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

II. Reflection was given by Dr. Noreen Lephardt

III. Approval of March 14, 2016 minutes
   • Motion to approve: Ms. Mary Jo Wiemiller
   • Second: Mr. Kurt Gering
   • Voice Vote: Unanimous

IV. Chair’s Report – Dr. Cheryl Maranto
   • Drs. Richie and Maranto are meeting with the Academic Excellence Committee of the Board of Trustees next week. The topic is “advancing research.” If members have items to convey, they can share with Cheryl or Jim.

V. Vice Chairperson’s Report – Dr. James Richie
   • Good attendance at recent Faculty Forum, including those who attended via streaming video.
   • Faculty Council will be bringing a motion to the May meeting of Senate to establish a work group for the purpose of reviewing the dean search protocol.
   • Faculty Council will also bring a motion to the May meeting of Senate to establish a work group to review the terms of Senate chair and vice chair.
   • Faculty Council will also be looking at proposed tenure buy-out policy changes.

VI. Secretary’s Report – Dr. Noreen Lephardt
   • Elections are today. Ballots were provided for the purpose of selecting UAS Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, Executive Council and liaison to University Board of Graduate Studies. There is currently no specific provision for absentee ballots. The UAS might want to consider a change to the statutes for addressing absentee ballots. Dale Kaser advised that balloting has been done by e-mail in the past, which would also allow the new members to participate in the vote. Paper ballots are being counted by Dale Kaser. Dr. Noreen Lephardt thanked those willing to be on the
ballot and engaged in the shared governance process.

VII. Provost’s Report - Dr. Daniel Myers
- VP Enrollment Management finalists have been on campus. Dr. Myers is consulting with the committee this week and hopes to make a decision shortly thereafter. He was pleased with the candidate pool.
- Dean of Admissions search just started and is moving forward with the search firm. This search was purposefully delayed so that the VPEM could participate. Hope to have both in place to participate in the recruiting season for next fall.
- Dean of Nursing search committee is in place and have a good pool of candidates. Still believe we are in good shape to have someone in place for fall; Dr. Donna McCarthy agreed to serve as interim until the position is filled.
- VP Student Affairs airport interviews are scheduled for this week; finalists will be selected in another week or so.
- Good progress is being made on all searches.
- Enrollment – 57% of projected first year class is deposited. We are still running ahead of last year (roughly 11%) and feel good about that. Traditionally, 40 to 50% of deposits come in the next couple of weeks. We are a little behind on transfers, but it is still early in the transfer process.
- Graduate enrollments are 8 to 9% ahead of last year; some programs are doing very well, others not so much. Good progress is being made.
- Strategic Plan website will probably be made available to the campus after the April Board meeting. Board shares the belief that a primary goal is to get this released as soon as possible after the board meeting. Looking for feedback, etc., and participation in the process, etc. Believes that all will be impressed with the website.

VIII. Revision to the Statutes of the University Academic Senate Pertaining to the Faculty Hearing Committee
- Prof. Bruce Boyden, Chair of the FHC
- The Senate, following a unanimous vote on a motion to do so, met in Executive Session to discuss the motion being presented by Prof. Bruce Boyden regarding proposed changes in the statutes pertaining to the Faculty Hearing Committee.
- The initial motion was introduced from the floor by Prof. Bruce Boyden at the March 14, 2016 UAS meeting. Because of changes to the motion it was re-introduced at the April 18, 2016 meeting and the motion will come to the floor for vote on May 2, 2016.
- The motion to be voted on in the May meeting (full language of the motion is included as enclosure to these minutes) is as follows:
  ▪ Revise the final paragraph of Article 4, Section 1.01.1, Faculty Hearing Committee
  ▪ Insert paragraphs 21 and 22 following Section 307.07 of the Faculty Statues
  ▪ Insert section 9.03, paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 following Section 9.02 in the Faculty Handbook

IX. University Board of Graduate Studies – Dr. Michael Johnson
- Informed on:
  a. Termination of specialization in Curriculum and Instruction, Education Policy and Leadership Master of Arts, College of Education
  b. Termination of specialization in Literacy, Education Policy and Leadership Master of Arts, College of Education
  The University Board of Graduate Studies unanimously approved both terminations. There were no questions from Senate.

X. University Board of Undergraduate Studies – Dr. John Su
- Informed on:
  a. Termination of Minor in Photography delivered with MIAD – Diederich College of Communication
MIAD has changed their curriculum and is no longer offering photography, hence the termination.

