MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY
University Academic Senate Minutes
October 18, 2021
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Teams

Members in attendance: Dr. Allison Abbott, Dr. Kimo Ah Yun, Ms. Valerie Beech, Dr. Jill Birren, Ms. Rebecca Blemberg, Dr. Heidi Bostic, Ms. Jennifer Cook, Dr. Joseph Domblesky, Dr. Scott D'Urso, Mr. Atiba Ellis, Ms. Ana Escudero; Dr. Marilyn Frenn, Dr. Sarah Gendron, Dr. Arndt Guentsch, Ms. Makayla Harrow, Mr. Tim Houge, Dr. Margaret Hughes-Morgan, Dr. Yasser Khaled, Dr. Chima Korieh, Dr. Jennifer Ohlendorf, Ms. Samari Price, Dr. Kristina Ropella, Mr. Doug Smith, Dr. Elaine Spiller, Dr. John Su, Mr. A. Jay Wagner, Dr. Doris Walker-Dalhouse, Dr. Miao (Grace) Wang, Dr. David Wangrow, Dr. Amber Wichowsky, Ms. Mary Jo Wiemiller, Dr. Doug Woods

Members excused: Dr. Michael Donoghue, Dr. Sarah Feldner, Dr. Paul Gasser, Dr. Lars Olson, Dr. Christopher Stockdale, Mrs. Lisa Weber

Members not present:
Guests: see spreadsheet for full attendance list

I. The Chair observed a quorum and called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

II. Approval was given by Mr. Atiba Ellis.

III. Approval of September 20, 2021 meeting minutes (Att. III)
   o Motion to approve: Senate Chair Abbott
   o Second: Senate Vice Chair Wichowsky
   o Passed without objection

IV. Chair’s Report – Dr. Allison Abbott
   o Update from last meeting: The change to UAS statutes to form the University Faculty Committee on Budgets and Financial planning was supported by Provost Ah Yun and approved by President Lovell. UAS EC is working on next steps to get the committee populated. Chair requests assistance in identifying individuals to engage in this committee work.
   o Chair highlights letter written by Dr. John Su to solicit Teaching Excellence award nominations; these are due November 16.
   o FELOS program highlight: Please consider participating in this cohort; it is transformative. Applications are due November 5.
   o Senate needs to decide if we want to remain fully online for Spring 2022 UAS meetings or move to in-person meetings with a virtual option. Chair puts a survey in the chat and adds that she needs to hear from all senators; others may weigh in as well.

V. Vice Chair’s Report – Dr. Amber Wichowsky
   o FC met last week and there are several items to bring forward. Doug Smith brought a resolution before UAS at the last meeting that was referred to FC; this resolution was regarding task forces as well as confidentiality agreements. All FC members solicited feedback from their respective college/department faculty members. Results of feedback were received and discussed, and we subsequently voted. Vote results: 1 vote to endorse as is; 4 votes to endorse with amendments; 4 ‘no’ votes; and 3 abstentions. Feedback received was that while the resolution was able to identify faculty concerns, faculty wanted to find more productive ways to work together moving forward.
   o FC had invited the Marquette AAUP chapter members to present at one of their meetings; Sonia Barnes and Sergio Gonzalez presented to FC last week. They noted that their AAUP chapter meetings are open to the campus community.
   o FC voted on approving several faculty members to serve on the MCC Advisory Council.
   o Dr. Kristen Haglund has been nominated to be Vice Chair of FC; this will be voted on at the next meeting.
   o We anticipate that at our next FC meeting, we will be reflecting on what we hear from Provost Ah Yun today in his report on the work group recommendations.
VI. Secretary’s Report – Ms. Rebecca Blemberg

- We have a new senator, Ana Escudero, who is replacing Taylor Ralph from Libraries.

