MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY  
University Academic Senate Minutes  
May 8, 2017  
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.  
AMU Ballroom C/D  

Members in Attendance: Dr. Abir Bekhet, Dr. Pradeep Bhagavatula, Mr. Bruce Boyden, Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay, Dr. Joseph Domblesky, Dr. Marilyn Frenn, Dr. Ana Garner, Mr. Kurt Gering, Dr. Arndt Guentsch, Mr. Blake Hartman, Dr. Todd Hernandez, Dr. Rick Holz, Dr. Javier Ibanez-Noe, Dr. Kristof Kipp, Mr. Scott Mandernack, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Mr. David Marra, Dr. Tim Melchert, Dr. Daniel Myers, Dr. Michelle Mynlieff, Dr. Paul Nolette, Dr. Therese Novotny, Dr. David Papke, Dr. Anne Pasero, Dr. Jim Richie, Ms. Dawn Smith, Dr. John Su, Dr. Brian Till, Dr. Doris Walker-Dalhouse, Dr. Jennica Webster, Mrs. Janice Welburn, Ms. Mary Jo Wiemiller, Dr. Susan Wood, Dr. Doug Woods, Ms. Jean Zanoni, Dr. Wanda Zemler-Cizewski  

Members Excused: Ms. Iman Ajaz, Dr. Kim Factor, Mr. Adam Kouhel, Mrs. Courtney Warren  

Members not in attendance: Dr. Julia Azari, Ms. Alyssa Goodwillie, Dr. Brian Hodgson, Ms. Melissa Meyler-Warlow, Dr. William Thorn,  

Guests: Dr. Allison Abbott, Ms. Valerie Beech, Mr. Brian Dorrington, Dr. Kerry Egdorf, Dr. Jean Grow, Dr. Mark Johnson, Dale Kaser, LTC Ioannis Kiriazis, Dr. Cecelia Landin, Mr. Chester Loefler-Bell, Dr. Gary Meyer, Dr. Daniel Miessner, Dr. John Pauly, Dr. Sharron Ronco, Dr. Erik Ugland, Ms. Toni Uhrich.  

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

II. Reflection was given by Dr. Jennica Webster  

III. Approval of April 17, 2017 minutes  

- Motion to approve: Janice Welburn  
- Second: Doris Walker-Dalhouse  
- Vote: Unanimous voice vote  

IV. Chair’s Report – Dr. Cheryl Maranto  

- Thanks to all current Senators, both those who are completing terms, as well as those who are continuing; members of the Executive Committee, and members of standing committees, chairs, and Faculty Council, which is the workhorse of Senate. Thank you for your time, effort and hard work.  
- Welcome new colleagues to Senate. Will hold a brief Senate orientation in conjunction with the August 2017 meeting. For now, know that it is important to prepare for meetings, engage, and keep colleagues informed; be proactive in bringing issues to the attention of Senate. The Senate can only be the voice of all faculty if there are contributions and input from the Senators.  
- Committee charges for 2017-2018 include:  
  o Committee on Academic Technology  
    ▪ Integration of Checkmarq and D2L  
    ▪ Coordination of technology upgrades relative to timing of other campus and academic activities-propose blackout dates where upgrades may not occur outside of safety updates.  
    ▪ Evaluate alternatives to D2L as a platform for online learning  
  o Committee on Teaching  
    ▪ Engage the colleges and schools to review IDEA as an alternative to MOCES. Deadline for this task is December 2017, to present to UAS.  
  o Faculty Hearing Committee  
    ▪ In the committee’s final report from a recent case, several issues and concerns were identified during deliberations regarding vague or conflicting procedures and standards for faculty dismissal. The committee is being charged with proposing amendments to standards that will address these issues.  
    ▪ The Chair offered gratitude to the Faculty Hearing Committee for their hard work on that recent case. The court has now ruled on the case, issuing summary judgment for the university. The judge’s heavy reliance on the FHC report is a testimony to the very careful, thorough and fair job the committee did.  
- Reminder that the requirements for accessibility of online course materials will go into effect in Fall 2017. Webpage
with available resources can be accessed through Center for Teaching and Learning or the Office for Disability Services. Those resources include a checklist of things to consider in getting started.

