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I. The Chair observed a quorum and called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.
   - Chair announcement - the Teaching work group’s listening session is this Friday from 1-2:30pm

II. Reflection was given by Mrs. Janice Welburn

III. Approval of October 19, 2020 meeting minutes (Att. III)
   - Motion to approve: Tim Melchert
   - Second: Doris Walker-Dalhouse
   - Passed without objection

IV. Chair’s Report – Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay
   - Listening sessions – thank you to the co-chairs who ran these sessions as well as all of the individuals who attended. All of the sessions were recorded and have been well-attended. The recordings are posted in the UAS Teams site. Some of the work groups are also doing their own individual sessions (Research Workgroup is doing coffee chats, for example).
   - The campus town hall is on Thursday, November 19 from 3-4:30pm. There will be some information presented on the nonacademic workstreams. Registration is done through Eventbrite, and the link is available through Marquette Today.
   - Rebecca will share more during the Secretary’s report, but there will be an additional UAS meeting scheduled in December for the work group leaders to share their preliminary recommendations.

V. Vice Chair’s Report – Dr. Allison Abbott
   - The Faculty Council has received some productive feedback from faculty and we are working to be more engaged with the academic planning and budget process. We now have FC representation on each of the work groups, and the chair and vice chair are now included in the leader work group meetings as well. We are also working with Kimo and Doug to create a resource to address some of the FAQs that come forward from faculty and staff. We will keep you posted on this.
VI. Secretary’s Report – Ms. Rebecca Blemberg
   o Call for special meeting, Wednesday, December 9, 2020, 4:00 to 6:00 p.m.: the purpose is to get updates from the work groups. This will be additional to the normal meeting.
   o Call for nominations for spring elections; there will be 2 at-large positions; 1 at-large part-time position and a couple positions open on the faculty hearing committee. Please contact Rebecca with any questions or to nominate.
   o Welcome Tim Houge, new senator representative for GSO.

VII. Provost’s Report – Dr. Kimo Ah Yun, Provost
   o COVID-19: when we began the semester, we were unsure what this would look like and we made some decisions in the summer to adjust the calendar. We are 10 days away from the in-person classes being completed for the semester. Thank you for your flexibility during this time.
   o There are five gating criteria we use for evaluating this situation, one of which is positive cases. The gate is red because the numbers are high; this is true for the city, county, state and country. These challenges are not happening, for the most part, on Marquette’s campus proper. Although we get cases in the residence halls, we continue to be in the single digits on most days. This is incredible when you think about the 2400 students who are living on campus. Our plan has been robust and good. We have quarantine and isolation spaces where we can take care of the students. Outside of the positive rates being high, we know that the other four gates are in the green category. It is promising that we have a vaccine on the way, but this will not get to our campus community until late spring. We do see a positive future outlook on COVID-19. We will continue to be in touch with national and regional experts while we monitor this, and we will take whatever action is most appropriate and safe for our community.
   o Enrollment – just a few weeks ago we had a deficit in the number of applications for the incoming class (20% below than we were a year ago). We are now only down 7% (700 fewer than last year). We have accepted about 1200 students fewer than last year. One of the positives is that we have 36 students who have deposited (32 at this time last year). We also have received over 100 transfer applications (double of where we were last year). Additionally, we continue to see high registration rates for our campus tours (filled every day).

   o Discussion/Questions:
     • Q: when you are talking with the BOT, is the discount rate still under consideration?
       ▪ A: Kimo – we have increased the discount rate this year, adding $2mil more to bring tuition down. There is a balance to what we do because net revenue per students is what we use to be able to make sure we can take care of all of our expenses at the University. 