VII. Provost’s Report – Dr. Kimo Ah Yun, Provost

- The official UG enrollment for fall 2021 is 1653; this is below our 1770 budget. Diversity is strong: 34% of the class comes from diverse backgrounds; 18% identify as Hispanic and 6% identify as Black. The average ACT score is strong at 27.4. We continue to see growth in our graduate programs with 3660 graduate and professional students; this is the highest since Fall 2010. This population represents 32% of the entire student body and is the highest proportion since at least 2005. Diversity: 22% identify as students of color; this is highest since 2005. Spring 2022 applications for the Graduate School and are GSM down 11% compared to last year at this time. However, students who have accepted offers to attend Marquette has increased 16% over last year at this time.

- Beyond Boundaries and University strategic priorities (PPT presentation): We presented to LEAD last week and this information was also posted in Marquette Today. Beyond Boundaries is the top level of the strategic plan. The five strategic priorities are 1) Student Success: increase retention and graduation rates through a multi-year process. 2) Research: double research expenditures to $50M; last number was ~$37M. 3) Enrollment: grow in areas of UG 4) Online and graduate programs: would like to see increases in this area. Please use the existing pathways to bring your initiatives forward. The Incubator program has done very well. 5) Stewardship of resources: making sure we are using resources in the most efficient way.

- Executive searches: each of the three committees have been charged (Dean of Nursing, Dean of Libraries, and VP for Inclusive Excellence). Positions should be posted by the end of the semester with the intention to announce the decisions in March. Listening sessions begin next week; please get engaged in these.

- Update: there was a question about IP policy and related data; the resolution was referred to FC. The request for data has been filled; I sent the documents to FC Chair Jeff Berry. Next steps are in their hands, but I believe I have fully fulfilled the request that was made.

- Discussion/Questions:
  - Q: Senator Gendron – Can we get more clarity around the FC votes on the resolution? We know the numbers but we don’t know the reasons. Will this be shared at some point?
    - A: Vice Chair Wichowsky - I only have the vote totals. I will defer to Jeff Berry, FC Chair. I can tell you that there were some suggestions about raising the resolution in a more productive way. There was concern about some university committees being hamstrung by the limitations within the resolution, and there were also concerns about things being overly restrictive if everything would need to feed through faculty senate. Many of these things already work through the standing committees of senate. We need to be careful that we are doing our part for shared governance in a mindful way.
    - Senator Gendron clarifies that she was not looking for all of the specifics of the vote right now.
    - A: Senate Chair Abbott – the resolution brought forward some issues and concerns, and we will work to identify how to best address these concerns between now and the next meeting through policy guidance, a resolution, or possible reaffirmation, etc. We have the appropriate structure within the new budget committee as well as within the existing standing committees; they can all create task forces if necessary. We will keep working on this, and we should be able to report back next month.

UAS, October 18, 2021
connections to the recommendations made by the work groups.

- Q: Senator Smith – with regard to the University budget documents that will be presented to the BOT for approval in December, will ELT share these with UAS or any faculty prior to the board meeting? If not, can you discuss what, if any, additional budget reductions to academic programs and colleges are being considered for FY ’23?
  - A: Provost Ah Yun – We have the new committee being formed, and when that committee is up and running the budget will be presented to them prior to its adoption by the BOT. Yes, there are faculty eyes on it. The UFPRC faculty representative is Gary Adams and he has talked with UAS. Additionally, Lisa Thiemann is a NTT faculty member who serves on that committee.
  - A: Senate Chair – We are in good shape for the following cycle, but the committee may not be populated in time prior to the December BOT meeting. Therefore, Doug’s question remains. Can there be a presentation of the information prior to it going to the BOT?
  - A: Provost – I am not certain what ‘that’ information is, and as you know, I will always talk about this with UAS EC. The reason you recommended Gary Adams is that he can serve as the faculty member who can discuss this. We can work with UFPRC. I imagine there are some things to be discussed; however, I am not certain what that all would look like right now. We do have faculty members on this committee, and we can certainly talk about what we can do.

