I. Call to Order - Dr. Timothy Melchert called the meeting to order at 3:04 pm

II. Reflection – Dr. Noreen Lephardt

III. Approval of February 16, 2015 Minutes

   Motion: Dr. Bill Thorn
   Second De. Michael Wert
   The minutes were unanimously approved.

IV. Chair's Report – Dr. Timothy Melchert

   Once again, we welcome Dr. Dan Myers who is able to attend today’s Senate meeting. I know he wants to learn as much as possible about the issues we deal with and we're glad you could be here today.

   a. UAS representative for the Graduate School Dean Search Committee

      The Provost has assembled a search committee for the Dean of the Graduate School and asked the Senate EC to identify a Senate representative for that committee. We are very pleased that Dr. Ed Blumenthal, from Biological Sciences, agreed to serve on that committee. They plan to get the search underway as soon as possible and select a candidate who can start in the position this summer.

   b. Conforming revisions to Senate Statutes regarding election for Faculty Council and procedure for implementing the changes the first year.

      The Executive Committee has made various conforming revisions to the Senate Statutes as you authorized us to do at our last meeting in order to implement the changes we made to the committees that report to the Senate. We are disbanding of the Committee on Faculty Welfare and the Committee on Academic Policies and Issues and the making the Faculty Council a representative body instead of one comprised of faculty elected at-large from the whole university. Several of the changes we made were very minor, such as deleting references to the disbanded committees. But we noted that the language for electing the chair and vice chair to the Faculty Council was unclear:

      The statute revisions we approved at our last meeting state that the vice chair and chair will be elected annually but they also state that the vice chair will serve as chair the following year. The intent was to ensure continuity in leadership of the Faculty Council from year to year, but the statutory language needs to be clarified about whether the chair and vice chair are in fact elected annually or the vice chair is essentially elected for a two-year term. We've
asked the Faculty Council to discuss that issue and propose language that would clarify this issue. Their proposal will then come here for a vote.

We also went ahead with implementing changes in the way Faculty Council members are elected for next year. Previously nearly all the FC positions were elected at-large from the faculty as a whole, but going forward the colleges are selecting their own representatives for the FC. So Council members whose terms are ending this year are being replaced by people elected in the various colleges. The length of the terms for the new FC members (starting next Fall) are being staggered so that one-third turn over every year.

c. Request UAS representatives for the Faculty Activities Database Advisory Committee

Regarding another matter, two faculty members are moving off the Faculty Activities Database Advisory Committee at the end of this year and the Senate Executive Committee has been asked to appoint replacements. That committee does not meet often but it provides important input on how that database functions and how it is used. Dr. Gary Meyer is chair of that committee and I’m sure he is happy to answer questions if you are interested in serving on that committee starting next Fall for a 3-year term. Please contact me over the next 3 weeks if you would like to nominate yourself or someone else for that committee. The Executive Committee will identify our nominations for that committee at our next meeting on April 13. Dr. Gary Meyer noted that the rep. did not need to be a senator and this position would be good for young faculty.

d. Updates

You may have noticed that Linda Salchenberger, Associated Provost for Academic Planning and Budgeting, was on the Senate agenda earlier this semester to update us on plans for moving ahead with enrollment management. That presentation has been postponed until our incoming provost is able to learn more about the issues involved and be appropriately involved

I also want to provide an update on the case involving Dr. McAdams. Therefore, I would like to ask Drs. Holz and Callahan to again excuse themselves because we’re trying to keep the lines of responsibility for processing this case as clean as possible. So could you two along with Dr. Myers please wait outside and someone will let you know when we’re finished with this part of my report.

Drs. Callahan and Myers were excused from the room.

After a brief discussion the senate determined the body would not be going into executive session.

The Senate Executive Committee is continuing to monitor the case involving Dr. McAdams. As I mentioned at our last meeting, Dr. Holz informed Dr. McAdams on Jan. 30 that a process was initiated to revoke Dr. McAdams’ tenure and to dismiss him. As you know, the Senate does not have responsibility for faculty discipline, but we do have a responsibility to ensure that faculty review processes are fair and carried out appropriately. So I think it’s important for the Senate to be aware of the process that is being used in this case. I’ve noticed that many people on campus are not familiar with the policies that apply here, probably because the university hasn’t attempted to dismiss a tenured faculty member in decades. Therefore, I want to take a minute to review those policies so we are in a better position to respond if we notice problems in the process or the policies involved in this case.