XI. Revisions to Statutes of the University Academic Senate

- Motions to Approve:
  a. Revise Article 4 Section 2.02.1 Core Curriculum Review Committee to add library liaison to committee
     - Motion: Mr. Kurt Gering
     - Second: Ms. MaryJo Wiemiller
     - Approved Unanimous by voice vote
  b. Revise following sections to remove College of Professional Studies faculty membership
     1. Article 2 Section 1.01 sentences D 1 and 3 remove UAS membership for College of Professional Studies
     2. Article 4 Section 2.02.1 remove Core Curriculum Review Committee membership for College of Professional Studies
        Given the closure of the College of Professional Studies, these actions are necessary.
        - Motion: Dr. Tim Melchert
        - Second: Dr. Rhonda Hughes
        - Approved: Unanimous by voice vote

XII. Revisions to Statutes of the University Academic Senate

- The following motions will be presented at May meeting
  To change the title “Dean of Graduate School” to “Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Studies and Dean of the Graduate School” in the following sections:
  a. Article 2, Section 1 – Definition of Membership
  b. Article 4, Section 2.03 – membership of University Board of Graduate Studies

The University Board of Graduate Studies is recommending an amendment to the motion to revise Article 4, Section 2.03 – membership of University Board of Graduate Studies. After discussion, UBGS recommends that the proposed revisions read:

Article 4, Section 2.03, Section 7:
Serves, as needed, as a hearing body for graduate student appeals.

Article 4, Section 2.03, Membership
“Dean of the Graduate School shall be a non-voting member.” should be replaced with “Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Studies shall be a non-voting member.”

This recommendation is made because, although one person is currently filling two positions (Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Studies and Dean of the Graduate School), making those positions effectively combined at the current time, that may not always be the situation. Those positions could easily be separate and filled by two individuals. In order for all graduate and professional programs to have appropriate representation on the University Board of Graduate Studies, the proper name is the Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Studies. Revising the statute to include only the one title eliminates the need to revise again in the future should the positions be separated. The recommendation to amend the revision is fine with the Provost’s Office.

Dr. Doug Woods explained that there are multiple graduate programs on campus and several do not fall under the Graduate School. The UBGS has oversight over all graduate programs and would be better served by Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Studies representation. That was one of the reasons for the new title – inclusion of professional program representation at the Vice Provost level.

Dr. Jim Richie presented a friendly motion, seconded by Dr. Rhonda Hughes, and unanimously approved by voice vote that the recommendations of the UBGS be accepted and that the motion being presented to the Senate for vote at the May meeting will read:
b. Article 4, Section 2.03 – membership of University Board of Graduate Studies.
   o Section 7: “Serves, as needed, as a hearing body for graduate student appeals.”
   o Membership: the next to the last sentence in the paragraph will be revised to read: “Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Studies shall be a non-voting member.”

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

- Dr. John Su briefly explained the current status of the core revision process.
- Dr. Lars Olsen provided further information, explaining that we have to make good on our promise to students, parents, and alumni to train men and women for others in the Jesuit Catholic tradition. External feedback indicates that we have to be more integrative and workable. The sweet spot for all of these is that we become something truly transformational. Lots of people on campus have been involved in this process, with 14 proposals prepared by various individuals/groups.
- Lars Olsen provided a short summary of the 14 proposals.

A suggestion was made that the UAS discussion of the Core Revision should be tabled to the May meeting to assure there is adequate time to discuss. The discussion can begin now and continue in May with sufficient time allotted on the agenda.

- Dr. John Su explained that we are currently at the point of conceptualizing ideas and should not necessarily worry about the resources, etc.
- The different structures enable different outcomes. We should be considering what should be the priorities, what is super important to us in figuring out how to fit this into the undergraduate core.
- Dr. Jim Richie added thanks to the many people that have done a lot of work in this process. He indicated that if one reads the big document, it lists areas where there might be difficulty with assessing or providing faculty development, etc. The data resources tab of the core revision website has a lot of information on the entire process.

This discussion will continue at the May Senate meeting.