VIII. University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure – Dr. Gary Meyer, Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
  - Introduction of motion (to be voted on at next meeting): Addition to Section 3.04.08 in Faculty Statutes on Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Section 304.08 to include information on time-bound year extensions (Atts. VIIIa, VIIIb and VIIIc)

Dr. Gary Meyer:
  - Dr. Meyer thanks the Chair for mentioning the FELOS Leadership Program and states that the last three UAS Chairs have gone through this program. Please reach out to Dr. Meyer if you have an interest.
  - This proposal is coming to you from the University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure as a recommended change to the faculty handbook that would create a pathway for pre-tenured faculty to apply for a timebound year extension under extenuating circumstances. This was prompted in part by COVID, when all pre-tenured faculty were given an extra year. We recognize that there could be faculty who are still experiencing supply chain challenges and are unable to get labs running, for example. We know that no one would take an extension unnecessarily. We don’t see this as being something that would be used regularly but only in disruptive and unusual circumstances.

- Discussion/Questions:
  - Q: Senate Chair – Were there any concerns or potential problems brought up at the committee?
    - A: Dr. Meyer – There was some concern that an applicant may get approved and go up through the chair and/or dean who might be very amenable, and there could be others who may not be so amenable. The language in here talks about the spirit of cura personalis; if the rationale is compelling and the situation is disruptive, then the answer would be a presumptive ‘yes.’ In any case in which the provost may feel inclined not to approve a request, there would be discussion between the university committee and the provost ahead of the decision. This way the committee would be able to begin to get a sense of which types of applications/cases to which the provost may not be amenable. This is added as a safeguard to get a second set of eyes on it. We just want to provide the opportunity in the case that the need arises. It is meant to be helpful but not used often. This has been inserted in Section 304.08 of the faculty handbook.
  - Q: Vice Chair Wichowsky – My question does not have anything to do with this particular piece of the handbook, but rather your discussion about COVID and the disruptions that have prompted this. Have you (also mentions that this is also a possible topic for Senate consideration) thought about helping faculty who have had their research severely disrupted? Perhaps they have fallen off the grant cycle or have not been able to access their labs. For those of us with young unvaccinated children, this continues to be a struggle. What thoughts have been given to the other supports for faculty across ranks? We know that other universities have tried to find creative ways for faculty to apply for additional resources in order to help make up that gap.
    - A: Dr. Meyer – The committee that brings this forward is P&T, so we did not address anything post-
Dr. Gary Meyer:

- In Spring 2021, this task force was charged with answering four research questions. The members of the task force were recommended for their representation across various disciplines, rank, gender, race, expertise, etc. The committee met about twelve times during the spring and about half of the summer to put together a report and submit recommendations to the provost. Dr. Meyer shares the research questions. The task force did conclude that the benefits of the program do outweigh the costs. When this benefit started about twenty years ago, there was no consistency in the ways in which buyouts were managed. Therefore, one of the reasons for this policy is to establish transparency and good will. This does create opportunities for the university to hire new faculty.
- There are different ways to calculate costs when looking at the payout; this really depends on the year. The 2-year median is about $800k. Also considered in terms of cost is that we tend to lose all of that institutional history and experience when someone retires; we also considered the program administration costs. We believe the program should continue in some fashion.
- Compared to other universities, most do not have a program like Marquette’s. Of our benchmark universities, five in the reference group are Jesuit universities (some are peer and some are aspirational). We also looked at ten additional Jesuit universities and four additional Big East universities. We did not look at public universities. Only about 1/3 of the 36 universities had any kind of program, and only five of those had an immediate payout. Thirteen had some sort of phased plan similar to ours. The plan we had in place at the time of review was certainly in the top three of all those we found. Many phased plans did not even have a buyout benefit.
- Effectiveness of the program: There was no written articulation of any goals. The group considered what the goals of a program like this would even look like. We believe that we were able to put forth a transparent and consistently managed process. We wanted to incentivize faculty retirement. Faculty age is getting younger, and there is partial evidence most are retiring before the age of 70. We believe there are cost-saving opportunities realized here as well as an opportunity for young scholars. We also tried to be thoughtful about balancing cura personalis and cura apostolica.
- There continue to be two options: the immediate payout option and phased option. We are happy to continue with both. The payout amount is different (changed from 100% to 75%). This is still very generous, and the provost can use the 25% to pay someone to backfill the courses. Alternatively, that money could be combined and used to hire back a faculty member, depending on how many people retire within a department. The phased option is a little different. We are proposing a 75% salary payout for a 50% load; that is a 25% advantage each year. The phased option offers a 50% payout over the course of two years. Anyone over 67 would receive a 5% payout. Age eligibility was also changed because very few apply before the age of 60. The ‘sweet spot’ is between the ages of 62-67 for the time of surrender, and age 65 for the phased. We also added a 10-year employment requirement. One of the challenges with the former arrangement was the negotiated halftime arrangement; therefore, we are recommending that the halftime load simply be two courses per semester with no other expectations for scholarship or service. This will also make scheduling easier for department chairs. Retirement will only be at the end of the spring semester. In terms of the healthcare stipend, this will only be available to an individual if, in the year of application, that employee is enrolled in one of Marquette’s plans for health, dental and/or vision. The last stipulation is that an individual cannot take a tenure track position at another university within twelve months of retirement. We discovered that there were individuals who had done this.

