies permitted and prohibited relationships, 4) sets forth mitigation plans, and 5) allows for exemptions on a case-by-case basis.

- Highlights: 1) Prohibits relationships between: a) UGs and employees/affiliates and b) grad/professional students over whom employees/affiliates have direct authority. Conflict in these categories cannot be mitigated because the power differential is too great. 2) Permits with mitigation plan in place relationships between: a) students when one is teaching, evaluating, or supervising the other, b) employees when one is supervising or evaluating the other, c) employees already in a relationship when new circumstances create a supervisory dynamic. 3) Policy permits relationships between employees/affiliates and grad/professional students over whom they have no direct authority and could not reasonably expect to in the future. No mitigation or consultation is required.

- Remaining decisions for this UPP: Where will this policy will ‘live’ (likely Title IX or Title IX/HR)? Who will consider exemptions? Who will investigate alleged violations? Who should receive reports of and address retaliation?

- Feedback: To whom would you feel comfortable reporting a relationship? What are the obstacles to MU community members adopting this policy? What are the obstacles to MU community members adopting this policy? How should this policy be communicated once it is launched? Is the policy clear and easy to understand? Please give feedback to the Senate Chair or your Senator. You can also provide feedback in an anonymous form on the Provost website where this policy is posted.

- Timeline: solicit stakeholder feedback through the end of February. Revise policy incorporating feedback by late February. In March we will share the revised policy with UAS and other bodies for final feedback or endorsement; we will also create a robust FAQ. By late March we will send the final policy to the Policy Review Committee. In March/April the PRC will evaluate the policy and send it to ELT for final review. Then the policy will be launched on website and will include an FAQ section; the policy will be promoted through Marquette Today and other means.

- Discussion/Questions:
  - Senate Chair thanks Kristen.
  - Q: I am curious about the role of an Ombuds-person in this process? This would be the trustworthy person to go to in my opinion.
  - Q: Was there a specific case that produced this?
    - A: Kristen - there was no particular case that prompted this. I was previously at Stanford in their equity office and had worked on their consensual relationships policy. When I got to Marquette, I thought we needed to have one here. When I talked to folks, I found out that this had been percolating already. It was an organic coming-together.

IX. University Board of Undergraduate Studies – Dr. John Su, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

- Approval of termination in the minor of Software Development, which largely duplicates the newer minor in Computer Science.

- Approval of a new minor in Professional Selling in the College of Business Administration. Previously, a concentration in Professional Selling was approved, and committee members across the colleges were very excited. They encouraged our colleagues in CoBA to make this into a minor so majors across campus could take this as a minor.

X. University Proposed Resolution on Shared Governance from Marquette Chapter of American Association of University Professors (AAUP) – Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay, Chair, UAS (Att.X)

- Senator Katie Blank moves to conduct a blind vote on this resolution as a NTT participating faculty member. Senator Pat Loftis seconds this and states that faculty are fearful voting ‘yes’ or ‘no’ in the open due to retribution from either administrators or faculty who support this resolution; voting blind allows senators to vote without fear of retribution. Senator Josh Burns ‘thirds’ idea because senators are tasked with working with fellow faculty members and administrative colleagues, and we have a number of colleagues who are very passionate about this on both sides. I will offend people if I vote yes or no or abstain from voting.

- Voice vote on blind vote: one vote against blind vote from Noelle Brigden. Dave Wangrow is abstaining. Motion for a blind vote passes.

- Discussion about who can vote. Senate Chair advises it is senators only.

- Motion to endorse/discuss the AAUP resolution: Amber Wichowsky. Second by Noelle Brigden.

- Senate Chair advises that the matter is now open for discussion and debate. We will spend 20-25 minutes to discuss this and then I will close discussion for the vote. We will consider amendments if they are friendly. Any non-senators can comment, but amendments need to be brought forward by a senator’s motion and will require a second motion.
Senator Wichowsky – I have been involved in the planning process and am really hopeful for the future of Marquette when it comes to shared governance. I thank the AAUP, COR, COT, and the Jesuits. The resolution does not say that the work done by the work groups gets discarded. Faculty and staff worked in good faith to find cuts that would have the least amount of impact on students. The resolution is rather focused on what comes next. There are many questions about course modality, teaching loads, programs, class sizes, budgetary resources coming to the university, etc. Statutes for UAS are based on AAUP guidelines. Many faculty have expressed concerns about the lack of faculty involvement in budgetary processes at the university, and want to make sure we are not in this situation again.

Senator Abbott re: FC’s position - we have had a lot of productive discussions about this resolution and voted not to endorse. The group’s response was 6 against the resolution, 4 in favor, and 2 abstentions. We understand that no resolution is perfect; however, the points of disagreement were important enough that they were deal-breakers for some members. There is consensus that the economic planning process has been difficult and flawed because there were several decisions made without faculty consultation, specifically re: apportioned cuts between the non-academic vs academic side. Setting up parallel processes was a challenge, and there do remain concerns that faculty have not been consulted about some of the cuts made. Disagreements within FC included whether or not people felt there was sufficient consultation; however, people interpret the meaning of consultation in different ways. The greatest involvement came in forming the groups. We also had faculty involvement in listening decisions and feedback forms. We did agree that the provost did take our recommendations into consideration. There was disagreement with the assertion in the resolution that the process should be suspended to wait for more information. Finally, the resolution called for intervention by UAS and FC by setting up a faculty-led process for economic planning. We are in full support of being involved in economic planning, but there is a concern that the resolution that FC can critique the complete financial state of the entire university, but we feel this is beyond our purview due to our modest expertise in budgeting. In conclusion, true shared governance remains a goal that we are working towards. While the process may have been more participatory than true shared governance, the level of involvement with the faculty reflects the provost’s concerted effort to take a step in the right direction and we want to build on this in the future. The national and local chapters of the AAUP have been leaders in crafting policies and guidelines to promote shared governance, and we appreciate their contributions. We believe there are alternative ways to advance shared governance at Marquette and we can work together constructively.