If you want to examine the specific university statutes that govern the dismissal of tenured faculty members, refer to the university Statutes on Faculty Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure, which is part of the Faculty Handbook. Chapter. 307 of those statutes describe the procedures used after notice is given that the process to dismiss a faculty member has been initiated. The person who makes these decisions is the “appointing official” which I believe in all cases here at MU would be a dean, and s/he also needs to spell out the reasons for the decision in writing.

The faculty member and the dean are then given 120 days from the date of that notice to negotiate a settlement of the issues. If no resolution is found and the dismissal remains contested, the issue is then referred to the Faculty Hearing Council. They then have 90 days to review the case, make findings of fact, and arrive at conclusions about the case. Their findings are then referred to the President for a final decision.

Given that Dean Holz’s letter to Dr. McAdams was dated Jan. 30, 120 days from then is roughly June 1. So if a
resolution to the case is not achieved by June 1, the matter will be referred to the Faculty Hearing Council which has 90 days to review the case and make a conclusion. Their deadline would be roughly the end of August. All members of the FHC must be tenured faculty members, and the statutes state that a minimum of 5 members is required for a quorum. If members are unavailable due to recusals based on a conflict of interest, or sabbaticals, medical issues, or whatever, the Faculty Council has the responsibility to identify alternate members. Therefore, the Senate Executive Committee has asked the FC to review and publish in its minutes its procedures for identifying alternate members for the FHC so they are prepared if alternates are needed in this case. The Senate, Faculty Hearing Council, and all the other committees that report to the Senate typically do not meet over the summer, but it is important to note that all of our terms begin and end on August 15 of each year. So if the McAdams case went to the Faculty Hearing Council at the beginning of June, they would be asked to hear the case over the summer. By the way, the same thing applies to the Senate. If a major issue or controversy comes up over the summer that requires an immediate or timely response, we would expect that the Senate leadership will be informed and consulted even though regularly scheduled Senate meetings are not taking place. This is essential for effective shared governance.

Dr. Meyer asked if this went to the FHC are they reviewing the whole case and could the decision be reversed? The FHC is fact finding and they can agree or disagree but they are advisory. The final decision will be made by the president.

This is just an overview of the process. There are many more details involved but I wanted to explain the main parts of the procedure because, as I said, a lot of people seem to be unaware of the process involved and we, as a Senate, do have an interest in making sure the policies are fair and carried out appropriately. The group felt that this report was adequate. No other groups need to be updated. Any additional concerns, please contact Dr. Melchert.

V. Vice Chairperson’s Report – Dr. William Thorn

Dr. Thom noted that the process for the election of the FC Chair and VC will be taken up by the Faculty Council.

The Faculty Forum on March 25th at 3:30 PM in the AMU. He asked each senator to submit one question from their area to the FC. The questions will be screened and then forwarded to the President. The Faculty Council email will remain open through Thursday of this week.

VI. Secretary Report – Dr. Noreen LePhardt

The at-large nominations for the Senate seats and Faculty Hearing Committee will close on March 20 and elections will begin March 23 and be open for one week. Once all elections are completed the senate will elect UAS leadership, executive Committee and senator liaisons.

Please complete the handout to self-nominate or nominate another seated senator for the UAS leadership and liaison positions. At the April meeting final nominations will occur. Ballots will go out and the final results for the Senate EC and liaison positions will be announced at the May meeting.

VII. Provost’s Report - Dr. Margaret Callahan

Undergraduate Admissions:

- **Freshmen:** 271 Deposits, up 7% from last year (17 deposits)
- **Transfers:** 16 deposits, up 129% from last year (9 deposits)

We have 162 TR admits, up 16% from last year (22 apps)

- Last Saturday’s MU v DePaul game was our Admitted Student Game for incoming freshmen
- Sunday we hosted our first ever Marquette’s First Families event for the families of admitted first generations freshman. This was a collaborative effort between Admissions, Student Success Services and Student Development. Over 38 families attended (120 individuals)
- Wednesday we hosted 15 high school counselors from 8 states for our annual Counselor Advisory Board meeting
- Many PrepTalk sessions are taking place with admitted and waitlisted students, school counselors and parents. We’re finding many ways to try to reach out to freshmen and transfers
• Both, to ensure we are addressing any questions they have as they make their final college decisions. May 1 is fast approaching and we have more events yet to take place.