- Discussion/Questions:
  - Q: Senator Gendron – You brought up the reason for not wanting to give the retirement buyout option prior to the age of 60 as well as the stipulation that this individual cannot take up a tenured position at another university after leaving. From what I understand, one can officially apply for retirement at the age 55, correct?
    - A: Dr. Meyer – The way retirement works is the individual must be at least 55 years old, and the age plus their years of service at Marquette must equal 70.
  - Q: Senator Gendron – This all makes sense, but why should it matter if the person is 55 or 60? Also, why do you care where they go and if the person takes another position somewhere else? If this saves the university money and allows younger scholars to come in, etc., then why does it matter?
    - A: Dr. Meyer the policy prior to this one had this exact stipulation in place. This policy is designed to foster a pathway to retirement, not to provide an opportunity for a retiree to collect a double salary. It
is outside the spirit of what this is meant to be; this is not meant to incentivize faculty to leave and go elsewhere. If someone wants to take another position, that is fine; we cannot preclude them from doing that, but we should not provide salary on top of that. In terms of the age of 55 for retirement, this is not the back-end of one’s career; there are very few who retire between 55-62.

- Q: Senator Gendron – If there are so few who actually do this, then why not offer a potential buyout? For some it may very well be the back-end of their careers, and it is the official retirement age.
- A: Dr. Meyer – I’m sorry that I do not have more of an answer for you. There are others on the committee who may want to weigh in.

- Q: Vice Chair Wichowsky – With regard to process, there are some great comments in the chat as well.
  - A: Senate Chair – Process-wise, this is a benefit; therefore, it is not an item that UAS would vote on. This is informational only.
  - A: Dr. Meyer – The provost wanted me to present it here. He has not approved this yet; he is still considering comments. This year, we will likely extend the retirement application deadline from November 15, 2021 to February 1, 2022. I know there are people who are anxious about this.
- Q: Vice Chair Wichowsky – One suggestion: it would be good to get the chat commentary as well as the spoken commentary to get to the provost for his consideration.

Chat:
- Comment from the floor: This should be grandfathered not changed as I know of people who in response to our poor salaries have been counting on this. If this is working so well, and it saves the institution money and has such clearly defined benefit, why change it?
- Comment from the floor: My understanding is that Social Security benefits are highest if you start taking them at 70. This is what faculty colleagues are telling me in response to the plans previously announced.
- Comment from the floor: From a chair’s perspective, with certain individuals, one course with service would be better.
- Comment from the floor: (As a staff senator, but not necessarily representing that group) Can I ask UAS to consider that these benefits are present for faculty, but not staff? Direct comparison is overly simplistic, but worth considering what keeps good people here, and how individuals contribute to our campus community.
- Senator Ohlendorf: Many people with chronic illnesses experience 55 as a different age than those who do not. So, a disability, a chronic illness may be the thing that makes a person retire earlier. This strikes me as potentially discriminatory to have that age be a requirement when a person would otherwise be allowed to retire.
- Senator Gendron: I really would like to hear about why this would be the case (not to offer it to the few scholars would wish to take retirement at 55, since it is official age). Could someone please follow up on this? To add to what Jennifer is saying, many also become caregivers earlier on in later life.