Senate Chair comment: from the academic side, I was the one who created the final list of the work group members. In terms of the handbook, I did not see any violations. I agree there is room for improvement, and we are working to get a senate connection to the Finance/Budget Committee; it is the next thing for me on the agenda in the spring semester.

Discussion/Questions:
• Comment: Ian Gonzalez comments on the instructional expenses using IPEDS data, stating that Marquette ranks 25, not 27. Ranking does not consider differences in structures of the universities such as university-owned apartments, police department, and research (we are ranked 3 of 27 using IPEDS). It is better to look at instructional expenses on a per-student basis. This would put us at 13 of 27, which is the middle of the pack. Finally, the Office of Finance is undergoing a process to review the accuracy of our IPEDS classification. We have done some preliminary work on this. Our reviews and benchmarking to date show that instructional cost per student will likely improve as align allocation methodologies to IPEDS guidance and peer institutions. I wanted to clarify that the way this was presented in the resolution seemed a little misleading.

• Senator Wangrow comment: I represent the CoBA along with Grace Wang. I indicated in the last meeting that many of my colleagues supported this. Grace and I took the time to canvas the rest of our colleagues in the college. About 2/3 of the CoBA faculty who responded to the survey stated that they supported the resolution, but some aspects of the resolution were more supported than others such as the need for greater transparency. Administrative spending was also a major concern. There was less support for other aspects of the resolution, and much of the lack of support revolves around the definition of shared governance. Strategic planning must be done by those skilled to do so. Additionally, within shared governance, decisions still need to be made even when there is dissent. Lastly we feel we must come together. A number of my colleagues were concerned about the ‘us vs them’ tone of the resolution. We need to reduce/avoid adversarial relationships. We have a shared purpose and must also recognize economic and financial realities. Dealing with these realities requires the creative thinking that shared governance can foster but also requires making difficult decisions to keep the university sustainable.
  • A: Chair – thank you for that and for taking the time to solicit detailed feedback.
Senator Mynlieff comment re: the drawbacks in our handbook - when I was Senate Chair, I tried to get committees to update their portion of the handbook; most did, but Faculty Council did not. FC is supposed to oversee many areas, but there is no mechanism in place to do so. I wanted this rewritten because of this. Some of the work is being done by committees, but there are things that need to be done outside of this. The way the handbook is written makes it very unclear how FC would even get all of this information. There is no mechanism in place to provide this type of oversight.

- A: Chair – this is an important next step.

Provost comment – I think about this resolution and appreciate the words of FC. I appreciate that they understand that we have worked closely together toward shared governance. There was a process to identify people to serve on the university budget committee and I stand by that. There will be future actions that will involve faculty and shared governance. I don’t see anything happening that will not involve shared governance. I have thought a lot about this resolution. We have seen over the last few months that things that happen on campus spiral out to the community and get spun. For example, the Faculty Council letter got sent to Higher Education. This was not done by a member of FC, and I am not sure of the motivation. I worry that the passing of this resolution would be used against the reputation of this university. I worry this vote will signal to the whole world that there is a divide, an adversarial relationship between UAS and the administration. If that happens it will start impacting our reputation and students will question whether or not they want to come here, and that will make all of our jobs harder. Our goal and mission is to attract students and be able to teach them. My question to you is “Can we accomplish shared governance together without this resolution?” I believe we can. Use your voice to tell UAS that we do not need this resolution. Faculty can just work directly with me.

Senator Wichowsky comment – this is not a personal process; this resolution is in the spirit of improving shared governance. At the same time, I understand people’s concerns about wanting to have a blind vote. I am moving to amend the resolution in the following ways: I move to strike #1 under further resolved. Under #2 page 3, I move to amend it such that it is clear that it is future budget actions. On page 3 going into 4, at number 4, I would like to insert ‘future’ before budget reduction. Under number 2, insert ‘further’ before implementation.

- A: Secretary Blemberg confirms that she is taking notes.

Senator Wangrow comment – I would like to make a motion to table the vote on the current amendment and the overall resolution.

Secretary Blemberg question – put off discussion until the next meeting on the new amended version?

- A: Senator Welburn seconds.

Senate Chair – all in favor of tabling the motion until the next meeting, you do not need to say anything. Opposed please raise hands. Three hands raised. Abstentions – none noted. Vote has been tabled to the next meeting.

Senator Wangrow advises that he would like additional time to review the amendments in order to sufficiently represent his colleagues.

Q: Cindy – are you or the senators or AAUP entertaining further amendments to the resolution or is the amendment received right now the final one?

- A: Chair – we will vote on amended version at the next meeting.

AAUP Chapter President comment: I understand why representatives want to table this given the changes, but what will the provost do in terms of actions between now and the next meeting?

- Provost – I do not fully understand the question.
- Doug – will you implement further staff cuts between now and the next meeting?
- Provost – no. I have no plans. I would like to make it clear that we still have a gap, but we need to work with deans and chairs. My job as provost is to protect the academic enterprise. I would like to have zero more staff cuts; we have no plans.

Senate Chair confirms that there are no more actions planned that she is aware of. She states that she will work to get someone assigned to the Finance committee.

XI. Adjourned at 5:04pm

- Motion to adjourn: Dr. Dave Wangrow
- Second: Dr. Allison Abbott
Passed without objection

Respectfully submitted,
Ms. Rebecca Blemberg
UAS Secretary

The next meeting will be Monday, February 15, 2021 at 3:00 p.m. in Teams.