I. Call to Order by Dr. Cheryl Maranto at 3:06 pm.

II. Reflection was given by Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay.

III. Approval of February 15, 2016 minutes
   - Motion to approve: Dr. William Thorn
   - Second: Ms. Mary Jo Wiemiller
   - Voice Vote: Unanimous

IV. Chair’s Report – Dr. Cheryl Maranto
   - University Academic Senate representatives to the committee considering the proposal for a tobacco free campus were announced. Dr. Pradeep Bhagavatula and Dr. Ronda Hughes are those representatives. They bring an amazing level of professional expertise to that effort. Dr. Bhagavatula works with oral health at the dental school; Dr. Hughes has experience in health policy and research.
   - Chair of the Saint Louis University Faculty Senate has been working to organize a meeting of the Senate chairs from all of the Jesuit universities. This is a great opportunity to get a sense of governance and the challenges arising at other institutions. This is likely to take place in June and either Dr. Cheryl Maranto or the next Chair of UAS will attend.

V. Vice Chairperson’s Report – Dr. James Richie
   - Faculty Council has been working on the upcoming forum with the President, which Dr. Richie will moderate. The questions are nearly finalized. All were encouraged to attend and bring their colleagues. There will be time in the forum for open questions.
     - Are questions still being accepted from faculty?
       - The time for submissions is closed. There will be time for open questions during the forum, so this should not be a problem.
     - Forum will be April 13 at 3:00 in the AMU, Ballrooms C&D
   - Per Dr. Cheryl Maranto, last year’s attendance was disappointing. Everyone is strongly encouraged to attend and to encourage others to do so as well.

Members in Attendance: Dr. Julia Azari, Dr. Abir Bekhet, Dr. Pradeep Bhagavatula, Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay, Rev. Michael Class, S.J., Dr. Robert Deahl, Mr. Michael Dole, Dr. Sarah Gendron, Mr. Kurt Gering, Dr. Brian Hodgson, Dr. Rick Holz, Mr. Steven Hudson-Mairet, Dr. Ronda Hughes, Dr. Allison Hyngstrom, Dr. Kristof Kipp, Dr. Noreen Lephardt, Mr. Scott Mandernack, Ms. Aliya Manjee, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Tim Melchert, Dr. Daniel Myers, Dr. Michelle Mynlieff, Dr. David Papke, Dr. Anne Pasero, Ms. Katherine Reiter, Dr. Jim Richie, Dr. John Su, Ms. Michelle Sweetser, Dr. William Thorn, Dr. Doris Walker-Dalhouse, Dr. Michael Wert, Ms. Mary Jo Wiemiller, Dr. Doug Woods, and Mr. Benjamin Zellmer

Members Excused: Ms. Courtney Guc, Dr. Javier Ibanez-Noe, Mrs. Janice Welburn, and Dr. Michael Wert

Members not in attendance: Dr. Joseph Domblesky, Dr. Marie Hoeger-Bement, and Dr. Bryan Rindfleisch

Guests: Dr. Lowell Barrington, Dr. Curtis Carter, Ms. Patricia Cervenka, Mr. Brian Dorrington, Dr. Marilyn Frenn, Mrs. Heather James, Dr. Mike Johnson, Mr. Dale Kaser, Dr. Mike Lovell, Dr. Maureen O’Brien, Dr. Sharron Ronco, Dr. Rebecca Sanders, Dr. Heidi Schweizer, Mr. Christopher Stolarski, and Ms. Lynn Whittenberger
VI. Secretary’s Report – Dr. Noreen Lephardt

- Results of elections for UAS at-large representatives have been received. Thanks to all who were nominated, participated in the election and those who were elected.
  - Dr. Alison Barnes and Dr. Felicia Miller elected to the Faculty Hearing Committee
  - Ms. Mary Joe Wiemiller elected as UAS at-large representative.
- Nominations are needed for service on the executive committee; please give serious consideration to serving; it is a worthwhile experience.
  - Surveys were distributed (and collected at end of this meeting) allowing Senators to indicate their preference for serving or requesting excuse from service as officers of the UAS.
  - These surveys allow us to prepare a ballot for the April meeting, which will UAS to continue with a seated executive committee.
  - On the docket for 2016-2017 is consideration of the tenure and structure for the UAS chair and vice chair and the relationship of these roles to the Faculty Council. The Faculty Hearing Committee is also looking at making a motion to revise some of the statutes related to the FHC.
  - It should be noted that Vice Chair of UAS is not automatically chair of Faculty Council.