X. Discussion of Liaison Roles, Ex officio Positions and Voting Rights – Ms. Rebecca Blemberg, UAS Secretary

Ms. Rebecca Blemberg:
- Chair states that this will be postponed to the next meeting. She encourages liaisons to email Senate Chair or Senate Secretary to provide feedback about your experience(s). We would like to formalize the roles and voting rights for these positions, and your feedback will be helpful.

XI. Presentation on Fall 2022 Enrollment Strategy – Dr. John Baworowsky, Vice President for Enrollment Management

Mr. John Baworowsky:
- Enrollment targets for coming year: First-year goal is to grow enrollment back to 1843. We plan to grow Nursing from 152 to 200 students, and the balance will be spread among the other colleges. Meetings with deans will happen over the next month or two. Enrollment targets: 160 transfer students and class-shaping for diversity. How do we balance this against revenue?
- We are expanding programs in dual enrollment and online. Catholic Virtual offers online asynchronous classes in dual enrollment format to Catholic high schools. We are working with Doug Woods’ department to help promote and manage the Business completer program.
- Six key new enhancement strategies: 1) Move to a regular decision admission timeline, 2) Bring student search in-house, 3) New financial modeling approach, 4) Regain IL market share, 5) Enhance recruitment in low-need
pipelines, 6) Pursue new revenue sources.

- 1) Move to regular decision: December 1 is the pooled admission deadline, rolling afterwards with national release day on December 21. We will electronically notify the first-year applicants about whether they are admitted, the college they have been admitted to, as well as their initial scholarship. We expect to be able to see about 90% of the admitted pool at this time; this will allow us to move scholarship monies to optimize enrollment in certain areas. This is a new approach for us. In February we will send the full financial aid package. Despite our concern about taking away the urgency for students to apply early, we find that we are roughly even with last year’s applications. So the students are applying at the same rate that they have in the past even though they have until December 1.

- 2) Bring student search in-house: Student search is the communication that we do with high school students whose names we rent from testing agencies as well as other organizations. We reconfigured the Admissions staff to bring this in-house this year. It was previously done by an outside firm, and there was a certain level of inflexibility that we had noticed. We wanted to refine our market strategy, find new sources of student inquiries, and increase our capability of personalized outreach. We are launching this right now with very customized messages based on the demographic information that is available to us. This approach also allows us a deeper level of search specific to academic departments and colleges. Engineering, for example, has reached out to us to do some additional targeted marketing and yield events for their applicants. We will be offering this opportunity to all of the colleges.

- 3) Utilize new financial aid modeling: We’ve missed our target the last two years largely due to the pandemic. However, we also became uncomfortable with our financial aid modeling partner over time, so we decided not to renew that relationship. We did an RFP and decided on a different firm to help us with modeling. We wanted to do something much more granular. We are still in the early stages, but we hope to have a plan announced in early November in order to hit the scholarship announcement deadline in December. We are looking to do a general shift from need-based money to more upfront merit money. We will not reduce the amount of money we give to needy students but rather increase the size of their scholarships. They will see that money earlier and hopefully gain confidence that Marquette is a more affordable option. The two will more-or-less add up in many cases to what they had before. Having the admission deadline will allow us to see the vast majority of our class and maximize the financial aid modeling.

- 4) Regain IL market share: Over the last two years we lost ~160 students from the state of IL. If we can win them back and gain the additional Nursing students, we can meet our target. We have a new Jesuit high school award and a Catholic high school award; these will roll out in the state of IL as well as WI. We will also be holding exclusive events in the Chicago suburbs. A lot of our losses have been in low-need or no-need students from IL. Heidi Bostic will be joining me at these events. We will do a VIP approach to talk about the value of why Marquette is a better choice than other schools (engaged learning, opportunity for research, honors, study abroad, etc.). We will also be holding high school guidance counselor events in the Chicago metro area of IL with breakfasts and lunches. We will be discussing our new scholarships and showing them that we are an affordable option. IL is the one state that has the largest number of students who leave their state to receive an education (within 250 miles). Marquette has been the #1 receiver of those students if they are choosing a private university. Marquette was the 4th most popular school a couple of years ago, even more so than Iowa State. We are optimally positioned and are committed to turning this around this year.