VIII. Exception to Faculty Handbook to host regular December meeting – Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay, UAS chair (3:22 to 3:25)

Motion to approve: Exception to Faculty Handbook to host December 14 regular meeting (Att. VIII)
   o We have our regularly schedule December meeting on December 14, which is technically after finals week. There is a clause in our by-laws that states that the meeting shall ordinarily be held on the third Monday of each month. In the past years we have always counted finals week as a week in which classes are held, and we have always had our December meeting on the last Monday of classes or the Monday of finals week. We will need a motion to approve an exception to the faculty handbook to host this year’s regular December meeting.
   o Motion – Joshua Burns
   o Second – MaryJo Wiemiller
   o Passed by unanimous voice vote with no abstentions.

IX. 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): Statutes on Faculty Appointment, Promotion and Tenure changes, Chapters 304.02 (Att. IXa) and 302.03 (Att. IXb)
   o This is a recommendation coming from the Committee on Faculty Promotions & Tenure. Back in the spring a committee member identified 304.02 with a concern in the last paragraph re: a definition of terminal degree. The definition is not problematic in itself, but the term actually appears before it is defined. The idea here is to move it to section 302.03 as a footnote to 1-B1, where the term terminal degree actually appears for the first time in the Faculty Handbook. Therefore, we are just moving the definition to the first point in the handbook where terminal degree is mentioned.
   o The other aspect of this change is actually the middle two paragraphs of section 304.02. One refers to someone who comes to the University with a terminal degree and the other refers to someone without a terminal degree. But both provide a pathway to tenure that does not require an evaluation but rather merely the passing of time.
This suggests that a faculty member, after a certain period of time, would automatically be granted tenure without any sort of evaluation. Where did this language come from? It was a bit of a mystery to the committee. We investigated it over the summer and reached out to OGC who informed us that the language comes from a 1940 AAUP statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure. General Counsel was not certain, but it has likely been in the handbook for a number of decades. The problem is that it is inconsistent with other parts of the Faculty Handbook. Section 304.08 states a person shall receive tenure only by virtue of a positive judgment on the part of the University that conveys tenure. That suggests there’s some sort of evaluative process. Section 1 states that the evaluation will occur no later than first semester in the seventh year, and for someone with a terminal degree, it will be no later than first semester the eighth year. Section 304.01 also discusses a process. It also provides a safeguard to put her or himself up for a promotion or higher rank if a department or local committee does not.

- The committee identified two remedies: 1) eliminate those two paragraphs to get rid of the conflicts. This is the preferred recommendation by the P&T committee. 2) modify the language of the two paragraphs to account for the fact that faculty regularly are provided extensions for things like parental leaves, medical leaves, COVID leave, etc. This change would not eliminate the conflict completely but would at least state that a process will take place. We recognize that faculty are given leaves for a variety of very good reasons. And yet, what the handbook doesn’t permit is simply the passing of time to allow someone to become tenured on this campus.

- These are the two remedies that the committee would ask this body to consider. While they would be pleased with either, the committee is recommending the first alternative.