VII. Provost’s Report - Dr. Daniel Myers

- Searches continue. VP for Enrollment Management airport interviews are going on as we speak. Dean of Nursing search is not quite as far along. Dean of Admissions search will begin toward the end of this week. Plan was to delay this search to follow the VP for Enrollment Management by a couple of months in order that new VPEM could participate in the search.
- Enrollment Update must be prefaced by saying it is too early to tell what will ultimately happen. Early signs look good; are about 17% of goal now, ahead of where we were at this point last year. Impossible to tell if the trajectory can be sustained, but if we do, will be in good shape. Transfers are also too early to tell. Applications to grad school are similar to last year. So far, everything is going pretty much as Huron predicted in their report.
- Strategic plan website is still being developed. Hope to introduce it soon, but are still working on some technical issues and responding to some of the input from the Board of Trustees. Want to think of this as a living document that can be changed, and hope to get feedback from Marquette community on an ongoing basis.
- Items from UAS that were recommended to the Board of Trustees were approved. These included the dissolving of College of Professional Studies, closing some certificates, and approval of the biomedical partnership with MCW.
- Provost Myers appointed a Committee on Arts @ MU to look at what we are doing in the Arts and what might we be able to do better. Have requested a really broad look at everything we are doing across the spectrum of the Arts in order to understand where we are and where we might head in the future in this area. Dr. Ana Garner is chairing the committee. All are encouraged to contact committee members with any contributions they might have to the discussion. The committee was not configured to represent all constituents, but they have been asked to reach out to others in order to represent all areas of the arts.
- Dr. Doug Woods is Dean of the Graduate School. It is being announced today that he has been named Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Studies and Dean of the Graduate School. Because his function reaches across many areas of the university, felt it was important that the position be a more integral part of the Provost’s Office. Also indicates an effort to elevate the importance of graduate and professional studies (and research) in the university. The new program incubator will also be placed under Dr. Woods. There is no change in his compensation; this just changes his function as a part of the provost’s office.
- Have received a number of questions about the new campus apartments as to where these came from, lack of knowledge that the university was going to build, etc. This is not a university project – it is something being done by a private developer. This is happening near campus, but is not a Marquette project.
VIII. Discussion with the President – Dr. Mike Lovell

- President Lovell noted the he understands that everyone is interested in the McAdams case. This is a personnel issue and therefore Dr. Lovell is limited in what he can say. Faculty Hearing Committee (FHC) reports were received in January. The report shows shared governance working at its best; the report was very thorough and comprehensive. It is difficult to imagine the number of hours that have been spent in deliberation and writing the report; the document reflected a deep consideration of a complex and comprehensive issue. The hard work of the committee has made his work easier, and he owes that committee a huge debt of gratitude. Although he will always be somewhat limited in what he can say about the case, he will be sending a message to Dr. McAdams, and then will share what is possible with the campus community.

- Campus master plan. Many attended the forum, with almost 300 people there. This is currently a plan, with nothing set in stone. Several things have to happen before we can move forward. Paying for both the master plan and strategic plan will require many resources. Don’t have the giving capacity to fully fund both, and therefore will be really pushing to develop partnerships. Might be looking at ways to combine academic and living spaces; simply have to look at things differently. We don’t have the endowment and resources to do things the way we’ve done them in the past.

- Will be launching a capital campaign this summer with some of the initial numbers that we have. Are currently working with consultants to scrub through what we believe we can raise. When we go into campaign mode, will be a somewhat changed structure and format from what Marquette has done in the past. Previously, there were some centrally-focused efforts in fundraising. Going forward, deans will be dealing with more of the fundraising directly related to development in their colleges. Deans will be held accountable for some of the effort in reaching their fundraising goals.

- APRC forum is being held on Tuesday afternoon. During that forum, the campus community will be talking about ways that APRC can partner with others on campus relative to research, etc. Are defining ways that this can be a great partnership.

- Budgets – fine for this year with few reductions. Don’t foresee any problems relative to the anticipated enrollment, etc.

- Through the campus master planning process, President Lovell has been made aware that there are questions about humanities not being focused enough in strategic plan. In his presentation to the Board of Trustees, discussed the fact that traditional lecture, etc. is not the way students are learning. How you get those skills – applied skills in the classroom and a focus on the humanities – these are really the core of a liberal arts education. We need to graduate students that are technically strong but that are also centered on critical thinking, etc. and the liberal arts.