Graduate Admissions:
• As of March 6th 2015, the gross total of applications is down 14% overall compared to the same period in 2014. When compared to 2013, it is down 19%. Anecdotally the reduction in applications is similar to peer Jesuit institutions, as well as other comparable institutions.
• Graduate School of Management applications are down from last year and in comparison to 2013 are down from being over 600 to just over 400.
• Some programs are capped, and will make their classes with no reduction in quality (e.g., Health Sciences). Capped programs: include Clinical Psychology, Counseling Psychology and Speech Pathology. All have small entering class sizes and reduced but still substantial applicant pools.
• Discounting capped programs from the overall figure, the decline is reduced from 14% to 8%.
• STEM disciplines have relatively flat applications numbers overall. There are increases in Electrical and Computer Engineering, and Computational Sciences, and decreases in Bioinformatics, Computing, and Mechanical Engineering.
• Education Policy and Leadership has seen a drop in applications which is likely attributable to the uncoupling of improved credentials to increased remuneration by local authorities in the wake of Wisconsin Act 10.
1. Nursing applications appear to be significantly down. Some of this may be due to the implementation of the CAS enrollment management system which has had a number of startup issues. Nevertheless there seems to be an overall decline. The Direct Entry MSN program (2015 summer start) will fill as usual.
2. Humanities applications are down following a national trend. In comparison are down 18% from 2014 and down 17% from 2013.
3. Some departments (e.g., Philosophy) are intentionally reducing the PhD acceptance rate as a correction to past practices. However humanities PhD programs are generally not revenue-generating and typically have low numbers.
4. Given the apparent trends, the graduate school is putting substantial effort into converting applicants into enrolled students through individualized outreach and hosting accepted student events. In the last two years, the average acceptance of offers has been 47%, and increasing that will go a long way to offsetting lower application numbers.

Budget for 2016 – units are getting their budgets at this now – huge shift that is welcomed and will help with planning.

VIII. Motion to Approve: Change in Statutes for Board of Graduate Studies to revise membership (Attachment VIIB)
This item was presented to the UAS at the February meeting in preparation for the vote at the March UAS meeting. There were no questions from the senators.

The motion was called, and a hand vote was taken:
In Favor: 26
Opposed: 0
Abstentions: 0
The motion passed unanimously.

IX. University Board of Undergraduate Studies – Dr. Edward Blumenthal, Chair
a. Motion to Approve – Biophysics Major, Department of Physics
Dr. Blumenthal briefly reviewed the proposed new major in Biophysics. Also here today is Dr. Brian Bennett, Chair of the Department of Physics, to help answer your questions about the proposal. The detailed proposal for the new major is included as an attachment.
Biophysics, as one can tell from the name, lies at the intersection of biology and physics. It involves both understanding biological phenomena at the level of individual molecules, individual atoms, and physical forces, and also designing the instruments and methodologies that permit such measurements. Biophysics is an exciting growth area in both biology and physics, and several recent faculty hires in the Departments of Physics, Biological Sciences, and Chemistry all work in this area.
The proposed major is quite rigorous. The curriculum includes 23 credits of required physics courses, 15 required biology credits, 32 foundational credits in math and chemistry, and 12 elective credits in physics, biology, and chemistry. No new resources are required to create this major, as all courses are already offered.
Biophysics has traditionally been taught at the graduate level, and undergraduate biophysics majors are relatively rare.
According to a market analysis, the largest existing programs in the Midwest are at Loyola and the University of Michigan, each of which graduates between 5-10 biophysics majors annually. We feel that the proposed major is superior in many respects to that of our closest competitor, Loyola, in that our program would be more interdisciplinary in nature and would offer more opportunities for student research.

Market research has been done and this program has room for growth and will be more interdisciplinary than others in the area. The vote at UBUS was unanimous at UBUS. There will be two dedicated biophysics courses which will be unique to Marquette University.

Eight students are expected in the first cohort and they anticipate expansion to possibly 10 students.

The motion was called, and a hand vote was taken:
In Favor: 26
Opposed: 0
Abstentions: 0
The motion passed unanimously.

b. Informed on Decision – Approval of Engineering Concentration, Opus College of Engineering

A new Concentration in Engineering Leadership, which was unanimously approved by the UBUS and is presented to the UAS as an informational item.

