I. Call to Order and Reflection by Dr. James South

Members in Attendance: Dr. Albert Abena, Dr. Lea Acord, Dr. Robert Bishop, Prof. Bruce Boyden, Mr. John Brenner, Prof. Patricia Cervenka, Fr. Michael Class, S.J., Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Marilyn Frenn, Dr. Steven Goldzwig, Ms. Ann Hanlon, Dr. Jeanne Hossenlopp, Dr. Peter Jones, Dr. Sarah Knox Dr. Christine L. Krueger, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Daniel Meissner, Dr. Gary Meyer, Dr. Maureen O’Brien, Dr. John Pauly, Fr. Philip Rossi, S.J., Dr. Linda Salchenberger, Dr. Heidi Schweizer, Dr. James South, Dr. John Su, Dr. Siddhartha Syam, Dr. William Thorn, Dr. Otto Widera, Dr. Joyce Wolburg, and Dr. Wanda Zemler-Cizewski

Members Excused: Dr. Evelyn Donate-Bartfield and Dr. Guy Simoneau

Members Not Present: Dr. William Cullinan, Dr. Alexander Drakopoulos, Ms. Jilly Gokalgandhi, Mr. John Helfin, and Mr. Terrence Neumann

Guests Present: Ms. Sandra Cleveland, Dr. Kerry Egdorf, Dr. John Fitzgibbons, S.J. Dale Kaser, Dr. Linda Lee, Ms. Georgia McRae, Dr. Timothy Melchert, Dr. Susan Mountin, and Mr. Dominic Tortorice Tribune Reporter

II. Approval of February 21, 2011 Minutes

The minutes were seconded and unanimously approved.

III. Provost’s Report- Dr. John Pauly

1. Revisions to Faculty Grievance Procedures

After the Faculty Hearing Committee completed its deliberations last year the chair of the committee Prof. Oldfather asked if the procedures could be revised to remove some ambiguities and clarify definitions. The draft revisions meet that request and have also been reviewed by General Counsel. As per UAS policy, this revision to the Faculty Grievance Procedures is being reviewed at this (March) meeting and will be submitted at the April meeting as a motion for UAS approval.

2. Enrollment

Nearly all admissions offers have been sent to the incoming freshman, and the first freshman and transfer students financial aid packages were mailed last week. The national decision date is May 1, and Admissions is working hard to secure as many commitments from accepted freshman as possible. The wait list of nearly 1,000 students is reviewed on a regular basis – and about 100 offers of admission have gone out to that group.

Inquiry: Do you have information about the number of applications received this year?

More than 23,000 applications have been received, and the yield for last year’s class was about 15 to 16 percent. The ease of applying on-line has contributed to the higher number of applications.
3. Dr. Pauly informed the UAS that a US Department of Education regulation limits the number of times a student can repeat a course. Effective July 1, 2011, a student receiving a passing grade in a course can repeat that course only once in order to improve the grade. A copy of the regulation has been provided to senators and this will be sent to all faculty who teach undergraduate students. (Graduate and Professional policies will be made available through the associate deans.)

Please keep this revised policy/procedure in mind when advising undergraduates in the coming weeks. In addition, note that while the graduate and professional schools also have to follow the new repeat policy, each school has developed different policies and procedures for its students. Therefore, if you advise graduate or professional students, please refer them to their respective school office when questions arise about repeatable courses.

4. Donor/gift update:
University Advancement reports that FY11 gifts exceed $33.5 million to date. Endowed scholarship gifts continue to be among fundraising highlights, including a recent $1 million gift. Four other endowed scholarship gifts total $250,000, including $100,000 to support the Freshman Frontier program thanks to an alumnus from the class of ’94. The university also received funding for a new scholarship to support a future student athlete in lacrosse. Fundraising continues for Eckstein Hall and the Discovery Learning Complex, including a $50,000 gift toward the Law facility.

The diversity of these gifts demonstrates the varied interests that alumni and friends have in advancing the university’s mission.

5. Diversity:
Diversity hires have been successful in English, Mechanical Engineering, Nursing and Social & Cultural Sciences. Dr. Welburn’s efforts at the beginning of the search process have been very successful.

6. Retirement options will be present to the Senate in the next few months. The plans and financing are still being reviewed.
Discussion:
- Inquiry: Will the Senate have a voice in the retirement choices?
  Provost: Yes. I will bring the options back to the Senate.
- Inquiry: Will the final decision be made by Administration?
  Provost: Yes. However, this process started as a senate resolution.

IV. Chair’s report – Dr. Christine Krueger
1. Election update. At least two candidates have been slated for each of the open UAS and committee positions, so please urge your colleagues to vote. The goal is to have all positions filled by the end of the current academic year, which will eliminate the scramble to find
committee chairs that has occurred in the past. Please give some thought to nominating yourself as UAS liaisons to the standing committees.

2. Report on meeting with Fr. Pilarz. The Executive Committee emphasized two points during the very successful meeting with Fr. Pilarz: (1) Work needs to continue on improving shared governance at Marquette; and (2) it is imperative that he establish a bond of trust with the faculty. Fr. Pilarz noted that he would like to have more faculty representation on key administrative bodies, similar to the current situation on the University Leadership Council.