- Discussion/Questions:
  - Q: So a faculty member can put him/herself up even if the department vote is negative because they are timebound?
    - A: Gary – yes, if you read the paragraph on the timebound year, you will find that language.
  - Q: Part of what is in red and crossed out in the third paragraph is related to faculty who lack the terminal degree pertinent to their academic discipline. It looks like that possibility for faculty who lack the terminal degree route to tenure is being cut off. Am I reading that correctly?
    - A: Gary – I don’t think so because 304.08 states a person without a terminal degree must be officially considered for tenure no later than the first semester of the eighth year appointment.
  - Q: Is it implied they will have their terminal degree by the end of their eighth year? My experience with this time-served language is that it benefits people with the terminal degree who maybe do not have a have a pre tenure appointment; however, with the number of years they’ve worked at the University, they would have a route to tenure. So I was just curious if that was preventing people who don’t earn the terminal degree from having a route to permanent employment?
    - A: Gary – are you referring to participating or regular faculty?
    - A: Participating
    - A: Gary – that language does not refer to participating faculty.
  - Comment: I read through the sections and I agree that they seem kind of redundant. But in the second version where you added in the extra time, that should be moved below the language about the timebound year. I would also strike those two paragraphs.
    - A: Gary – If I hear what you are saying, this third possibility would be to eliminate those two paragraphs, but incorporate the paragraphs in yellow in some section to be determined of the Faculty Handbook where we talk about the timebound year?
    - Comment: yes, that would be my proposal. That would make more sense because in the second version you’re keeping that paragraph which again states that you don’t have to go through a process, which I thought was the whole point of illuminating it.
    - Gary – this language does not fix the problem. That’s why the committee recommended version one, but this puts forth another possibility.
    - Comment: there are sections in there about stopping the clock, but maybe that could be more clear.
  - Q: Amber – I know experience of friends at other universities who were hired on the non-tenure track, but then were hired into a tenure-track position. There’s the question then about what years for service count for their timebound year. Is that addressed in our handbook?
    - Gary – we see cases like that here. When that happens, they have the full 7 years as would any new faculty member unless there are prior negotiations and/or contracts. I am not certain where that might be stated in the handbook though.
• Q: Comment - I did hear some voices raised about the potential erasure or deletion of this policy to undermine the institution of tenure. It seems to allow for the possibility that people could be denied tenure prior to their eighth year of employment for any cause without having to subject that faculty member to review.
  ▪ A: Gary – when I read these two paragraphs, it is the passage of time that grants tenure and not an evaluation. I oversee the P&T committee. When people are turned down, they can come back up. I'm not certain I see how this language allows the university to remove people at will. There is language that addresses 'for cause', but I don't think that is what you are referring to.
• Q: Amber – is it that people are concerned this is taking place in the context of eliminating programs and shrinking colleges? Tenure track faculty are feeling vulnerable right now, so that might be what is going on. There aren't protections like there are for tenured faculty.
  ▪ Gary – there was probably a time when faculty could be easily stonewalled and this provided some measure of protection if the department would not put someone up. But this was written 80 years ago when they didn't have parental leaves, FMLA, COVID extensions, etc. We have this conflict, but I don't believe it is anyone's intent to grant tenure based simply on the passage of time.
• Comment from the Chair – some of the confusion was related to the work groups. I have told people that this is not related to that.
  ▪ Gary – yes, we talked last spring about this.
• Comment: I noticed this section many years ago as a department chair and assumed this was some historical artifact. Everyone ignored it when I inquired. I think in K12 education, they have used a procedure like this for granting tenure (which did not involve an evaluation). I was told just to ignore it because it does not apply.
• Chair – please send your comments to myself of Gary.

IX. Presentation on Results of the Third Student Academic Experience Survey – Ms. Alix Riley, Director of Institutional Research, and Ms. Laura MacBride, Associate Director of OIRA
  o Given the unique and challenging nature of this semester, we have administered a number of surveys in order to understand and improve the academic experience of both students and instructors around issues like academic technology experiences with class modalities, challenges, concerns, and well-being. We have administered three surveys to students, and we have the results of that third survey today. We have shared the results fairly widely and some of you likely have seen this.
  o Third survey was administered from October 19-23 (week after midterms), and had a 16% response rate, which was lower than the first two surveys.
  o Laura re: experiences with various communication tools. We saw a drop in students who did not experience these challenges (32% to 28%). And 58% of respondents reported that they had challenges with Teams; this number has risen from the previous surveys. The most cited reasons were audio and video quality, connectivity, lag time, and the perception that instructors need training. Students who reported challenges with D2L cited reasons related to inconsistent use across instructors and classes, perception that instructors need training, or no structure or guidance from instructors. Because off-campus students seem to be having connectivity issues, we are recommending that faculty record their lectures and work with ITS if sound quality is an issue. ITS has recommended using a headset to improve audio quality.
  o Laura re: multimodality course schedules and moving between classes – we saw the percentage of students saying that they never or sometimes have enough time to transition between classes drop just a bit. We did see an increase in the percentage of students who reported challenges with classes meeting outside of scheduled times (mostly classes running long). Recommendation is to communicate to instructors to end class times (virtual) on time and also record their lectures.
  o Laura re: student engagement – students are continuing to struggle with engagement in the classrooms. More students are reporting somewhat or a great deal of a challenge with lack of interaction, collaborating with other students, and getting feedback from instructors. About 55% report that a few or none of the instructors allow opportunities for the students to engage with each other. We're doing a little bit better on number of instructors providing useful feedback on assignments and tests, and establishing consistent, regular communication. Recommendations are asking CTL and DDL to promote their resources, particularly those on active and engaging group discussions, prior to the start of the spring semester and also the promotion of resources for using Microsoft Teams breakout rooms and how breakout rooms could help boost student engagement in classes.
  o Laura re: instruction mode satisfaction – in-person is reported as having the highest level of satisfaction with fully
virtual synchronous and hybrid synchronous both reported as second highest. We're again encouraging instructors to be thoughtful about the challenges that the multi-modality course schedule is presenting to students. We also are asking CTL and DDL to promote resources for instructors related to managing face-to-face and remote learning in the same class and encouraging instructors who teach virtual classes, whether it be hybrid or 100% online, to implement a synchronous instruction mode where possible.