- 5) Enhance recruitment in low-need pipelines: We are going to bring the VIP events to other cities such as St. Louis, Boston, New York, San Francisco, Minneapolis, etc. We’re grateful that the academic deans are giving their time at these events with us. We will continue to increase focus on the private high schools where students are more comfortable with our price-point. We will work on our personalized yield efforts to capitalize on recent increases in admit numbers.

- 6) Pursue new revenue resources: Examples of this include the business degree completer programs, Catholic Virtual, WI Early College Credit Program, MUHS, international virtual pathway, etc. We have reimagined the role of the transfer advisor to support and recruit transfer and dual enrollment students. Over the last few years we have set up direct admission programs with most of the key suburban community colleges in the Chicago metro area as well as the Chicago city colleges themselves, in addition to some of the area community colleges here, including MATC and WCTC. With these we hope to have a strong pipeline going forward for recruiting transfer students.

- Discussion/Questions:
  - Q: Josh Burns – Do we have any information on why parents are making the decision to keep their children closer
to home? Paying lower costs may be attractive to them during this time.

- A: Dr. Baworowsky – I have not seen the actual data yet from the state of IL, but the data we have seen have been from students anecdotally sending us their financial aid awards from other private institutions. Those who went to SLU, Xavier and even Creighton had awards that made their costs $13k-$17k less than us. Those schools are actually discounting the competitive nursing program. The guidance counselors are telling us that it is becoming difficult to recommend us because of this price disparity. We will try to do a little bit in strategic areas through events and personalized messaging, so we can really sell how we are different from the other Jesuit institutions. The IL governor has also increased the amount of aid that public schools can offer. We are looking forward to seeing the clearinghouse data so we can see where we lost our admitted students.

- Q: Senator Gendron – Maybe I misunderstood, but it sounds a little disturbing to me to have VIP events for low-need and no-need students.
  - A: Dr. Baworowsky – Everyone is invited to those events. It is probably better to phrase it as students who are living in suburban areas. We did not lose our needy students in IL. Our staff will continue to visit the high schools in the city because that supports our diversity goal.

- Q: Vice Chair Wichowsky – I remain concerned about our financial competitiveness. We don’t seem competitive with our Jesuit and Catholic peers. How do we raise money for scholarships?
  - A: Dr. Baworowsky – Tim McMahon addressed this at the last board meeting.
  - A: Provost Ah Yun – In the campaign, we have raised over $200M in scholarships. About $151M-$152M of that is endowed scholarships, which will be about $7.5M in scholarships every year; but that goes quickly. This is always the number one need I identify for UA.
  - A: Dr. Baworowsky: We need more Darren Jacksons as well as mid-sized gifts. Darren was able to move the needle all by himself with diversity in Nursing along with his All-In program. Tim McMahon clearly expressed a commitment for scholarships being one of the key drivers of the RISE campaign.

XII. Presentation on Analysis of Fall 2021 Class Sizes, Teaching Loads and Faculty Diversity – Ms. Alix Riley, Director of Institutional Research; and Dr. Michelle Mynlieff, co-chair of Teaching Academic Work Group