VI. Secretary’s Report – Mrs. Mary Jo Wiemiller
- University Academic Senate election results from April repeated
  - Results of elections for UAS Executive Committee were announced:
    - Chair: Cheryl Maranto; Vice Chair: Michelle Mynlieff; Secretary: Mary Jo Wiemiller; Faculty Reps: Julia Azari and Bruce Boyden; Liaison to UBUS: Anne Pasero; Liaison to UBGS: Marilyn Frenn
- Names of Graduate Student Organization and MUSG representatives were announced: Ms. Melissa Meyler-Warlow, Ms. Iman Ajaz, Ms. Alyssa Goodwillie
  - Thank you to Dale Kaser and Deb Reeder for help in organizing minutes and meetings this year.

VII. Provost’s Report – Dr. Daniel Myers
- Thanks to Cheryl as chair last year and next.
- Enrollment report:
  - Have 2063 undergraduate students deposited for fall semester; will grow and shrink over the summer, but expect to be in about this place for the fall class. Is a terrific result, with 40 more students than in fall 2016. Goal was 1970 and are happy to exceed that number.
  - Tried to reduce the discount, but not possible because late deposits were high need students. Increased numbers should help offset lack of reduction in discount.
  - Have radically improved diversity numbers for next year. Thankful to Brian Troyer and John Baworowsky for their work. Up 26% in first generation; up 14% in African American, up 67% in Native American and 16% of incoming class is Hispanic. Transfer deadline is still a couple months away, but we are up a little at this point.
  - Graduate student enrollments are up also, but still have some time before that cycle is complete. If combine the students that are starting in summer and fall, are up 36% in matriculations, which is encouraging. The GSM is still struggling, which is a national trend, but is looking better than it has in the recent past. Overall, we are still up 27% in matriculations. We are down in applications across the board, but did a much better job of converting those applications to matriculations. Congratulations to Doug Woods and his crew for their hard work.
  - Questions/Discussion:
    - The diversity statistics can be helpful to share when applying for grants, so faculty can email the Provost office for updated data when needed.
    - Any focal point to that 36% increase in graduate school?
      - Different stories; arts and sciences are up, nursing is up, humanities is down (history is up but others are down). A lot of variance across disciplines/programs.
    - Dental, law and other professional programs?
      - In the Health Sciences Professional Programs, the number of applications compared to the number of seats available is huge, so there are no concerns. They are capped by accrediting agencies.
      - Law school will have a decline, but it is a planned decline.
      - Dental School is the same as health sciences as far as applications vs. available seats.
- CFO Search Update.
  - Doug Woods is chairing.
  - First round of airport interviews is completed.
  - Committee still considering whether to conduct more interviews from the pool or use existing pool to begin campus interviews. At least one candidate stood out from the rest.
- VP University Advancement Search.
  - Names of search committee members were shared.
  - Bill Scholl is chairing.
  - With campaign planning in full swing, the plan is to move forward on this as quickly as possible.

VIII. Faculty Council Proposed Statute Amendment – Mr. Kurt Gering
- Motion to Amend: Statutes of the University Academic Senate: Article 3: Officers: Section 2. The Vice Chair of the
University Academic Senate and Article 4 – Standing Committees: Section 1.01 – The Faculty Council

• Discussion/Questions:
  o Amendment changes the statute to provide chair of Faculty Council a one course buyout.
  o Provost Myers pointed out that the initial conversation on this topic was to give the course buyout to the Chair of Faculty Council, but to remove that buyout from the Vice Chair of Academic Senate, effectively moving the course buyout from one position to another. The suggestion to add an additional course buyout will have to be discussed at the level of the Provost office.
  o A separate but related discussion is the effort to create continuity in Academic Senate leadership.
  • Faculty Council conducted a review of many other schools.
    o There appear to be three options:
      1. Leave as is
      2. Amend the statute changing the term of UAS chair to 2 years and imposing a limit of 2 consecutive terms.
      3. Amend the existing statues to provide a chair elect, chair and past chair to provide continuity.
    ▪ Faculty Council will be discussing this further next year, but feedback would be helpful.
    ▪ While longer terms are ideal, the reality is that we have difficulty getting people to take the chair position.
    ▪ There are defined roles and duties for each position.
    ▪ Have typically had difficulty finding a chair; could be a problem finding a vice chair that wanted to be chair.
      o In option A (See attachment) the chair is a 2-year term and vice chair is a 1-year term.
    ▪ Faculty Council will address next year as part of their committee charge, ultimately bringing it to Senate for a vote.
    ▪ Consider making some sort of leadership training available which might encourage and/or feed into individuals taking these roles
  • The motion on the table is to provide course release to the Chair of Faculty Council. The rationale for this is the amount of work that is asked of this chair.
    o Does this motion also include removing the one course release from vice chair?
      ▪ Not at this point. This motion is just for and additional buyout of Chair of Faculty Council.
  • Vote: Approved by hand vote with 2 abstentions. Amendment passes. Implementation of the Senate motion is subject to negotiation with the Provost.

