

**MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY**  
**Office of the Provost**  
University Academic Senate Minutes  
February 16, 2009

---

- I. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 3:14 pm. Invocation was led by Dr. James Courtright.

Members Present: Dr. Margaret Bloom, Prof. Bruce Boyden, Dr. Margaret Callahan, Dr. Sharon Chubbuck, Fr. Michael Class, Dr. James Courtright, Dr. William Cullinan, Dr. Evelyn Donate-Bartfield, Prof. Edward Fallone, Dr. Marilyn Frenn, Dr. Kristin Haglund, Ms. Kristen Hickman, Dr. Jadwiga Hjertstedt, Dr. Diane Hoeveler, Mrs. Susan Hopwood, Dr. Jeanne Hossenlopp, Mr. Stephen Hudson-Mairet, Mr. John Jentz, Dr. Edward Korabic, Dr. Sarah Knox, Dr. Christine Krueger, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Anne Pasero, Dr. John Pauly, Mr. Jason Rae, Mr. Raymond Redlingshafer, Dr. Linda Salchenberger, Dr. James South, Dr. Siddhartha Syam, Dr. Steven Taylor, Dr. William Thorn, and Dr. William Wiener and Larry Soley (sub for Dr. Steven Goldzwig).

Member Excused: Dr. Alex Ng, Dr. Kristy Nielson, Dr. G.E. Otto Widero, and Dr. Wanda Zemler-Cizewski.

Members not present: Dr. Marie Hoeger Bement, Dr. Alexander Drakopoulos and Dr. Daniel Meissner.

Guest Present: Dr. Richard Fehring, Mr. Daniel Gemoll, Dr. Edward Inderrieden, Mr. Dale Kaser, Dr. Janet Krejci, Dr. Linda Lee, Dr. Gary Levy, Mr. Roger Lopez (Tribune Reporter), Dr. Mary Pat Pfeil, Ms. Georgia McRae, Mrs. Alix Riley, and Dr. Joyce Wolburg

- II. Approval of January 26, 2009 Minutes

Motions were made to record Dr. Goldzwig as member rather than a guest and that the header have an “M” added to “arquette”.

Motion to adopt the minutes as amended was made and seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

- III. Chairperson’s Report – Dr. William Thorn

A. NCAA - Dr. Phillip Naylor. The report will be presented at a future meeting.

B. Special UAS meeting on March 2 with North Central team

Members are reminded to attend this meeting with the accrediting team. Dr. Margaret Bloom will create a one page entitled “Brief Facts” to be distributed to the members so they are prepared to meet with the accreditation team.

C. Dr. Courtright spoke regarding the Committee on Committee and Elections. There have been two requests to identify faculty to service on committees prior to the annual elections. The role of the Committee in filling such openings in between elections is unclear. Bill Thorn asked Jim to investigate how committee vacancies should be filled and candidates identified other than through the annual election, and to report back to the Senate. Jim encouraged all faculty to volunteer for service on University committees and to indicate their preferences.

- IV. Provost Report – Dr. John Pauly

A. Graduate Assistant Health Insurance and Stipend

Four hundred graduate teaching and research assistants will be able to enroll for health insurance in the fall. The budget for next year also contains an adjusted stipend for 114 graduate assistants.

Improving the graduate assistant programs will keep the University competitive and also benefit undergraduate research.

## B. Enrollment

Applications are up 17% from last year, and acceptances are running well. We are looking for 11,000 acceptances. Cancellations are about the same. Deposits are coming in a little slower than in years past. An additional \$4 million is available for student financial aid. The ideal freshman class for budget purposes would be 1870 students. No drop off in continuing students has been detected. A fantastic job is done at scholarship days with a return of approximately 40% of those attending going on to enroll at Marquette.

Asked to explain the 17% rise in applications, John Pauly cited improved programs. We give good value in comparison to peer institutions such as Boston College. “The basketball team doesn’t hurt.” The main factor is how Marquette looks in comparison to other schools, in relation to quality of programs and value

## C. Syllabus on D2L

The Senate adopted a policy asking faculty to post syllabi online. John Pauly charged the Deans with communicating this policy to their faculty. Difficulty is that it is unclear where responsibility for compliance lies. Also, D2L is password protected, so staff members cannot be tasked with doing the posting on behalf of faculty. Deans will follow up with faculty in order to increase compliance.

## D. Dean Searches

Searches underway have gone very well. Arts & Sciences may be bringing in an additional candidate. Communication has seen four outstanding candidates and a decision should be made soon.

## E. Program Review

Dr. Wiener is meeting with the Deans to discuss what program review will look like. They will try to tailor the specific program review to the specific college.

## F. Promotion & Tenure Review

The promotion & tenure review is coming to an end. Decisions will be reviewed by Father Wild, S.J., who will return to campus next week. John Pauly would like to see one uniform set of promotion and tenure procedures established, and move away from the “Provost’s Note” that is used to make amendments to the process each year.

