I. Call to Order by Dr. Cheryl Maranto at 3:04 pm.

II. Reflection was given by Dr. Tim Melchert.

III. Approval of January 22, 2018 minutes
   • Motion to approve: Dr. Marilyn Frenn
   • Second: Mr. Bruce Boyden
   • Vote: Passed by unanimous voice vote

IV. Chair’s Report – Dr. Cheryl Maranto
   • Reminder to think about Senate officers for next year. Encouraged all to consider willingness to serve. Particularly in need of someone willing to serve as Vice Chair and for Secretary and the Executive Committee.
     o Chair and Vice Chair get a one course reduction for their service.

V. Vice Chair Report – Dr. Michelle Mynlieff
   • Faculty Forum will be April 11, 3 to 4:30, in Weasler Auditorium with Dr. Kati Berg moderating
     o Questions from faculty will be solicited via email
   • Recent notice that day care center was changing closing time to 5:30 pm. Faculty Council initiated discussion with the center and closing time was ultimately changed back to 6:00 pm.

VI. Secretary’s Report – Mrs. Mary Jo Wiemiller
   • Election Update
     o Three at-large vacancies; have received three nominations; would like to have more.
     o Two vacancies for faculty hearing committee; please continue to advertise the positions.
     o Nomination sheets distributed; nominate anyone who might be interested. Mary Jo can confirm willingness to serve.
     o Dr. Abir Bekhet and Dr. Paul Nolette are teaching during Senate meetings this semester; Dr. Margaret Sebern and Dr. Doug Berry respectively are replacing for spring.

VII. Provost’s Report – Dr. Dan Myers, Provost
   • Enrollment Update
     o Undergraduate
       ▪ Overall, looking very positive.
       ▪ Comparisons to past years are running ahead; all colleges are up in applications over last year.
       ▪ Weak spot in enrollment for fall is in international applications and seems to be across all colleges. Holding flat on international apps at undergraduate level overall – but are working harder with those applicants to convert to deposits.
       ▪ Doing well in numbers of applications from minority students.
o Graduate:
  ▪ Still very early in the cycle for graduate programs but are up in overall applications.
  ▪ GSM is down in number of applications, but up in matriculations and deposits.
o Overall looking very strong in enrollment projections for the fall.
o Questions/Discussion:
  ▪ Where does Hispanic enrollment put us in relation to goals for HSI and what is the ultimate target for HSI designation?
    o Goal for fall 2018 is 17.3% of entering class. It is hard to know until the end of the cycle as the highest need students tend to deposit last. It appears that we will meet that goal.
    o The HSI target is 25% by 2025; we have good momentum on that front.

VIII. M12 Initiatives: Fundraising Update – Ms. Gina Sholtis, Vice President for University Advancement
• Presentation:
  o activities of University Advancement and how those impact the M12 initiatives
  o work with broad network of active volunteers (approximately 1500 in any one year)
  o brief description of funds and activities for Annual Fund
  o have raised approximately 75% of FY2018 goal
• Promoted GiveMarquette Day on February 22 and ask that all spread the information

IX. University Committee on Promotion and Tenure – Dr. Gary Meyer, Chair
Informed on Motion:
Statute on Faculty Appointment, Promotion and Tenure, Chapter 303 Originating Unit Procedures
To amend chapter title, add new section and renumber current section
• P&T Committee discovered that the university does not have a policy for addressing which set of local standards apply to full-time tenure track faculty when the criteria are revised.
• Questions arise as to whether new or old standards should apply, especially relative to those who have been at the university six years.
• To be pro-active, the P&T committee has prepared a policy that can be applied in these situations, especially as local standards are revised from time to time.
• Proposed policy is straightforward.
  o When the local standards are revised, all faculty should be notified of the change (through the Provost’s Office).
  o Within 90 days of notification, assistant and associate professors are required to submit a letter to the department chair (copying dean) to indicate which standards/criteria they will use for their next promotion.
  o If a faculty member fails to provide the letter, they would automatically move on to the new standards.
  o Revised standards must be used by everyone in the department after a period of seven years from date of provost approval of revised standards.
• Other amendments in motion are to the chapter title and renumbering of the sections.
• Discussion/Questions:
  o Some areas had practices in place, but there was no policy in writing to be applied across all tenure track faculty.
  o Policy applies to full time tenured faculty. Will there be some guidelines for those departments that allow for promotion standards for participating faculty?
    ▪ The university P&T committee does not consider promotions for participating faculty. While it is possible that someone should consider this, it would not be the role of this committee to review/prepare any policy for that group.
  o As this is a change to the statute in the Faculty Handbook, this motion will be voted on at next UAS meeting.

X. University Board of Graduate Studies – Dr. Allison Abbott, Chair
Motion to Approve:
Business and Managerial Analytics – New stand-alone certificate
• Passed unanimously by voice vote.