Questions:

- Could you please comment on rumors about/around a Center for the Humanities?
  - Dr. Dan Myers shared that there is a committee working on what a Center for Humanities might look like. We have received some encouraging nibbles about funding a Center. Don’t know yet what it will look like etc., but are excited about the way we are headed. We hope that we will be one of the universities that stands up to say humanities are important in a very visible way. He noted that liberal arts are critical

- Similar comments have been heard about the life sciences, especially the facilities?
  - Dr. Lovell responded that the biological sciences were seen as one of the top three priorities and that health sciences and nursing also clearly have some needs. This was clear in the master plan discussions. It is necessary to partner and be creative. We know that for us to be successful in doing good research and attracting great students, we will have to be creative. He has no answer about the timing, but knows it is needed.

- You have suggested creativity in teaching models. What avenues do faculty have available to try different teaching models, etc.?
  - Dr. Lovell responded that if we are going to task the campus to think about ways to be creative, we also need to be willing to find ways to be transformative and evolve. If we
don’t, our value among other universities will decline. Need to make sure we are making it worthwhile for students and faculty to come here. Incubator programs will help develop courses around professional courses and continuing education. Those are ways that money can come back to a department.

Dr. Myers added that over the next six months, we will run a couple of pilot programs through the incubator. This will help develop the way in which we are going to run things. Necessary to buy faculty time, perform market research, advertise the program, etc. The Incubator Bank will fund all of that. When it begins to generate revenue, the program will pay back the loan to the Incubator Bank, and then will enter into some type of revenue sharing agreement. As we work through the process, there will be guidance and resources for those that want to develop programs/ideas.

Could you please explain how all of the property that was acquired on 6th Street will be developed?

Dr. Lovell responded that the entire space will be used for the APRC.

IX. Discussion on Core Revision Process – Dr. John Su, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

- The website (http://www.marquette.edu/common-studies-revision) includes all data and updates. There have been fifteen proposals from various groups on campus as to how we can structure the priorities for delivering the desired outcomes.
- What do we have to do? The timeline document dictates that at the April UAS meeting, we will be discussing these proposals. The process is that we wanted to balance openness with transparency. Transparency is that all of the proposals have to be reviewed by the same bodies in the same way. Anyone on campus can look at the proposals and offer comments. How will the April discussion work? The core revision facilitation group will begin the discussion with a brief PowerPoint summary of the 15 proposals, followed by a discussion of similarities, core issues, etc., and what would make sense to balance our commitment to being involved in liberal arts education?
- All proposals are on the website; all the information is there. Everyone has that access.
  - Q: Is there a standardized set of criteria for evaluation of the proposals?
    - A preponderance of evidence on the data resources page. This looks at the priorities that have been established on campus. What we like, balanced with the different pedagogies that come from across campus. The document that outlines what our core is supposed to be is short and worth a read as it clearly explains what the core is supposed to do.
- Hope to have a robust session at April meeting – with breakout groups and reporting back to summary of discussions.
- Dr. Lovell noted the core revision process highlight three criteria; 1.) More integrated, 2.) Mission centered, and 3.) Workable.

X. Informed on clarification of Attendance Policy – Dr. John Su, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

- This is not a new policy but rather a clarification of the policy that is currently published in the undergraduate bulletin. This version will be effective with the coming 2016-2017 academic year. The primary effort is to clarify several ambiguities.
- Questions:
  - Someone asked who was involved in these deliberations? There has been concern that the discussion did not involve faculty.
    - The discussion was initiated from A&S, was discussed by CAPS, Dr. John Su reviewed it and then sent it to Dr. Myers to make certain it was consistent with our vision. It was sent back to CAPS for further revision; University Board of Undergraduate Studies is the representative body that reviewed and endorsed.
Best practice indicates one should not grade at all on attendance; should be grading on student knowledge, not whether or not they are sitting in class. Has concern with some of the language. It was noted that on-line courses makes it difficult to evaluate attendance.

- A reminder that this is currently clarifying an existing policy rather than making policy. If a broad change should be considered, it can go to the Board of Undergraduate Studies. Dr. Holz would like to see that considered.