Ms. Alix Riley:
  - We are happy to be here to share institutional data. There is much concern about Fall 2021 (F21) teaching loads. We will touch on some faculty data, but the faculty data are not finalized until November, so I can certainly come back later to cover this. What we see institutionally or even at the college and department level are trends that may be different than the experience of some faculty. I am more than happy to meet with your department to go over the data in more detail.
  - Student enrollment context: Student Full-Time Equivalency (FTE) includes all students except law and dental. FTE is a way to measure enrollment. FT = 1 and PT = 1/3. Graduate enrollment was steady over the ten-year period from 2012 to 2021, but started to increase in F17 and again in F21. UG student enrollment was stable from 2012 to 2019 and declined sharply in 2020 due to COVID and then again in 2021. That is a decrease of more than 800 UG students from F19 with the exception of Nursing.
  - F21: With the exception of a handful of years, student and faculty FTE have been moving together with few exceptions. In 2016, student enrollment dropped while faculty increased; this also happened in 2020. Looking at the ratio of student FTE to faculty FTE over time, it has remained fairly stable between 14:1 or 15:1. In F20, there was the lowest student to faculty ratio ever at 13, increasing slightly in F21 to 13.4.
  - Class sizes and teaching load changes relative to past fall terms: In F16, there was an increase in number of UG sections offered and then a decline in F21. We see a steady increase in the number of graduate sections offered since F16.
    - Dr. Mynlieff offers context behind these changes: In 2017 we instituted a cap policy to keep the class sizes smaller. In 2018, we launched MCC and had the biggest freshman class size ever.
  - Ms. Riley: The mean and median class sizes shows that on UG side, the average class size decreased (from 30.2 in 2019) to 28.2 in 2020 and increased slightly to 28.8 in 2021. This is the second lowest class size that we have seen over the last ten years. The median class size for UG sections is 21, which is the same as fall of 2020 and lower than previous fall terms. There is a similar trend on the graduate side. Class sizes on average are smaller than in the past ten years, but that is not true in every department. Eleven departments had larger mean class sizes.
    - Dr. Mynlieff: The data here indicate that there was no increase in class sizes on average, but that does not mean that certain class sizes did not go up. The smaller average class size is largely due to smaller
student enrollment. The class sizes, however, are not uniform across departments. The Teaching work group asked the administration to increase class sizes strategically. Language classes should be kept smaller, for example, but Intro lecture classes can be made bigger. The administration appears to have taken our recommendations.

- Ms. Riley: Teaching loads differ by departments in meaningful ways, and it is not fair to compare teaching loads to each other. We group instructional faculty into three categories: FT T/T, FT NTT and PT (including administrators and staff who teach as well as tenured phased buy-out faculty). Looking at those previous sections compared to the instructional FTE, the number of sections taught per instructional FTE varies between 2.6 in F15 to 2.8 in F21. FT T/T teaching load remained very stable across time, ranging from 1.9 in F20 to 2.1 F15 (2.0 in 2021). For FT NTT faculty, since F12, the average number of sections has increased over time; it moved from 2.7 in F17 to 3.1 in F20 and slightly lower in F21. This is a very diverse group and the teaching loads are very different depending on what that faculty member was hired to do. Clinical faculty will look very different from adjuncts or professors of practice and visiting professors. The number of FT NTT faculty has increased over time.

- Dr. Mynlieff offers some caveats to consider: 50% of the departments do not count all classes equal, and this visualization does. It makes the assumption that every class is a basic 3-credit lecture and takes no accounting of lab sections or clinical instruction, etc. There are some departments with varying credit courses, but this assumes all courses count as 3-credit; so the data may not be as granular as you would like to see. This also does not include those on sabbatical and with course releases, so this is an overestimation depending on the department. There are nuances within the data that do not show up the way the teaching load visualization is put into place. The TT faculty only has an increase of 0.1 in teaching load, and the average teaching load per faculty member is not a lot. However, about 10% of our TT faculty in each department are teaching an additional section, so it may be a lot for those individuals. There was a decrease for our NTT faculty between 20-21, but the ramp-up in the last five years for them is a concern. Increasing NTT teaching loads makes it more difficult for these faculty to participate in other things in their academic life. Faculty have additional responsibilities that are not reflected in the teaching load alone due to the loss of personnel across the university.

Discussion/Questions:
- Comment: Senate Chair thanks the presenters and invites them back in November to present.

