I. Call to Order by Dr. Cheryl Maranto at 3:03 pm.

II. Reflection was given by Dr. Anne Pasero

III. Approval of September 21, 2017 minutes
   • Motion to approve: Dr. Brian Hodgson
   • Second: Dr. Tim Melchert
   • Vote: Unanimous voice vote

IV. Chair’s Report – Dr. Cheryl Maranto
   • No report

V. Vice Chair Report – Dr. Michelle Mynlieff
   • Kurt Gering will serve as Chair of Faculty Council; Dr. Arndt Guentsch will serve as vice chair in the fall 2017 and Dr. Said Audi will serve as vice chair in the spring 2018.

VI. Secretary’s Report – Mrs. Mary Jo Wiemiller
   • No report

VII. Provost’s Report - Dr. Dan Myers, Provost
   • Update on VP University Advancement search: Gina Scholtis will begin November 16, 2017. Most recently at University of Missouri with previous experience at Saint Louis. She knows the Jesuit ways, appreciated them at SLU and is excited about again working in a Jesuit environment.
   • Enrollment: Not a lot to report because of timing of admission cycles; have started the process of using rolling admissions and hope to have application decisions and financial aid packages to prospective students by Thanksgiving. The entire admissions cycle has been pushed earlier with the hope of locking students into Marquette earlier.
   • Guidance for MU employees on non-MUPD law enforcement actions: Recently provided a reminder of how to deal with situations where non-MUPD law enforcement are seeking information on Marquette employees and students. Nothing in this has changed, but we have an ongoing concern and want to be certain that all are prepared if confronted with that situation. Basic guideline in the policy is to call MU Police Dept to have them handle; don’t give out information, etc. without contacting General Counsel.
   • Cluster Hires: To clear up any misinformation about how the cluster hire was determined – these were not new lines. In the normal process of deans requesting their lines for the next year (all vacant lines are reviewed); from among those identified lines that could be put together logically to create this cluster hire. This is not a new set of lines but rather reconfiguring lines already requested by deans. Advertising seems to be going well, but positions are not yet filled.
• Status of Dr. McAdams: Per General Counsel, the case was dismissed by summary judgment on all counts. Dr. McAdams has filed an appeal with Wisconsin Court of Appeals. We are currently in the stage of doing the briefings for that and given the strength of the summary judgment, are confident that we will prevail on appeal as well. His status as a suspended faculty member has not changed, he is still suspended. He is allowed to be on campus.

VIII. Course Evaluation System – Dr. Cynthia Ellwood, Chair, Committee on Teaching
• Committee on Teaching has been reviewing the course evaluation system for the last year and a half. Have reviewed 9 other pre-packed systems that are the most commonly used throughout the country.
• Recommending that IDEA be considered and discussed on a university-wide basis throughout the coming year. One option is to continue with MOCES, but that is not the committee’s recommendation.
• Committee reviewed about 1200 pages of information on the 9 top choices and has considered a lot of background information.
• IDEA appears to be the most faculty-centered and learning-oriented vs. a student-centered orientation.
• The database of information available ties faculty into other individuals within their own discipline. Links are provided within the feedback that take the user to information on ways to improve in their own discipline or where they have indicated a focus area.
• Student evaluations are only one of many items that are considered in a promotion and tenure dossier. But we have a responsibility to use the tool that provides the best and most complete feedback to and about faculty. IDEA provides resources for faculty to use based on the feedback they receive. Provides documentation for faculty to show ways that they have used the feedback.
• Adjusted scores that IDEA tool provides take into consideration various factors that are beyond a faculty member’s control (e.g., class size, student motivation, background preparation). Any adjustments in these areas can only improve a score, not lower it. The extra context allows faculty to better trust IDEA scores.
• IDEA has been in existence for 45 years; there is a lot of research information available on the product.

