

**MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY**  
**Office of the Provost**

Academic Senate Minutes  
November 15, 2004  
3:00 – 5:00 PM  
AMU Ballroom E

---

1. Call to Order/Invocation

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 pm. Dr. Mike McKinney led the prayer.  
Approval of Minutes of October 18, 2004

Members Present: Dr. Lea Acord, Dr. Janet Boles, Dr. Jack Brooks, Prof. Patricia Cervenka, Dr. Sharon Chubbuck, Dr. Robert Deahl, Rev. John Donnelly, Dr. Thomas Eddinger, Dr. Marilyn Frenn, Dr. Dan Griffiths, Dr. Carla Hay, Mr. Jacob Held, Dr. Peter Jones, Mr. Jay Kirk, Dr. John Krugler, Mr. Timothy Lefeber, Dr. William Lobb, Dr. Michael McKinney, Dr. Sarah Peck, Dr. Gregory Porter, Dr. James Rice, Dr. Guy Simoneau, Dr. William Starr, Dr. Thomas Taft, Dr. Madeline Wake, Dr. Marianne Weiss, Dr. Wanda Zemler-Cizewski

Not-Voting Member Present: Dr. Margaret Bloom

Guest Present: Dr. Rita Burns, Dr. Doug Day, Ms. Stephanie Russell, Mr. Steve Schultz, Sister Carol Ann Smith, S.H.C.J.

Members Excused: Dr. Nicholas Burckel and Dr. William Elliott

2. Approval of Minutes of the October 18, 2004

The following correction was noted: Dr. Thomas Taft was present.  
The minutes of October 18, 2004 were approved.

3. Enrollment Report – Anne Deahl

Ms. Deahl presented the current status of the recruitment process. Applications have dramatically increased. The admission office will use a four basic steps procedure for application. The deadline for applications is December 1, 2004. A goal has been set for mid-January for acceptance letters to go to incoming freshman students. Moving up the deadline date has resulted in many more applications coming in earlier this Fall than Fall 2003.

Mr. Kirk asked about the students who are admitted but don't attend. The "yield" last year for this Fall was 26%.

#### 4. Academic Governance

Provost Wake reviewed the groupings of items for Academic Senate review and approval. The senators were placed in groups of three to discuss the value of faculty input on the items marked on the attachment as for discussion. After small group discussion for 15 minutes Provost Wake opened up discussion. Discussion of each item

- a. College core curriculum, Dr. Taft and Dr. Curtis, reported their group opinions: The value: Senate could look over the overlap between offerings, offer a broader perspective. Thought would be at the level of Senate review and input or approval. Dr. Brooks stated he thought it was the right of the College to approve core, not the Senate. Dr. Bloom asked wasn't this the role that BUS takes in approval? Split opinion on Senate authority for college cores.
- b. Establish a new college. Faculty input would be most valuable. Faculty would need to know about resources and finance as well as curriculum to act on this. Group thought approval was appropriate. Majority favored approval.
- c. Hiring a President: Dr. McKinney reported the group thought faculty input is important. It wouldn't necessarily have to be academic senate. The charter of the Board of Trustees pertinent to this calls for faculty input. Group recommends executive committee of Senate gives input. General consensus was input was appropriate. Several senators and visitors commented on how beneficial faculty input would be. In respect to hiring a Dean there is faculty input at the college level and the appointment comes to Senate for endorsement. Endorsement was an unclear term so discussion continued about that. Provost Wake clarified that input is academic senate information is forwarded. Endorsement is review and recommendation.
- d. Discontinuing a major. Dr. Jones and Ms. Anne Deahl thought that if the Senate approved a major it would be parity to also have it approve or review and recommend the discontinuance a major. Dean McKinney shared what happened to three recent majors that were discontinued. He wondered if the decision might have profited for more input.
- e. Establishing a new interdisciplinary center. Rev Donnelly asked what an interdisciplinary center is. Senators favored either approval or Review and Recommend.
- f. Strategic Planning: Dr. Deahl stated that the group thought that faculty input was critical but not approval. Because it is university wide the Senate should be involved in input. All agreed.
- g. International study programs. Dean Accord reported her group thought it was so important that it should be approval. Dean McKinney stated these programs are small and that review and recommend seems more appropriate. Fr. Donnelly expressed concerns about international study being discontinued. The possibility is the difference between a study program and a course overseas. Majority favored review.

The Academic Governance Task Force will consider the discussion.

#### 5. Final Report – North Central Association Higher Learning Commission

The Senate was provided with the letter of certification from North Central and a copy of the program data from NCA.

#### 6. Dean Evaluation – Dr. Marilyn Frenn and Dr. John Krugler

The Committee on Staff felt uncomfortable in having staff give information on Deans and Committee on Administrators had limited contact with Deans so did not have input. The Committee on Faculty expressed concern about the Arts and Sciences faculty may have limited contact with the Dean. Is a separate form for the College of Arts and Sciences necessary? Committee on Faculty also wanted to know what happened to these evaluations after it was completed. A separate item was added to assess the office functioning separate from the Dean.

Dr. Brooks commented on the different definitions of part-time faculty and did not want to include all part-timers in the College of Health Sciences. Dean Acord commented she liked the changes. Provost Wake noted that faculty gets a compilation of the scores and comments. Senate recommended that the final version of the evaluation form go ahead.

#### 7. Planning Assumptions – Doug Day

Dr. Day summarized the process used in identifying the planning assumptions and the functions of the planning council. The academic planning process is now through March 31, 2005. The purpose is a plan that can be considering and building the process of Marquette academic units to plan. The support/administrative units will engage in a similar process during late Spring. Next Fall 2005 all of the plans were will used to identify key Marquette University decisions and priorities. The planning assumptions are guides to the colleges in formulating their plans in terms of what are central facts about Marquette University. Dr. Bill Starr stated he saw a heavier emphasis on undergraduate programs and felt this was not good as it isn't reality. Dean Deahl shared that this was a long discussion at ULC and the Dean's Council in identifying university values and emphasis. Dean Acord said the key word was transformational so that transformational education is the core value rather than undergraduate per se. Dr. Taft said transformational was also a goal in Dentistry and probably in other professional schools at MU. Dean Brooks agreed with this about professional programs. Rev. Donnelly states that there are many more undergraduates than graduates so seems appropriate to have special emphasis. Dr. Minor thinks that transformation does apply to graduate and professional as well. Dr. Day suggested that by naming both it allows more choices and directs attention to graduate as well as undergraduate. Dean McKinney shared that with the Deans' Council the top three with Catholic Jesuit, Teaching, and Undergraduate education with the others adding more distinctiveness. Dr. Peter Jones thought that the quality and character of faculty was more important than the phrase "to a considerable degree". Dr. Carla Hay agreed that there should be comments on resources for graduate and professional.

#### 8. Other - Provost Wake recognized Tony Tortorella for his long service to Marquette as Registrar.