XIII. Presentation on Recommendations from the Academic Work Groups – Dr. Kimo Ah Yun, Provost

Dr. Ah Yun:

- Work groups were co-led by an administrator and a member of the UAS EC. There were six committees, four were short-term and two were long-term. There were a total of 185 recommendations, both short-term and long-term. Of the short-term recommendations, 35 of 54 were accepted; we are still working through 17 of these, and two were not accepted. Some of those recommendations accepted were related to reducing furniture expenses, decreasing the printing of college magazines, cutting professional memberships by 15%, minimizing use of administrative search firms, etc. Those recommendations that we are still considering are related to student success and coordinating advising, centralizing marketing and communication, finding ways to deepen relationships across libraries, and revising the CRP to four or five years.

- Two recommendations not accepted 1) Moving study abroad functions in CoBA to OIE: we did not see any efficiency or cost savings with this. 2) Restructuring the provost office regarding HLC, CTL, FELOS, new faculty orientation, and P&T committee: we could not figure out how to get all of the work done, and I cannot risk having important things such as promotion and tenure or accreditation not get completed. Gary has reduced FELOS to every other year, and the new faculty orientation budget has also been reduced.

- Long-term recommendations can be found online; 36 have been accepted, completed, or are in progress; 18 are still under consideration; and 77 were referred. Examples of those which have been accepted: growing the online presence, increasing student retention rates through the Student Success Initiative, faculty research in P&T should include productivity and support of student experience, and immersing NTT faculty in the life of the department/college. I will have a follow-up to the 77 referred recommendations later. The 18 recommendations under consideration include shifting a greater portion of the PT NTT to FT NTT, tracking department ability to hire first-choice faculty candidates, and increasing the hours at the childcare center and also enabling childcare as a billable research expense. Next steps: we will continue to vet and adopt recommendations, track the referred recommendations, identify the best solution for posting recommendation status, and I will come back to UAS in
the spring to follow up on continued thoughts.

- Discussion/Questions:
  - Q: Senate Chair – The work group recommendations have been posted to the chat.
    ▪ A: Provost Ah Yun thanks everyone who participated in the work groups.

XIV. University Board of Graduate Studies – Dr. Norah Johnson, Chair, University Board of Graduate Studies

Motion to approve: Revision to Graduate Bulletin to remove tuition discount language (Att. XIV)

Motion to approve: Revision to Graduate Bulletin to remove tuition discount language (Att. XIV)

Motion to approve: Revision to Graduate School of Management Bulletin to remove tuition discount language (Att. XIV)

Dr. Norah Johnson:
- There are three motions for removing website language related to the 50% tuition discount for students who will be auditing courses. The specifics are noted in the attachment. All three were voted on together. The first is related to language about the discount for auditing classes, the second is related to language regarding the discounts for senior citizens in the Graduate School, and third pertains to the language for the school senior citizen discount in the GSM.

- Discussion/Questions:
  - Q: Senate Chair – Was there any debate within your committee?
    ▪ A: Dr. Johnson – There was none because it pertains to removing the language only, not removing the discounts.

- Motion to approve is not required since the motion comes from a standing committee (UBGS).
- Passed without objection or abstention.

Motion to approve: Revision to Health Sciences Professional Bulletin (Att. XIV)

Dr. Norah Johnson:
- This motion allows the HESP courses to follow the academic integrity procedure from HESP; this is no longer following the centralized process. The university process is slower than the quick turnaround needed within the Health Sciences. This is also in-line with the recent changes at the HESP UG level.

- Motion to approve is not required since the motion comes from a standing committee.
- Passed without objection or abstention.

XV. University Board of Undergraduate Studies – Dr. John Su, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

Motion to approve: Revision to Undergraduate Bulletin – Procedures for Incidents of Academic Misconduct: Academic Integrity process for Health Sciences Professional students (Att. XVa)

- This agenda item has been tabled to the next meeting.

XVI. Adjourned at 5:06 p.m.
- Motion to adjourn: Senator Blemberg
- Second: Senator Wichowsky
- Passed without objection
Respectfully submitted,
Ms. Rebecca Blemberg
UAS Secretary

The next meeting will be Monday, November 15, 2021 at 3:00 p.m. in Teams.