- Is this a participation grade or is it about attendance. Legitimate medical extenuating circumstances should be considered differently than for those students who just don’t attend.

- Can’t participate if not present.

- Would also suggesting including grandparents as well as parents. Some students are being raised by their grandparents, and also some families consider grandparents a part of the core family.

- Dr. Su will pass this information on to CAPS for consideration in the next round of clarifications.

XI. University Board of Graduate Studies – Dr. Michael Johnson

Motions to Approve:
- New Master of Applied Statistics, Klingler College of Arts and Sciences
  - Math department is doing good work.
  - Motion to Approve: 31 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain  Motion Passes: Unanimous
- New Certificate in Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner, College of Nursing
  - Motion to Approve: 31 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain  Motion Passes: Unanimous

Informed on:
- New specialization in Bioengineering – Biomedical Engineering Doctoral Requirements, Opus College of Engineering
  - Connects to the new joint program with MCW. Allows us to allow those that are interested in beginning that collaboration before everything is off the ground.
- Termination of specialization in Leadership Studies – Master of Arts in Public Services, Klingler College of Arts and Sciences
  - Can no longer be offered based on resources that are available.

XII. Informed on Potential Revisions to Statutes of the University Academic Senate
(motions will be presented at April meeting)
- Revise Article 4 Section 2.02.1 Core Curriculum Review Committee to add library liaison to committee
  - This revision comes through the core curriculum review committee; membership is defined by statutes. Dean of Libraries requested a library liaison be placed on that committee, and Ms. Heather James has been serving in that capacity. Have now received a request that the liaison become a permanent member. The rationale to change the membership in this way is because the library is central to the body of knowledge of the core, regardless of the discipline. This should be done now to have more experiential learning and to encourage more undergraduate research. These areas can be best supported by the library, across the board.
- Revise following sections to remove College of Professional Studies faculty membership
  - Article 2 Section 1.01 sentences D 1 and 3 remove UAS membership for College of Professional Studies
  - Article 4 Section 2.02.1 remove Core Curriculum Review Committee membership for College of Professional Studies
  - These are necessary revisions because we are closing the College of Professional Studies.

XIII. Proposed amendment to Faculty Hearing Committee in UAS Statutes
(motion presented from the floor by Prof. Bruce Boyden.)
- Proposed amendment has to do with the confidentiality statements. It is not clear in the existing language whether the committee’s report is subject to the confidentiality provision. Prof. Boyden is
proposing to amend the statues according to the document that was distributed so that some matters will be kept confidential even if a wider distribution might otherwise be considered.

- Read carefully; will be voted on at April meeting.

XIV. Dean Search Protocol Discussion

- Protocol was developed, but it never really came to Senate. Because it never came to Senate, it was changed without having gone to Senate.
  
  - Members pointed out that it was in fact sent to Senate as an informational item.

- Questions and Discussion:

  - Dr. Lephardt: Where is the final resting place, where is the formal document?
    - Fr. Michael Class indicated that the Provost’s Office requested a change and a committee was formed.
      - Dr. Maranto pointed out that the protocol has been changed in such a way that there is no longer an existing protocol. The practice has become keeping finalist candidates confidential. A number of concerns have been expressed to senate chair, and others that some changes might be made so that there was adequate opportunity for feedback from faculty members. Dr. Maranto asked that Faculty Council consider, so that a proposal could be made to the Provost.
      - When should a decision be made, how, and who makes it. If search is closed, how might student feedback be gathered, should student representatives on search committee be changed? Previously encouraged faculty to reach out to their faculty network to gain feedback, etc. Do we use this as a shared governance issue that needs our conversation? Opening to discussion.
    - Dr. Tim Melchert: His impression is that this is a bit of cultural change. Do we see this happening at other universities or is it only here?
      - Dr. Myers: Has asked the search firm to confirm because they have a better reach, but his impression that it is happening in other places. Searches in which he has been involved at the dean level and higher have been closed whenever possible. Public institutions cannot always do that, but it has become the norm elsewhere. This is primarily because candidates don’t want their current institution to be aware of their potential change because of their inability to be effective in current position if they don’t get the job. Therefore, some candidates (some of very best candidates, in fact) may choose not to enter the search at all rather than risk becoming ineffective in current position. That is what is driving the trend. He believes we want to get the very best candidates that we can; discussed with Dr. Lovell, and he agrees. Have attempted to bolster faculty participation in search committees in order to have the best input and representation without losing the best candidates. Happy to take comments and suggestions on ways to accomplish attracting best candidates.
    - Fr. Class: the search for provost was closed until finalists were named. We believe we got the best candidate – not just the best candidate that applied.
    - Dr. Myers: search firm has confirmed that this happens with some regularity.
    - Dr. Melchert: having closed searches seems to conflict with the desire to have more open and transparent, shared government. However, he is not opposed to the concept in general. He is aware from sitting on various school boards, etc., would have lost good candidates had it not been a closed search.
    - Dr. Myers: For the nursing dean search, had the faculty elect the search committee. That gave them a different kind of voice, but they had voice in who would be on the committee. Are trying to enhance the input and feedback in other ways. Previously, the provost appointed a search committee, and this change was seen as an effort to make the different approach work.
    - Mr. Stephen Hudson-Mairet has served on two search committees in the College of
Communication. From the committee and process standpoint, it is not terribly different. Sense was that they received a great number of qualified sitting deans this time around as compared to the past. Committee solicited more input in the “nominate” stage. Committee tried to provide as much information in the process as possible. How would the committee have done anything differently operationally? Would have allowed colleagues to do their own homework – not sure that actually add to the process. Believes there were more faculty and student reps this on committee than there might have been in the past.