Informed on Decision:
MS in Applied Economics – New specialization in Business and Managerial Analytics
• There was good collaboration between business and math to develop a complimentary set of programs.
XI. Committee Chair Updates
Committee on Academic Technology – Dr. Gary Krenz, Chair

- Committee has been discussing the following items:
  - Scheduling of updates; there is never a good time to push updates and ITS understands there is a challenge with this. OneDrive helps this; have enhanced communication about updates.
  - High Performance Computing cluster is running at 85% to 100% of capacity; not current technology, has some storage issues. Grant/funding proposals have not yet been successful. Support for the cluster is expiring.
  - CRP; should we forego CRP for one or two years to balance the budget requests for high performance computing cluster.
  - Challenge of knowing what software is available on campus.
  - New technology learning environments create many possibilities, but those possibilities sometimes conflict with the need for ease of use and the sacrifice of speed. Sometimes create individual points of failure.
  - Need for university to support data analytics

- Discussion/Questions:
  - What is the cost of high performance cluster vs. CRP?
    - Costs are not the same; but there is only so much money available. This was just a thought from one committee member as something to consider.
  - Scheduling of updates. One of the recent challenges was when we switched to Norton, which requires updates. While giving a final exam, computers were restarting. Is there no way to avoid pushing an update the week of exams?
    - Don’t believe there is a way to do that. Another example was when a class was unable to use machines in library (second week of class); this was actually a reboot from anti-virus update which had been pushed on Sunday but the class was on a Wednesday. Situation was that no one had gone around to check all the machines to be certain they had been powered down and back up. The push was done at a reasonable time, but no one had checked the machines to restart.
  - A list of all committees that touch academic computing would be helpful. Shouldn’t there be some coordination of all committees in some way?
  - Is there some place that oversees these individual points of failure that were mentioned?
    - General technology oversight is ITS. Every time one establishes some sort of redundancy, there is a cost (not necessarily dollars, but if a system is shut down to fix the failure, there is a cost to that, e.g., phones don’t work).
  - Point of failure seems to happen when teaching. Because of timing, is aware that there likely won’t be help for class currently meeting. Recommend committee think about a better support for teachers in the classroom when there are points of failure.
    - When calls are placed to classroom helpdesk, attendant usually asks instructor if they want someone right then or at a later time.
  - D2L – some talk about investigating other programs?
  - Data analytics aspects being considered.

XII. Core Curriculum Update – Dr. John Su and Dr. Sarah Feldner, Director of the University Core of Common Studies

- On track and on schedule for launch for new students entering in fall 2018. Received more than 200 course submissions for review in the fall.
- Foundations tier is fully populated; discovery tier and writing intensive are partially populated.
- For a list of approved courses, view the update page by googling “Marquette core revisions.”
- Some areas were more robust and are holding until the fall 2019 bulletin.
- Continuing students can take courses that were approved for the new core to fulfill UCCS.
- All four-year plans are in and the bulletin is up to date.
- Advising guides and list will be updated/distributed.
- Working on assessment guides
- Discussion/Questions:
  - Tables for transfer credits, etc.
    - Working with assumption that continuing students will remain with existing UCCS because it would almost certainly extend time to graduation. The expanded approach will address those students that want to take a new course to fulfill an old requirement.
• AP Credit has always been evaluated outside of core. How we, as an institution, accept AP credit stays the same, as does how those courses apply to the core.
• Working with transfer admissions counselors; seems to be functioning the way they had hoped on CAPS.

XIII. Faculty Council – Mr. Kurt Gering, Chair
Report on Council Activities
  • Review of Faculty statutes
    o What can we learn from peer institutions?
      ▪ Reviewed statutes, etc. from aspirational institutions
      ▪ Created traceability Matrix
    o What would we do differently if started over?
      ▪ Talked to past UAS chairs
    o What suggestions do colleagues on campus have?
      ▪ UAS membership – reviewing peer institutions; method for colleges/membership
      ▪ UAS reporting – statute that all committees report at last Senate meeting; might suggest that reports be provided at different points in semester which would give chance for questions/discussions with time to respond throughout year.
    • Chair succession – wants opinion of members:
      • Changes in terms to a two-year term for chair? Vice becomes chair?
      • Bigger issue of how we get more people to become involved.
      • Look at peer institutions to see how they value senate service in relation to university service and promotion/tenure.
    o Review and refine information and prepare report.
      ▪ Will report and vote. When senate approves, goes to provost and president.
  • Discussion/Questions:
    o Aspirational institutions are not necessarily aspirational relative to shared governance; ours is in much better shape than many of those.
    o Should really be looking at how we get people to step up; that is a big part of the succession discussion.
    o Service discussion is ongoing. Consider a faculty service award similar to faculty teaching and research awards.

XIV. Adjourn at 4:52 p.m.
• Motion to Adjourn: Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay
• Second: Dr. Susan Wood
• Vote: Passed by unanimous voice vote

Respectfully submitted,
Mrs. Mary Jo Wiemiller
UAS Secretary

The next meeting will be Monday, March 19, 2018 at 3:00 p.m. in AMU Ballroom C/D.