- Laura re: mental health and wellness – we’re seeing more students reporting difficulty concentrating or focusing. A vast majority are concerned about the impact of COVID19 on their mental health and are feeling isolated from other students and friends in the Marquette community. Recommendations include reminding students of resources available to them, and equipping advisors and other administrators who work with students with talking points for checking in with students around these topics.
- Laura re: classroom climate and racial injustice – with regard to feeling a sense of belonging and feeling valued, we are seeing an increase in students disagreeing, especially the students of color. Similar is the overall comfort with the climate in classes; we are seeing the students of color reporting that they are neither comfortable or uncomfortable, or just uncomfortable. Our preference is to see them feel comfortable. Recommendations here include prior to spring, promoting CTL trainings related to handling difficult topics and related to equity and inclusion.
- We have one survey left to administer. It is going to take place December 10th through 15th after the semester is wrapping up. It will be administered both to students and instructors.
- You will need the VPN to access this information on our website. Please let us know if you have any questions or concerns.

Discussion/Questions:
- Comment: obviously we come into this with faculty saying that Teams is not the best technology for a synchronous class; I started saying this in March. I pay for my own Zoom license. We are having a great class because of this. Zoom has the full functionality that we need, and it is not melting our computers like Teams. CTL does not have the expertise here; it is only a small group in ITS who can assist. Zoom is not that expensive for a site license, and it actually works.

XI. Presentation on AAUP and Shared Governance – Mr. Doug Smith, President of Marquette University AAUP Chapter
- The newly established AAUP chapter at Marquette is all about shared governance and I am here to advocate three aspects in the context of our current budget reduction and reorganization processes. The first one is the decision to make proportional reductions between the administrative budget and the academic budget. That decision has not been subject to input from faculty, and that decision does not seem to be strategic right now. The budget decisions made without faculty input could negatively impact undergraduate teaching. Second, how will these proposals be guided by strategic objectives? The work groups are fine, and they are doing excellent work; however, the process for final decisions has not been decided. I encourage everyone to take a look at the recent letter from the Marquette community of the Society of Jesus. They conclude that meeting budget targets without first assuring that the pursuit of academic excellence and a liberal education are preserved isn’t consistent with the purposes for which Marquette was established. Finally, what is our plan to make certain that Marquette is better prepared for these kinds of situations in the future? The Marquette chapter of the AAUP has identified some proposals that we think should at least be part of the process, and not an afterthought. The Academic Senate is going to have to take the lead in bringing these issues forward; therefore, I have prepared a letter that I’ll provide to the Senate Chair. We would ask the Senate to consider endorsing the consideration of these proposals and help bring those to the attention of the Board of Trustees.