IX. Faculty Credentials – Dr. Gary Meyer, Senior Vice Provost for the Faculty
Motion to Endorse: Unanimously approved by both University Board of Graduate Studies and University Board of Undergraduate Studies

• Discussion/Questions:
  o After the faculty credentialing motion was passed by UAS in April, it was realized that there was no mechanism for allowing individuals with master’s degrees to serve on master’s thesis committees, etc.
  o This motion presents a slightly revised policy to allow for a person with a master’s degree to serve as a member on these committees, but not as chair.
  o The failure to include this language previously was an oversight, not an intentional exclusion.
  o Requesting endorsement of that policy change.
  o Questions: none
  • Vote: Approved by unanimous voice vote

X. University Committee on Promotions and Tenure – Dr. Gary Meyer, Chair
Informed on Motion to Amend: Statutes of the University Academic Senate: Article 4- Standing committee: Section 2.01 – University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure

• Discussion/Questions:
  o Statute change, so there will be no vote on motion today. This is to inform, with the vote occurring in the fall.
  o Dr. Meyer provided the following background. In December, the Provost asked the Committee on Promotion and Tenure if he could sit in, but not participate in the meeting where the dossiers of candidates for promotion and tenure (P&T) are being discussed. He believed that having heard this discussion would be beneficial to him if he were later asked about the extent to which a specific candidate did or did not meet university guidelines. The committee agreed and the Provost observed the meeting. Dr. Meyer reported that
the committee members felt it went well, were not intimidated by his presence, and were free to say what they wanted to say, etc. The committee wanted these changes to be present in the statute so that members of Senate had an opportunity to discuss.
  o This change would allow the provost to sit in on those meetings, if the provost asked to do so and the committee agreed by vote. This change does not mandate the provost’s presence; it allows for the possibility. The Committee members voted 9 to 2 in favor of amending the statute to allow for such a possibility.
  o Provost Myers shared his rationale for making the request of the committee: P&T decisions are among the most important decisions made at the university. If P&T is granted, the university is making a multi-million-dollar investment; if not, the direction of a person’s life is changed. It is important that we get the decisions right. Some are clear, some are tough. When they are tough, is helpful to hear the opinions of everyone involved to get the best and most information available. As Provost, appreciates hearing as much as possible of the discussion that has gone into making those decisions. The discussion among the committee members is very valuable to the entire process. The chair of the department and dean of the college attend that meeting To offer a summary of the case, and take questions from the committee. Hearing the actual exchange and discussion, along with the questions and answers was very helpful in the decision-making process. Would like the ability to ask the committee if he could attend these in the future, with the ultimate goal of getting it right because of the importance of the decisions.
  o Concerns of Senate members include:
    o Find it curious to have a judgment embedded in the amendment (line 4 and 5 – “thereby preserving the Committee’s independent role in evaluating candidacies”).

There is a lot of research evidence that would suggest that Provost’s presence would affect the actual meeting: it would be difficult to tell the provost “no” if he asked to attend; his mere presence would affect what committee members were willing to say in the meeting, due to the power differential.

There are procedural concerns relative to the Faculty Hearing Committee possibly hearing an appeal; the recommendations of the FHC might relate to the activities of the P&T committee. The FHC’s recommendations would go to the Provost; If the Provost had been in the room with the P&T committee already hearing discussion it could compromise the independence of the appeal process. This new process seems to interfere with the independence of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