3. Announcement: On March 1, the MUSG passed a motion similar to that passed by the senate on LDA benefits.

4. Resolution on Catholic Social Teaching and Wisconsin State Budget. Several faculty members inquired why the Academic Senate had not taken a stance on the current state budget bill since the issues relate to Catholic social teaching. In response, the Chair with the help of other faculty members has drafted a statement for consideration:

**Resolution on Catholic Teaching and the Wisconsin State Budget**

As the University Academic Senate of the second largest institution of higher education in Wisconsin, and in light of Catholic teaching on worker rights (Rerum Novarum, Laborem Exercens), Pope Benedict XVI's recent Caritas in Veritate and Archbishop Listecki’s statement regarding the rights of workers and the value of unions, we hereby affirm the principles of workers’ rights enshrined in Catholic teaching and urge the elected representatives of the state of Wisconsin to honor these rights.

We hope that the events in our state will be handled with prudence, justice, and charity such that solidarity as a social principle and a moral virtue will be honored by all involved.

**Discussion:**

- **Statement:** The motion is based on Catholic ideals and should be adopted.
- **Statement:** I strongly support the motion, however, faculty in another committee were concerned about limited discussion on the statement and its limited scope of concern.
- **Vice-Chair:** The issue is more complicated than presented in the statement. Some members of the Faculty Council were in favor of the statement and some were not, and a limited poll of nursing faculty was similarly split. I would like to see a broader study and statement.
- **Chair:** The faculty who brought this forward were not “conservative” but supportive of Catholic teaching.
- **Statement:** There should be wider discussion in colleges before voting on this motion.
- **Statement:** We must separate personal opinions from those of the MU community.
- **Proposal:** rewrite the final sentence to read “We hope that in serving the common good...”
- **Vice-Chair:** A more serious problem can be found in the first paragraph, where the facts may not be as stated.
- **Statement:** Marquette is the second largest university in Milwaukee, not the state. Also, is it correct to state that we “resolve” to “hope”? 

A vote was called on the suggested amendment: 26 – yes 0 – No 3 Abstentions
The amendment was adopted

Further Discussion:
- Statement: Can we rephrase the statement as “As the Marquette University Academic Senate. . .” and strike the phrase, “second largest”?

A vote was called on the amended statement: 29 – Yes 0 – No 0 – Abstentions
The amendment was adopted

Further Discussion:
- Statement: Is there any way to rephrase the statement to eliminate the term “hope”?
- Vice-Chair: Are we not lobbying for a specific side in the state debates?
- Statement: We are not supporting either side or party
- Statement: But we are appealing to one side only.
- Proposal: Can we add “all parties”?

A vote was taken on this amendment: 27 – Yes 0 – No 2 – Abstentions
The Amendment was adopted

Further Discussion:
- Statement: I will vote against this motion because I have not read the documents referred to in the statement, and I do not see it as a charge of this body in the Preamble, except perhaps related to the phrase: “relevant to the academic mission of the university.”
- Statement: The motion represents to the Provost the sentiments of this body.
- Vice-Chair: Can we speak for our constituents without asking first?
- Motion: That this motion be tabled for further discussion:

A vote was taken on tabling the motion: 13 – Yes 14 – No 1 – Abstention
The motion to table was defeated

A vote was called on the amended motion:

As the University Academic Senate of Marquette University, the largest private institution of higher education in Wisconsin, and in light of Catholic teaching on worker rights (Rerum Novarum, Laborem Exercens), Pope Benedict’s recent Caritas in Veritate, and Archbishop Listecki’s statement regarding the rights of workers and the value of unions, we hereby affirm the principles of workers’ rights enshrined in Catholic teaching and urge the elected representatives of the state of Wisconsin to honor these rights.

To serve the common good, we encourage all parties to act with prudence, justice, and charity such that solidarity as a social principle and moral virtue will be honored by all involved.
Vote: 18 – Yes 7 – No 4 – Abstentions  The motion carried

V. Vice Chair’s Report – Dr. Marilyn Frenn

Faculty Council Draft Report on the Shared Governance

The Executive Committee charged the Faculty Council with a number of substantive issues for consideration this year. The committee was successful in addressing most of these charges (see report for details), including a motion passed by the senate to facilitate shared governance through the passage of a FC motion requesting that the Chair and Vice-Chair be invited to attend Administrative meetings; a successful Faculty Forum featuring Trustee Dick Fotsch; and senate passage of an FC motion on election reform.

The report also includes issues on which the Faculty Council is making progress, including enhancing the role of the Provost as a senior administrator, particularly in budget concerns; the implementation of 360-degree assessments; and drafting policies for requesting information from OIRA.

Future issues to be considered by the Faculty Council include: an orientation for all new senate and committee members; re-examining the charge of the COCE; and overcoming the current culture of non-service.

Please provide me with any comments you may have concerning this report before the next UAS meeting.