Discussion/Questions:
- Comment: I was given the document and I think the University community should see that letter. I don’t think it should be restricted to administration.

  ▪ A: Doug – I will provide it to Sumana and she can distribute as she deems appropriate
  ▪ Chair – Doug, please share the document with me and we will share with the campus community. We can have this discussion more in the next meeting.

- Comment: I wanted to bring our collective attention to the faculty handbook which lays out shared governance in article 1 section 1 1.02. Section 102C addresses how faculty should have the opportunity to provide input on facilities, resources on campus security, institutional research, the academic calendar, programming, compensation, and employee benefits. However, if you go to the economic planning website and look at the wheel, the faculty are only involved in one section of this. There were a lot of
questions that came up on Friday's discretionary work group listening session about things that were not under our purview. The feedback form on the website is only going to the academic work groups. I just wanted to flag that. Faculty are raising questions about space and travel and office expenses. Some are under academic planning, but others are not.

- A: Chair – that is the one thing the campus would like more communication about.
- Sarah Feldner – we had a discussion this morning in our Discretionary Spending Work Group, and we are going to mention all of that in our report.

XII. Presentation on the Revenue Generation Workstream—Dr. Jeanne Hossenlopp, Vice President for Research and Innovation, and Mr. Patrick Loftis, Clinical Associate Professor, PA Studies and Senator

- As many of you know the work streams were introduced to look at reductions and building efficiencies. There was a lot of interest in figuring out where revenue generation is in the overall university strategy; this is something that came up last year as we started talking with the Ideation Review Council and even prior to that in the Beyond Boundaries steering committee. This work stream was developed to take a look at some of these strategies. We wanted to create a process that allows us to take a look back at some of the ideas and find a way to prioritize moving some of these forward in the short term. Mike Lovell is the lead, I serve as co-lead, and Pat Loftis is the UAS member on the committee. The basic idea is to define the process. We are collecting ideas, looking at impact and potential revenue, looking at implementation costs, connecting with mission, etc. We are on an ambitious time frame. We are well underway in taking a look at the first set of ideas we have been collecting since last year. We plan to present a couple examples at the December BOT meeting. Some examples include: coordinating student excellence initiatives, look at expanding clinical services to the public, strategic online program growth, data science programs, etc.

- Jeanne – feel free to email Pat or me and copy Mel Baker to get your ideas onto the spreadsheet.

- Discussion/Questions
  - Q via chat re: providing a list of the ideas.
    - A: Pat – there is a large list of potential ideas for both short-term and long-term; however, the list is not vetted in terms of projects.
    - A: Jeanne – the work group leaders have the full list from the Ideation Review Council and we can figure out how to make that public. It is identified more as input rather than ideas right now. We are in the process of putting the ROI together. We will dive in on some of those to get data on the finances to see how we will track this.
  
  - Q via chat re: focus on transfer student initiatives.
    - A: Pat – that is absolutely high on the agenda. We are looking at mechanisms such as discussions with other universities as well as two-year programs to see if we can figure out some ways to enhance the number of transfer students. The other idea was the creation of the student excellence center for purposes of keeping the attrition rate low. We lose students, particularly students of color, after the first couple years, and we're trying to figure out a way to keep them here. It's not new revenue; it's maintaining the student body rather than actually making physical money, but it still equates to money.
    - A: Jeanne – we're looking to see where we can grow transfer programs, but you know there are other factors that we also have to consider. We want to be careful that we are building budgets on real opportunities and not just what we hope will happen. We've had a long history on this campus of just talking about transfer students and how to make ourselves a more transfer-friendly institution. I don't see we’re going to suddenly flip a switch and overnight have enough by next year. That is not going to make up for the size of this year's freshman class. I just don't think that's a realistic thing for us to think about.

- Q: Is real estate also being considered?
  - A: Jeanne – yes.