• Questions/Discussion:
  o Costs $30,000 more per year than what we are currently spending (current cost is $25,000). Committee examined that cost, and in the context of the overall university budget, cost did not seem a big enough reason to disregard.
  o This is a lengthy evaluation instrument, and considering the difficulty we have had with getting students to complete the short MOCES evaluation, how can we expect the students to read and seriously consider all questions? ▪ This is a concern. Current response rate is about 63%; if instructor conducts an in-class evaluation, the response rate is much higher. Will consider the way that evaluations are administered, and possibly recommend moving them back to the classroom.
  o If moved back to the classroom, will instructors give students enough time to complete?
  o Will also be presenting to MUSG; hope that MUSG members will obtain feedback from other students and share with the committee. In the past, some students have indicated that MOCES evaluations were very generic questions, and therefore they just went through and clicked random choices without considering the questions.
  o Some concern that MOCES is the same across the board, regardless of the course format.
  o “Comments” seems a little blasé; would prefer to see the open-ended questions more defined.
  o Comparing to whole IDEA database doesn’t seem useful; are we able to more clearly define those comparison groups? Yes.
  o Which other universities use? Loyola Chicago.
  o What is the minimum number of questions included to get the broad feedback? ▪ Can’t modify the form if we want customized reports. Do have the opportunity to create customized reports and the diagnostic feedback instrument (36 items) is one that we would consider.
  o Because of the length, would seem unrealistic to expect students to complete for every course. Do other universities evaluate all classes or only a sample? ▪ Some use only the short form; some leave out the objective part and use only the teaching form.
• Instrument will be presented to many other groups around campus to allow more discussion and feedback. Want as much faculty and student input as possible.

IX. Health Care Update – Mr. Steve McCauley, Director of Employee Benefits
• Will be hosting 3 town hall sessions; two will be over lunch hours and the third at 5:00.
Not many changes in the plans this year:
- Plan names have been updated. Names themselves specifically indicate the plan.
- There has been a slight increase in the out-of-pocket limits in two of the plans.
- Premiums nationally trended upward 12 to 14%; Marquette premium increase is 7.2% this year.
- Navitus will be the new pharmacy benefit manager; they are highly ranked relative to customer service. Customer service is the main reason for changing from ExpressScripts. Every pharmacy benefit manager has a different formulary list, so watch for information directly from Navitus.
- Anyone enrolled in any medical plan for 2018 will receive new ID cards.
- Have added an application called Teladoc, which adds the convenience of being able to interact with medical professionals online, with smartphone, or by phone. The application is linked to your medical plan and those enrolled in any one of the medical plans will have access to this application.

Marquette has opened a Wellness Center on campus with free 24/7 access for all employees. Wellness Center includes a partnership with Preventure, our new wellness vendor. Preventure will be partner to many of the rewards programs that will roll out in 2018. Health Risk Assessments will now be done by Preventure. Wellness will become more and more integrated within our benefits.

Many thanks to Mary Jo Wiemiller, who is serving on the task force. Additionally, she was instrumental in working through the formulary changes and drug classes to make sure there was minimum disruption and that communication was appropriate.

Questions/Discussion:
- If making no changes to elections, the only thing that needs to be done to continue is to update the Flex Spending Plan. If want to change any tier or plan, need to manually go in and change that information.

X. Core Update / Core Transfer Policy – Dr. John Su, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
- Two policy documents
  - Proposed transfer policy
    - Comes from the core review committee and has been reviewed by various groups.
    - Is different from course to course transfer; this moves more to considering the requirements that are met by specific transfer courses.
    - Numbers of credits transferred are from admissions and registrar’s office.
    - Was a desire to acknowledge an earned associate’s degree.
    - Credits that count are the credits that were accepted by Marquette.
  - Transition Policy for current students
    - Continuing students must complete new or old core (existing students must elect one or the other –not requiring that they complete new core)
    - Students who switch to the new core, will switch to the 2018 bulletin; they cannot switch back to UCCS
    - For students who remain in the current core, provides a list of courses in the new core that students in the old core can take to most efficiently complete their core requirements.
      - One thing not fully worked out yet is the question of back-transferring.
      - Which of my courses count for which requirements? Will know by Dec 10.