XIV. Adjourn at 5:01 p.m.
- Motion to Adjourn: Fr. Michael Class
- Second: Mr. Kurt Gering
- Voice Vote: Unanimous

Respectfully Submitted,
Noreen E. Haas-Lephardt, Ph.D.
UAS Secretary
**Motion**: The Faculty Hearing Committee moves to replace UAS Statutes Art. 4, Section 1.01.1, final paragraph, with the following (double underline/bold indicates additions; strikeouts indicate deletions), to take effect upon approval by the President and applicable to all disclosures made after that time, even if the disclosure pertains to proceedings or documents produced earlier in time:

*Confidentiality*: All persons participating in a grievance proceeding before the Faculty Hearing Committee under subsection (1) or (2) above shall keep all deliberations, records, reports, or minutes of the Committee regarding that proceeding, grievances presented to it in due course as contemplated by the Faculty Handbook, as well as any information presented to the Committee in conjunction with those issues during that proceeding, will remain confidential with respect to third parties nonparticipants, subject to the following exceptions:

1) Any disclosure to another University official or body permitted under these Statutes or the Faculty Handbook;

2) Any information disclosed in an open hearing under Faculty Statutes § 307.07 ¶ 10 or Faculty Handbook III.D §§ 506–507;

3) Any disclosure of a report pursuant to Faculty Statutes § 307.07 ¶ 21 or Faculty Handbook III.D § 9.03;

4) Any disclosure made pursuant to legal process recognized by the State of Wisconsin issued under the authority of state or federal law;

5) Any disclosure made as part of a proceeding in which the disclosing person is a party.

The FHC moves to insert the following new paragraph after Faculty Statutes § 307.07 ¶ 20:

**21. Upon a request from the subject faculty member, which request shall not be denied, the FHC shall release its final report by delivery to the University Academic Senate or by other means.** Upon a motion from the University Administration, or on its own motion, the FHC may by majority vote release its final report in the same manner, if the Committee first determines that a broader disclosure is required by the compelling interests of the University community, and if the subject faculty member consents to the release of the report. In either case, the report released must be redacted pursuant to paragraph 22 below. Once the redacted report has been released, any interested person may further distribute the redacted report.

**22. Prior to releasing its final report, the FHC shall first prepare a redacted version of its report that removes all sensitive, nonpublic information received by the Committee and contained in the report, such as information contained in performance reviews, student evaluations, private communications, information protected by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, or the testimony of witnesses in a closed hearing. It shall reveal its proposed redacted report to the parties to the proceeding and allow at least 14 days for objection prior to releasing the redacted version of its report. If any party objects to the inclusion of any nonredacted information, or the exclusion of any redacted information, the FHC shall consider each objection and vote whether to include the information in question in its redacted report. The right of the faculty member to make objections to redactions or nonredactions from the report, and the power of the FHC to decide whether to sustain or deny those objections, is independent of the right of the subject faculty member provided in paragraph 21 above to withhold consent to the release of the redacted report as a whole.
The FHC moves to insert the following new paragraph after Faculty Handbook § 9.02:

9.03—Distribution of Final Reports.

(1) Upon a request from the grievant, which request shall not be denied, the FC shall prepare a redacted version of its report, the committee’s report, or the university’s report, as provided in subsection (4) of this section, and provide such redacted version to the grievant.

(2) Upon a motion from the university, or upon its own motion, the FC may by majority vote release either its final report, or the committee’s final report, or both, by delivery to the University Academic Senate or by other means, if the FC first determines that a broader disclosure is required by the compelling interests of the University community, and if the grievant consents to the release of the report. Once the redacted reports have been released, any interested person may further distribute the redacted reports.

(3) The Provost, in consultation with the FC, may release the university’s final report in either the circumstances provided in Section 9.02, or in response to the release of other reports as provided in subsection (2) of this section.

(4) The FC shall prepare redacted versions of each report to be disclosed that removes all sensitive, nonpublic information contained in the report, such as information contained in performance reviews, student evaluations, private communications, information protected by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, or the testimony of witnesses in a closed hearing. It shall reveal the proposed redacted reports to the grievant and to the Provost and allow at least 14 days for objection prior to releasing the redacted version of the reports. If any party objects to the inclusion of any nonredacted information, or the exclusion of any redacted information, the FC shall consider each objection and vote whether to include the information in question. The right of the grievant to make objections to redactions or nonredactions from a report, and the power of the FC to decide whether to sustain or deny those objections, is independent of the right of the grievant provided in section 9.03(2) above to withhold consent to the release of a redacted report as a whole. In addition, if the grievant chooses to make any report public him- or herself, the grievant shall not be bound by any of the FC’s redaction decisions.