XIII. Update on Academic Budget/Program Planning Workgroups – Workgroup leaders

- Colleges / Administrative Structures / Shared Services – Chima Korieh: we have had about six meetings already with another two scheduled prior to Thanksgiving. We have received over 70 pieces of input from faculty and staff; this has been important. We have looked at the organizational structure at other universities to see what best practices are and how to be informed. We have also studied the organizational chart of academic affairs at Marquette. We are beginning to look at Student Affairs too because this department also reports to the Provost.
As we are looking at possible consolidations, we realize that there will be budget implications. We hope to submit a preliminary draft of our recommendations before Thanksgiving.

- Discretionary Expenses – Tim Melchert: our charge is very broad under the operating expenses under the Provost’s Office across campus. We have dozens of suggestions for possible expense reductions. We are learning that this process is going to be difficult because budgeting is handled very differently across campus and different departments have different needs – travel, accreditation, campus furniture and computers, etc. Many cuts have already been made, so this will be a very difficult process. We were thankful that Janice Welburn is undertaking an examination of the journal subscriptions by the library, because even that falls under our responsibility in terms of discretionary budgets. We are trying to make useful recommendations without getting swamped with all of the details.

- Program Offerings – Amber Wichowsky: our group will have its fifth meeting on Wednesday. We received a list of graduate and undergraduate programs for consideration of sunsetting or consolidation. That list has expanded a little bit following our workgroup deliberations; so the scope broadened a bit. Part of the impetus behind that is the cost saving targets that our workgroup was given ($5-7 mil for programs). We will be evaluating both undergrad and graduate programs. The challenge here is we don’t have a good guiding vision. Hearing Jeanne talking about the revenue-generating ideas, how does that intersect with programs? Our group will also be talking about the letter from the Marquette Jesuit community and evaluative criteria, in order to be mindful of mission and the role of the humanities. It is a difficult ask. I feel a bit more constrained with regard to the timeframe. Shion has asked to have a list of the programs that we are considering. We are not sharing this broadly with the campus community for fear of negative consequences resulting from any program consideration. It is my understanding that the deans have notified the programs that were on the list initially. We do need to connect with the Research group as well as Alix in OIRA to try to understand how this affects our rankings.

- Research – Noelle Brigden: we are a long-term work group, but we’ve started with faculty outreach as well as our listening session. We received a lot of constructive feedback. We established our own webpage and online portal from which we have begun processing faculty contributions. We have two upcoming coffee chats which are set up as informal opportunities to meet with faculty. I encourage you to attend these: Wednesday, November 18 from 11a.m. – 12p.m. and Monday, November 30 from 2-3p.m. We have split into subgroups within our workgroup which will give you a sense of how we’re interpreting our charge. One is to collect research activity metrics across departments, colleges, disciplines and also evaluate the potential sabbatical plan changes and teaching load impact. So will be reaching out even further to the teaching group in particular. The second one is student research, both undergraduate and graduate activity. We will be reaching out to the groups that are involved with students as well. Finally, we will collect and synthesize input on potential interdisciplinary strategic areas of excellence, including review of the FAD recent publication data.

- Student Body – Michael Danduran: we are a long-term work group and will hold our second meeting tomorrow. We have charged committee members with going back to their respective departments and having some discussions about their current student initiatives. We are working with admissions and discussing recruitment strategies, admission processes, and addressing support initiatives for diversity and first generation students. We are looking at the faculty feedback forms as well. We did have some small group coffee chats with some students, most notably the tour guides. They did share that there are some difficult questions being raised by families while they are giving the tours. We will continue meeting with other student groups across campus in different ways. We will also be in contact with Sumana to schedule our listening session, likely next week.