The new concentration is described in detail in the attachment. Briefly, the purpose of this concentration is to prepare Engineering students for leadership positions. Participating students will already have been accepted into the E-lead program in Engineering.

The concentration consists of 7 additional courses, most of which are 1-credit seminars. These include one professional development course, three didactic courses that focus on themes of Leading Oneself, Leading Others, and Leading Technology and Innovation, and three experiential courses that include opportunities for students to industry leadership practices in the workplace and a capstone project on which students serve in leadership roles.

Funds have already been raised to support annual cohorts of 20 students, and the first such group has already been accepted and has begun coursework. The College of Engineering is hoping to raise additional funds that would allow a total of 40 students per year to enter the new concentration.

They anticipate 20 students a year and the first cohort has been identified and plan for 40 in the future.

Approved by UBUS unanimously. No action needed by UAS.

X. University Board of Graduate Studies – Dr. Edward Blumenthal
a. Motion to Approve MS Degrees for School of Dentistry

This is an administrative change. Students cannot have the same degree twice. The administrative change will result in a student being able to earn two masters degrees. The new master’s program design will have very little overlap in courses. The ADA did not think it would be an issue.

The motion was called, and a hand vote was taken:
In Favor: 26
Opposed: 0
Abstentions: 0
The motion passed unanimously.

b. Informed on Decision – Approval of Nurse Anesthesia specialization in the Doctor of Nursing Practice program, College of Nursing

Dr. Maureen O’Brien responded to senate floor questions
The majority of clinical rotations will take place at Froedtert.

Students will need to take out significant loans (spend money to make money) but they will also earn higher incomes. The program would recoup its cost in the third year of the program and begin making money for the university at that time.
XI. Implementation of a Joint Biomedical Engineering Department between Medical College of Wisconsin (MCW) and Marquette University – Dr. Lars Olson, Interim Bio-Med Chair

This will truly be a joint department effort with a joint chair that will report to MU dean of Engineering and Dean of the Medical School. Dr. Kristine Ropella and Dr. Jeanne Hossenlopp will be engaged in administration. Other programs are similarly structured and faculty will retain tenure at their current institution. Five lines will be sustainable by the enrollments at Marquette and five lines will be created at the Medical College. Both Marquette and the Medical College are looking at philanthropy opportunities currently. Dr. Thorn asked about the interface between budgets Discussion are underway on how the two budgets will interface; this is still being clarified.

Dr. Henk asked why this was a department structure? MCW needs connection with an engineering school. The MCW increased grant writing will be reflecting in our US News & World report numbers.

Kyle Whelton inquired about transportation for the undergraduate students. Currently faculty and graduate students drive vans with the students to get to the seminars at the Medical College. Shuttle service is not currently part of the initial plan as at this time undergraduate course will be offered at MU’s campus.

Dr. Melchert asked about the approval process. Dr. Ropella indicated that it would need to be approved by the Board of Trustees by both institutions. Dr. Hossenlopp indicated that the proposal might not get to Marquette’s Board of Trustees until December of 2015. She indicated that it is not in a final proposal format. The initiative is still in a white paper format and details are still being worked out. Dr. Olson noted that there is no rubric for approving a new department. Dr. Meyer asked if ABET weighed in on the process. ABET does not accredit department but programs. Medical College of Wisconsin does not currently have this department.

Dr. Melchert noted this is an important proposal and a perhaps a resolution of support from UAS would be appropriate. Kyle Whelton indicated that MUSG would also be interested making a resolution of support.

Dr. Thorn asked for a “straw vote” of support. Dr. Gibson noted it should be support of the initiative since the proposal is not complete. Dr. Richie noted this was more of a graduate education

Motion:

“UAS supports the initiative for a joint biomedical engineering department between MU and the medical college of WI”

Motion: Fr. Class
Second: Kyle Whelton

Voice vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Kyle Whelton said thank you to the UAS as the MUSG representative. He was thanked for his service this year. This will be his last meeting.

XII. Adjourn – The motion to adjourn was made at 4:26 pm

Motion to Adjourn: Dr. John Su
Second: Dr. Noreen Lephardt
Voice Vote: Unanimous

Respectfully Submitted

Noreen E. Lephardt
UAS Secretary