## V. Report of Boards and Standing Committees

### A. University Board of Undergraduate Studies – Dr. Margaret Bloom

Information was given on the adoption of Interdisciplinary Minor in Broad Field Social Science. This change permits students in Education who have a major in another field to add a minor in Broad Field Social Science. The University eliminated the separate “teaching” major a while ago so that students in Education could take a second major in another field of study. This change makes it easier for students to graduate with two majors and a minor, which helps employment prospects.

### B. University Board of Graduate Studies – Dr. Edward Inderrieden / Dr. William Wiener

#### 1. Motion to approve New Certificate: Digital Story Telling

The proposal to approve a Certificate in Digital Storytelling came before the Senate as a seconded motion. A memo had been distributed to all members prior to the meeting. There were no questions or discussion on the proposal. The motion carried unanimously with 34 votes in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

## 2. Informed on policy change: Non-Degree Status Policy

The Board is examining changes in the policy for non-degree students. These are students who are allowed to take courses in a program even though they have not been admitted to that program. Concern is to cap the number of courses that a non-degree student can take without being admitted to the program. Some administrative issues still need to be worked out regarding the number of credits a student could earn prior to being admitted to the program. The Board will propose specific changes at a future meeting.

C. Faculty Council – Prof. Edward Fallone – No report

D. Committee on Academic Policies & Issues – Ms. Linda Milson - No report

E. Committee on Faculty Welfare – Dr. Charles (Steve) Melching – No report

F. Committee on Research – Dr. Richard Fehring

### 1. Revision of Research Misconduct Policy

Last semester, some questions arose concerning the purview of the Committee on Research in regards to the Policy on Misconduct in Research. The Committee looked at policies in place at other universities and compared them to the existing MU policy. After review, it was determined that the MU policy could be expanded to cover all research and scholarship within the University. Proposed changes to the current policy are noted in the memo distributed prior to the meeting. “Research” is broadened to include more than quantitative or empirical research and now includes research in the humanities. “Sponsored” means outside funded. If it is student work at issue, it falls within the Academic Dishonesty Policy. Discussion followed. It was noted that these changes result in a policy that is very similar to the policies reviewed at other institutions.

The proposal came before the Senate as a seconded motion. The motion carried unanimously with 34 votes in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

### 2. Report on Interdisciplinary Research – Dr. Janet Krejci

A power point presentation was given on her work during her ACE Fellowship. The material was presented to the Committee on Research in November. The focus was on interdisciplinary research, and resulted from a review and questionnaire conducted by the Committee. The report identified management and administrative barriers to conducting interdisciplinary research. Most collaboration taking place within MU right now is localized (intra-university). In order to promote interdisciplinary research, systematic and structural barriers must be addressed. Faculty initiative is vital, but in addition changes such as: promotion & tenure criteria (it is not recommended that faculty do interdisciplinary research until post-tenure); hiring practice changes; developing a strong graduate student body; direct internal MU funding towards interdisciplinary research; and examine possible restructuring of departments/schools/etc.

So where does MU begin? One way is to look at creating Centers. Interested Senate members can request copies of her powerpoint.

## VI. New Business –

Summary of the online course evaluation system (MOCES) for Fall 2008 – Dr. Gary Levy

1,583 courses were evaluated during fall 2008. This is an increase over paper evaluations. The response rate was 70%. This is lower than the 80% response rate from paper evaluations. The upper level undergraduate had the lowest return rate (66%).

The four questions concerning the core were re-worded but still as similar as possible to the standard questions from previous years. A score of 4.7 was the mean over the 4 core questions. This is consistent with the experience using paper evaluations when adjusted to reflect a 6 point scale.

Faculty typically have several concerns. One is whether there will be a lower response rate. The answer is “yes,” but only slightly. Another is whether there will be more negative responses. There are lower scores at the lower end (the “very poor” and “poor” responses) and at the middle (the “good” and “very good” responses). Did the two week open period for responding effect the scores? The vast majority of the evaluations were completed on the second day of the open period. The mean score for each day during the open period was 4.7 to 4.8. All of this information is available on the website.

Discussion and questions followed. Student response was mostly positive. It may be possible to open up MOCES so that individual colleges can add their own questions, so long as the 4 core questions remain the same. Could an option of “not applicable” be added to the four core questions? He feels that the 4 core questions apply to every class, but the question could be open for discussion.

The validity of the date in any evaluation becomes doubtful with fewer than 10 respondents or a lower than 66% response rate. If the response rate is high enough, the validity of the mean is not impacted by a response rate of under 100%. Small differences in the scores as between individual faculty members are not meaningful for drawing conclusions about teaching effectiveness.

Don’t know whether some students completed evaluations for less than all of their courses. That data could be obtained if Senate desires. Also could try to determine whether gender or race of instructor had impact on mean scores. If the Senate wants particular types of data, they will try to respond.

There were two faculty orientations last semester and this semester four will be held:

March 19

March 27

March 31

April 1

Students often have more than one email address so faculty will remain the best marketing tool to have students complete the questionnaire. The characteristics of the students who complete the survey are not available.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 pm.