Questions/Discussion:
- Are trying to give more rather than fewer options
- Advising students will be a challenge relative to whether they should keep the old or take the new
- Goes into effect in fall 2018
- There is anxiety, and there will be questions. Will be working through these as move forward; will have training.
- In the second section of the transition plan policy, Rick Holz suggests that “Courses from the UCCS will not substitute for courses in the MCC” be changed to “might not substitute...”. Pat Loftis offered a motion to amend this language; Anne Pasero seconded. This motion passed unanimously.
- Advisory vote to endorse these two policies: All agreed to endorse policies as amended.

XI. M-12 Update – Graduate Enrollment in Master’s Programs – Dr. Doug Woods
- Reminder that the M12 initiatives offer the financial underpinning of how to accomplish Beyond Boundaries.
- Revenues generated won’t necessarily go back to that initiative; revenues go to support entire process.
- Review of current graduate/professional enrollment trends
- Overall review of programs results in reallocation of assistantships and scholarship credits; encourage curricular
• Currently have a potential graduate student market of a roughly 90-minute radius of Milwaukee; online programming removes that limit for recruiting students.
• Enhanced marketing and recruitment for all graduate programs, including GSM
• Enhancement of accelerated degree programs; ADP coordinator hired
• Development of graduate programs through Incubator
• Infrastructure enhancements, both online and physical
• Anticipate revenue growth of $23 million over next ten years

Questions/Discussion:
  o Does increase in net revenue subtract all the costs associated with?
    ▪ Faculty cost is based on a structured estimate; some other costs are total estimates. Cost of infrastructure is 35% off the gross. New facilities are probably investments the university would have to make upfront.
  o Does this include raising stipends for TAs?
    ▪ Increased stipends would come out of the $23 million. An increase of 20 to 25 students would generate about $500,000 per year; in a revenue share agreement, the department would keep $250,000, and would have the decision on how that is used, TAs, etc.
  o What is timeline for courses submitted through the incubator?
    ▪ Have done 8 months from idea to approval by the board.
  o Are trying to do things in a stackable approach; flexibility will come with the online initiatives.
  o Overall national trend is downward. Why should we believe that we can somehow go against that?
    ▪ There is so much low-hanging fruit. Changing to online will make a huge difference. There is huge demand. We have many of the areas in fastest-growing jobs, but don’t have it easily available to those outside 90 minutes of Milwaukee. We haven’t done any marketing and recruitment.

XII. University Committee on Promotions and Tenure – Dr. Gary Meyer, Chair

Motion to Approve: To amend: Statutes of the University Academic Senate: Article 4 – Standing Committee: Section 2.01 – University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure-Presented by Dr. Gary Meyer (Chair of P&T Committee)

Background:
• In fall 2016 the Provost requested to sit in on the University Promotion and Tenure committee deliberations; it was not explicitly forbidden in the statutes. After discussion, the P&T committee agreed to allow him to sit in on the meetings as long as he did not actively participate. This was voted on by the P&T committee with a vote of 9 to 2.
• The P&T committee asked the Senate to deliberate about the inclusion of the Provost in the P&T committee meetings, including guidelines for how this would occur.
• At the May 2017 UAS meeting Dr. Gary Meyer presented a proposal to the Senate asking for a statute change that would allow the Provost to sit in on the P&T committee meetings as long as he made the request in writing by October 1 and the majority of the P&T committee agreed. Dr. Meyer provided a quick rationale for the requested change that would formalize it in the statutes.
• When this request was discussed last spring, the Senate recommended adding the requirement that each year a stated majority (unanimity was suggested) of Promotion and Tenure Committee members must vote to allow the provost to sit in on the P&T committee meetings as long as he made the request in writing by October 1 and the majority of the P&T committee agreed. Dr. Meyer provided a quick rationale for the requested change that would formalize it in the statutes.
• The revised statute makes it clear that the Provost may request to be present in the P&T meetings and gives the Promotion and Tenure Committee the power to say yes or no to a request from the Provost. Dr. Meyer asserted that in the past, and absent this statute change, the committee does not have the power to say yes or no. It should be noted that the Provost never sat in on these meetings in the past and while the current statutes do not explicitly prohibit it, the membership of the committee does not include the Provost. The statutes do state “The Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, or a substitute as designated by the Provost, shall serve as Chair and non-voting member.” This statement is consistent with the Provost being represented by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and not being present in the room. By requesting this statute change the P&T committee members would have the ability to make the decision of whether to permit the provost to be present, in the absence of a statement
prohibiting it in the statutes.