Discussion:

- Provost: I am not sure which offices in Administration this report is addressing.
- Vice-Chair: The administration silos as traditionally defined.
- Provost: How does FC know what collaboration goes on among the Provost, Deans, Enrollment, etc. – where is the evidence for lack of improved collaboration?
- Inquiry: Does FC intend that there should be greater transparency in financial decisions?
- Vice-Chair: Perhaps so. I will check with the faculty representative on the Budget committee on how that representative is chosen.
- Inquiry: How many and who are on the Budget committee?
- Dr. Salchenberger: Finance will have to get back with that answer.
- Inquiry: What issues does FC have with the state of communication?
- Vice-Chair: Liaisons need more guidance in reporting to the senate.
- Inquiry: Is this just a matter of process that needs improving?
- Vice-Chair: FC will consider this possibility and any other recommendations you may have.
- Provost: If a committee sees a problem, the Provost office should be brought in quickly so that a solution can be worked out rather than relying on a committee resolution.
- Chair: We had the same problem last year. Now that we have committee positions filled, we can start working with chairs to improve communications through an orientation workshop/seminar. We also need to work on the nomination process and need to reexamine the role of the COCE. The problem is that the nomination and election requirements for committees are overly complex. We need a body that can supply members when vacancies arise, which is not possible now. If there is a better way to get people into committees, then please suggest how.
- Inquiry: How should COCE be changed?
Chair: I cannot say without the statutes before me.
Statement: Committee work should be required of all faculty and placed on a rotating basis.
Chair: Then you will have the problem of unmotivated or unconcerned committee members.

VI. Other business
a. **Motion to Approve** change UAS statutes on chair of University Assessment Committee.
   Dr. Gary Meyer inquired if there were any questions.
   The motion was seconded. No discussion.

   **Vote:** 25 – Yes  0 – No  0 – Abstentions  **The motion carried**

b. Draft Undergraduate Attendance Policy, University Board of Undergraduate Studies. Dr. Gary Meyer reported that currently no standard attendance policy exists for the university, but rather, policies vary from college to college. If the UAS approves this motion, Assessment will draft a university-wide attendance policy for the senate to consider.

   The new policy will address recent changes and issues that the college policies may not include. For example, the Health Center no longer provides excuse slips for students, so how should valid absences due to illness be verified? The policy will address absences for on-line courses (missed deadlines for discussion posts or submission of work), and will include a section for ‘frequently asked questions, such as how to handle issues such as jury duty.

   Dr. Meyer asks the senate for a vote of support for drafting this new policy.

**Discussion:**
- Inquiry: How does this policy differ from the college policies?
  - Dr. Meyer: It will apply to all students, though colleges may create their own, more stringent policy.
- Inquiry: Would colleges need to re-write their policies?
  - Dr. Meyer: Yes, so their policy will not be at odds with the university policy.
- Inquiry: Would the university policy be included in all syllabi?
  - Dr. Meyer: No, though it will be published in appropriate university venues.
- Provost: Just a reference to the policy in the syllabus may be enough, is that right?
  - Dr. Meyer: Perhaps.
- Chair: There should be a link to the university attendance policy on D2L that would act as a default policy if an instructor does not articulate his/her own policy.
- Inquiry: Will the policy be ready for fall 2011 classes?
  - Ms. McRae: Yes, if approved by the UAS within a month.
- Inquiry: Can faculty alter the stipulations”
  - Dr. Meyer: The policy does not include a required action. For example, an instructor could design a policy that a student can only make up missed work with a doctor’s note.
- Provost: the FAQ section should be carefully crafted.
Vice-Chair: For example, the FAQ should note that students are able to change jury duty dates if the time conflicts with classes.

Dr. Meyer: The proposed draft policy has already been approved by the Board of Undergraduate Studies.

A vote was called on the motion to proceed with drafting a university attendance policy.

**Vote:** 22 – Yes 0 – No 1 – Abstention **The motion carried.**

c. Discussion of work of joint sub-committee on Academic Integrity.
Dr. Timothy Melchert provided a brief history and overview of the committee since its formation in 2006. At that time, UBUS had formatted a policy on academic integrity that focused primarily on procedures and discipline. Over the past two years, discussions on the revision of this policy have centered on the need for a more proactive educational approach to address cases of plagiarism arising from the misuse of internet material and sites.

Research on academic integrity indicates that cheating is wide-spread; 60-65 percent of students admit to cheating on exams or papers. *Who’s Who* reports the figure as 80 percent. Moreover, such sites as “Course Hero” and “Cramster” offer students easy access to plagiarized materials.

Only 10 percent of universities have an honor code, but such schools report 25-50 percent fewer cases of cheating.

Discussion:

- **Statement:** After teaching at a university with an established honor code, I would point out that the code must be institutionalized in order to be effective.
- Dr. Melchert: Exactly. To be effective, the code must be made a part of the culture.
- **Chair:** I suggest that you involve Stephanie Quade and MUSG in your discussions as well as First Year English instructors, who work primarily with freshmen and have experience with academic integrity issues. The Library also has policies on research integrity that should be reviewed and considered
- **Statement:** Thank you for initiating this investigation into academic integrity policies.

VII. Motion to Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05pm