  o Gary Meyer indicated that lines 4 and 5 could be amended. Faculty members of the committee discussed whether they would feel impeded by his presence and he reported that no one did.
  o Dan Myers added that this statute does not make the provost a member of the committee, and affords only the opportunity for the provost to sit in the meeting as a mute observer, not a participant. As for the Committee members not being able to say no to the provost, that has happened in the past, so doesn’t seem to be a problem. Nor did there appear to be any appearance of intimidation.
  o The Provost argued that bigger question is thinking down the road as to what might happen with different faculty comprising the committee. Should we not do it because there is potential risk down the road? The importance of getting these decisions right far outweighs the potential risk; it is very important to hear what people say in the process. Provost wants to hear what people are thinking. The gain in information by being there is ultimately important.
  o This motion simply gives the provost the opportunity to ask the committee if he/she can attend. The committee would vote on it each year, if asked. The reason they left the language that it be an annual decision was so they would have the option to say no should there be a provost in the future that they would not want to include.
  o Concern was expressed that the Provost’s presence during the committee’s deliberations (rather than the written record of their ultimate decision with rationale) could introduce more subjectivity into the process.
    o A number of Senators expressed reservations about this proposal.
  • Would suggest amending the amendment to indicate that the vote by the committee members whether to approve or disapprove the provost’s attendance at a meeting include some quantitative standard, whether that would be 2/3 majority or unanimous, or whatever it might be and that it would be a silent vote.
  o Senate has been informed on the motion. An amended motion, based on the Senate input, will be brought back for a vote in the fall. Members should think about this over the summer in preparation for a vote.
XI. University Board of Undergraduate Studies – Dr. John Su, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

Motion to Endorse: Definition of Senior Standing (UBUS approved unanimously)

- Discussion/Questions:
  - Change from 92 credits to 90 credits for senior standing; came about because of change to 120 credit floor
- Endorsed by unanimous voice vote

Motion to Endorse: Removal of Letter of Reprimand for Academic Integrity (UBUS approved unanimously)

- Discussion/Questions:
  - Provides the opportunity for a certain class of sanctions, those with a letter of reprimand;
  - Some faculty are hesitant to report minor infractions out of fear that it will permanently affect the student’s future in a negative way.
  - Dr. Mynlieff shared that we have many students with very minor infractions where they basically made a one-time bad decision, e.g., plagiarized one sentence in a paper. These are the cases where the removal of the letter of reprimand would be appropriate. Letters are retained in the academic integrity office and are available should there be a repeat offense. There are few repeat offenders.
  - Removal would be only for a first offense; must be a minor offense.
  - When seeking a government position, applicants must submit the entire file. In these cases, that one time minor offense would be truly detrimental.
  - Want faculty to feel comfortable reporting offenses, not worried about the consequences.
  - There exists a definition of what is considered a minor offense, but it is not published.
  - There are three levels of sanctions and the letter would only be removed in the case of a level one, first time sanction.
  - Second offenses are different from a first offense and need to be treated differently.
- Endorsed by unanimous by voice vote.

XII. Committee Annual Reports (Executive Summaries)

Committee annual reports are available on the Office of the Provost website under Academic Senate: [http://www.marquette.edu/academicsenate/annual-reports.shtml](http://www.marquette.edu/academicsenate/annual-reports.shtml)

- Board of Student Media, Dr. Erik Ugland, Chair
- Committee on Academic Technology, Dr. Mark Johnson, Chair
- Committee on Committees and Elections, Mr. Chester Loeffler-Bell, Chair
- Committee on Research, Dr. Christopher Okunseri, Chair. No report
- Committee on Teaching, Dr. Daniel Meissner, Chair
  - Addendum to the report was intended to inform the UAS that the Committee on Teaching will forward a motion in fall 2017 to replace the MOCES teaching assessment program with IDEA.
  - Demonstration sessions for IDEA were requested.
- Committee on Diversity and Equity, Dr. Jean Grow, Chair
  - Faculty hiring checklist is already being implemented in some cases.
- Faculty Council, Mr. Kurt Gering, Chair
  - Dean search protocol had input from both administrators and faculty and is a good example of working together.
  - Faculty Forum in April was successful, with attendance by nearly every member of ULC.
- University Assessment Committee. Dr. Sharron Ronco, Chair
- University Board of Graduate Studies, Dr. Allison Abbott, Chair
- University Board of Undergraduate Studies, Dr. John Su
- University Library Board, Dr. John Pauly, Chair

XIII. Adjourn at 5:11 p.m.

- Motion to Adjourn: Janice Welburn
- Second: Sumana Chattopadhyay
- Vote: Unanimous voice vote

Respectfully submitted,
Mrs. Mary Jo Wiemiller
UAS Secretary
The next meeting will be Monday, August 28, 2017 at 3:00 p.m. in AMU Ballroom C/D