- Teaching – Michelle Mynlieff: we have had a lot of meetings, and our short-term goal is to come up with some recommendations. I feel strongly that we cannot do this backwards and we need to know our end goal. We have been looking at teaching loads, sabbaticals, class size, etc. Long-term we need to know what makes Marquette unique. I would argue the teacher scholar model is really important and how that impacts teaching load, faculty mix, pedagogy, online learning is all important. We have organized our work group into subgroups to look at mission and sabbaticals, teaching load, and class size. We have gathered information and now know the teaching load for every faculty member on campus as well as the class size for every course. With this information we can look at various manipulations. I am including the Core Director and Honors Director in our discussions as well. We have also collected information about what goes into US News and World Reports; I will be working with Alix to model some things out. Finally, we will be having a listening session on Friday afternoon at 1pm.

XIV. University Board of Graduate Studies Dr. Doug Woods, Vice Provost for Graduate & Professional Studies and Dean of the Graduate School

Motion to approve: New Master of Science in Data Science (Att. XIVa)

- This proposal was approved by A&S and UBGS. The motion passed UBGS with 12 yeses, zero nays and one abstention. It will be housed in the Computer Science Department, and it has an ADP option. It has two
specializations: machine learning and big data, and the curriculum will be available online. The targeted enrollment is 14 for year one with a steady state of 20 students per year afterwards. This program appears to be profitable in year two and will get to a steady state of profitability of $275,000/year after expenses when it hits its steady state. The sunset clause for this incubator program states that there will be 42 students enrolled by year four graduating 10 to 15 students per year at that time. If the program fails to meet that sunset clause requirement, it will be reviewed and then potentially eliminated.

- The next set of four motions are all intertwined, two of which you will hopefully approve, and two of which you will be informed on. The College of Education currently offers a Master’s in Education in Educational Policy and Leadership. This degree currently has multiple specializations, including one in educational administration, one in STEM education, and one in Student Affairs in Higher Education. The problem is that this structure, with the all these specializations, makes it very difficult to track enrollments and revenues, and it often hides the clear focus of the degree from the students who are potentially interested in the program. Therefore, the college would like to create two new degree programs which will keep the exact same programs for the two specializations, but give them new names: Masters in Education in Student Affairs in Higher Education (36 credits) and Masters in Education in Educational Leadership (30 credits). The budget analysis on these essentially suggest they are revenue neutral. The UBGS has a motion to approve both of these programs.

Motion to approve: New Master of Education in Student Affairs in Higher Education (Att. XIVb)
- Discussion/Questions
  - Q: Michelle – I was curious what happened to STEM. Why did the other two get separated out?
    - A: Doug – it is still there as a Masters of Education and EDPL with a specialization in STEM education. I don’t know why it did not get separated out. That would be a question for Education.

Passed by unanimous voice vote with no abstentions.

Informed on motion: Terminate Specialization in Student Affairs in Higher Education (Att. XIVc)
- Because we started the new degree, the specialization can be terminated. Senate is being informed of that motion.

Motion to approve: New Master of Education in Educational Leadership (Att. XIVd)
- Discussion/Questions
  - Q: How do these changes at the Masters level impact PhD programs? Is it the PhD program that generates the revenue?
    - A: Doug – almost no PhD programs generate revenue. By default they are more of the university’s investment. The return is not financial, with the exception of possible research.

Passed by unanimous voice vote with no abstentions.

Informed on motion: Terminate Specialization in Educational Administration (Att. XIVe)
- Because we started the new degree, the specialization can be terminated. Senate is being informed of that motion.

Informed on motion: New Accelerated Degree Program in Master of Science in Finance (Att. XIVf)
- The Senate and the Board approved a Master’s of Science in Finance. This is just to inform the Senate that an accelerated degree pathway has been opened for that Master’s degree in Finance by the College of Business.

XV. Adjourned at 5:04pm
- Motion to adjourn: Tim Melchert
- Second: Marilyn Frenn
- Passed without objection

Respectfully submitted,
Ms. Rebecca Blemberg
UAS Secretary

The next meeting will be Monday, December 14, 2020 at 3:00 p.m. in Teams.