- Dr. Myers: hadn’t started at Marquette yet when the Comm search started. The idea that came up after the search started was to elect additional faculty to be a part of the finalist process.

- Dr. Marilyn Frenn: both process have assets and limitations. She is a strong component of shared governance. There were different perspectives. Having an open discussion among faculty prior to the search being named as open or closed can help get a feel for making sure people feel included. Would help the search committee and next dean know what the college feels – the limitations and assets. Dean might have a harder time getting used to faculty once hired if closed search. Believes everyone is trying to do a good job; good efforts were made in reaching out to offer election of faculty to committee and to finalist process.

- Ms. Mary Jo Wiemiller: The document proposed by Faculty Council encompasses all the ideas. Can you clarify how we are supposed to proceed?
  - Anything passed by Senate would be passed to Provost as an Advisory document.

- Dr. Maranto: Discussed at a recent Business faculty meeting; the faculty felt this would most affect the more non-traditional candidates; faculty voted strongly in favor of an open search. This document ensures the piece of shared governance that has nobody telling colleges what they can do. Her experience is that when Provost says this is the way you are going to do something, very few people are willing to stand up and argue that point. This document protects the shared governance component.

- Dr. Myers: The protection of the closed search is probably more salient to people not in academic searches. However, the problem usually arises in situations where a faculty member is already a dean who applying to make a lateral move or to someone in another administrative position that they don’t want to lose. A faculty member applying for a dean is not so much the concern. A provost applying for a provost position at a different school risks a lot.

- Dr. Lephardt: Why not allow the faculty to vote whether they want closed or open? If presented with the right information, wouldn’t the faculty reach the same decision?

- Dr. Myers: Takes this protocol as something that ought to be a suggested set of norms vs. a dictated set of steps. All things should be taken carefully.

- Fr. Class: If keeping a search closed, how do you do due diligence on candidates?
  - Dr. Myers: Search firms we work with have protocols for managing that. They use the candidate-provided reference lists, but also “off-list” reference checking. Thy swear folks to secrecy when calling those off-list references. There is an advantage to having a search firm handle all of these because of consistency.

- Dr. Maranto: Point is well-taken; it is good to have all of this information as early in the process as possible.

- Wanted to bring this to Senate to have this discussion.

- Next steps: please read the document carefully and send any possible changes to Dr. Maranto. Will take an advisory vote at the April meeting, understanding that it is advisory. Important that there be some sort of endorsement of the process.
• Dr. Lephardt: Please discuss with your constituents in your college so that you can act as a true representative.
• Dr. John Su: If this is actually going to be held at a vote, could we actually get more information, would like some actual data vs. anecdotal; do chairs of search committees wish to address Senate; Senate needs to be informed.
• Dr. Lephardt: Documentation of actual process would be helpful.

XV. Adjourn at 5:00 p.m.
• Motion to Adjourn: Dr. Brian Hodgson
• Second: Dr. Jim Richie
• Voice Vote: Unanimous

Respectfully Submitted,
Noreen E. Haas-Lephardt, Ph.D.
UAS Secretary