Questions/Discussion:

- The original request to allow the Provost to sit in on the committee deliberations came from the Provost. The current request for the statute change came from the P&T committee so have formal Senate review whether to allow the Provost’s attendance at the meeting, and if so, that it is clear that the decision to allow it is made by the committee rather than the Provost.
- The Provost explained that he wants to be able to make the best decisions possible, particularly in light of the importance of tenure decisions for both the university and individual faculty members’ careers. He firmly believes that best happens when he can hear the discussion.
- The proposed statute change gives the committee the ability to decide whether to accept or decline a request from the Provost.
- The Provost explained that he wants to be able to make the best decisions possible, particularly in light of the importance of tenure decisions for both the university and individual faculty members’ careers. He firmly believes that best happens when he can hear the discussion.
- The proposed statute change gives the committee the ability to decide whether to accept or decline a request from the Provost.
- A question was asked why the report that summarizes the issues raised and their disposition that goes to the Provost was not sufficient. The report that goes to the Provost is a synopsis; the report doesn’t provide as much detail as is heard when sitting in the room.
- In the context of the University's current grievance procedures, it is possible to file a grievance regarding the Promotion and Tenure Committee's procedures, deliberations, and/or decisions. When the Hearing Committee makes its recommendations regarding such a grievance, those recommendations go to the Provost. However, the Provost would be compromised with regard to a grievance related to the Promotion and Tenure committee's procedures, deliberations, and/or decisions if he was present at Promotion and Tenure Committee meetings. A decision by the Provost in this situation would be a fundamental denial of due process.
- More generally, the presence of the Provost at meetings of the Promotion and Tenure committee would have a chilling effect. Members of the Committee could well be hesitant to speak freely because of the University’s chief academic officer was present. The issue is not the impact on the Provost’s own decision later in the process but rather the integrity of the Promotion and Tenure Committee's deliberations at its stage in the Promotion and Tenure process. During this stage, representative tenured faculty are supposed to be able to be able to speak and decide freely without being concerned with what the Provost might think.
- Concerns were also expressed as to whether committee members would be comfortable being completely open if the Provost is in the room. Committee members might be hesitant to fully share concerns about a case for fear that it could impact the Provost’s decision even if the Committee ultimately decided that the issue was not dispositive. This would lead to less than full vetting of cases.
- Members were reminded that the Committee voted to request that this statute change be brought to the Senate for review and a vote.

The deliberations had not yet resolved at 5:00 pm. Anne Pasero offered a motion to Table the Motion, seconded by Cheryl Maranto. Motion to table approved by voice vote, with one abstention.

Agenda items XIII and XIV were not discussed and are carried forward to the November meeting.

XIII. Amendment to Statutes on Faculty Appointment, Promotion and Tenure, Dr. Gary Meyer, Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Informed on Motion: To amend Chapter 304 – Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure; Section 304.06 to remove ambiguity of verbiage

XIV. College of Business Administration – Dr. David Clark, Executive Associate Dean
Amendment to Statutes on Faculty Appointment, Promotion and Tenure, Chapter 301 Faculty Titles for Members of Marquette University, Section 310.02 – The Participating Faculty, Paragraph 14 – Professor of Practice

Informed on Motion to include Instructor of Practice as an approved rank

XV. Adjourn at 5:02 p.m.
- Motion to Adjourn: Dr. Bruce Boyden
- Second: Mr. Kurt Gering
• Vote: Unanimous voice vote

Respectfully submitted,
Mrs. Mary Jo Wiemiller
UAS Secretary

The next meeting will be Monday, November 13, 2017 at 3:00 p.m. in AMU Ballroom C/D