Members in Attendance: Dr. Pradeep Bhagavatula, Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay, Dr. Marilyn Frenn, Dr. Ana Garner, Mr. Kurt Gering, Dr. Brian Hodgson, Dr. Rick Holz, Dr. Javier Ibanez-Noe, Dr. Teresa Jerofke-Owen, Dr. Kristof Kipp, Dr. Noreen Lephardt, Mr. Adam Kouhel, Mr. Scott Mandernack, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Tim Melchert, Dr. Daniel Myers, Dr. Michelle Mlynieff, Dr. Anne Pasero, Dr. Jim Richie, Ms. Dawn Smith, Dr. John Su, Dr. William Thorn, Ms. Mary Jo Wiemiller, Dr. Doug Woods, Ms. Jean Zanoni, and Dr. Wanda Zemler-Cizewski

Members Excused: Dr. Julia Azari, Dr. Abir Bekhet, Prof. Bruce Boyden, Dr. Brian Till

Members not in attendance: Dr. Joseph Domblesky, Mr. Scott Mandernack, Mr. David Marra, Mr. Abe Ortiz Tapia, Dr. Doris Walker-Dalhouse, Mrs. Janice Welburn, Dr. Susan Wood.

Guests: Dr. Allison Abbott, Ms. Sandi Cleveland, Mr. Brian Dorrington, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Kerry Egdor, Dr. Mark Eppli, Dr. Susanne Foster, Mrs. Tyra Hildebrand, Dr. Tom Kaczmarek, Dale Kaser, Dr. Gary Meyer, Dr. Rebecca Sanders, Dr. Sheila Schindler-Ivens, Dr. Rosemary Stuart, Mr. Michael VanDerhoef.

I. Call to Order by Dr. Cheryl Maranto at 3:07 pm.

II. Reflection was given by Ms. MaryJo Wiemiller.

III. Approval of November 21, 2016 minutes
   - Motion to approve: Dr. Noreen Lephardt
   - Second: Dr. William Thorn
   - Vote: Passed by unanimous voice vote

IV. Chair’s Report – Dr. Cheryl Maranto
   - Met with Dean’s Council for statutory meeting; discussion primarily regarding how to strengthen shared governance and finding common ground around concerns of strengthening the academic side of university, especially relative to budget.
     - Senators that are representing a unit are asked to regularly communicate to that unit about what has been going on in Senate, whether through a faculty meeting or in some other manner. Keeping Senate in the forefront of faculty minds should generate more interest in the work being done and in serving on Academic Senate.
   - Faculty Council has completed their work on the dean search protocol. Provost has asked that discussion in Senate be delayed until spring.
   - Recognized Dr. Noreen Lephardt, who is retiring this month, for her extraordinary service to Senate over many years. She has had a very strong impact on the work of Senate and will be missed. Noreen offered her thanks.

V. Vice Chair Report – Dr. Anne Pasero
   - Faculty Council is in good hands with Kurt Gering and Dawn Smith.
   - Are currently discussing terms of office of Senate chair, vice chair and chair-elect.
   - Dean search protocol has been completed and is under review.
   - Currently discussing the various titles for participating faculty and what each means, etc.
   - Have set date for Faculty Forum with President Lovell. It will be held on April 12, 2017, right before spring break.

VI. Secretary Report – Mrs. MaryJo Wiemiller
   - Dr. Kristof Kipp has agreed to serve on University Board of Graduate Studies in place of Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay, who has a teaching conflict in the spring.
VII. Provost’s Report – Dr. Daniel Myers

- Retirement
  - The new tenure buyout plan was approved and put in place; the deadline for May retirements was December 1st. Twenty-seven faculty members signed tenure buyout paperwork; about 1/3 selected the phased option, with 2/3 taking the one-year buyout. That is about double the number that we had in the prior year. Believes faculty saw it as favorable and useful at this particular point in their careers.
  - Emeritus status changes are also in place.
- Budget
  - Operating budget was approved by the Board of Trustees on Friday. Was a tough and very tight budget cycle. Tried to do things in ways that were the least painful in order to balance the budget. Started off with a pretty big hole, primarily because of issues with discount this year. Discount rates nationally have gone up dramatically and we also had to increase discount rate to remain competitive in attracting students. This has produced a budget for next year that includes a tightening of resources. Have been asked if we have net new lines this year as a result of the budget, and the answer is no. In order to improve our situation, we will have to focus our attention on revenue drivers. Are looking at revenue-generating master’s programs and will try to expand the graduate options online. Related to that is doing more stuff online – especially at the post-baccalaureate level and also with continuing education, certificate programs, and masters programs. These things will help us have more flexibility in the budget in the future. We did balance the budget and have continued to build the university’s reserves.
  - Questions:
    - What is our discount rate?
      - Across the board for the first year class, discount rate was 47% overall. This is higher than our traditional average, but is typical of other universities across the nation.
      - Plan is to reduce the discount rate by a couple of percentage points.
      - Dr. John Baworowsky, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management, has laid out a good plan for enrollment management in the next year, with intentions of increasing minority enrollments as well as the quality of the class. In the past, we haven’t had a true enrollment manager, so we should now show some real improvements in the strategy and management of our enrollment efforts.
      - We are trying to increase the number of international students, as we believe we can do better than the approximately 50 students we currently have.
      - Are also trying to increase the number of transfer students. Dr. John Baworowsky is also working on this, including some articulation agreements with community colleges. We are also looking to partner with community colleges to accept students who are tracking Marquette majors. We have a lot of capacity for transfers if we can be flexible enough about our requirements. The aim is modest for next year (from 150 to 170), but will be more aggressive in the future. This should also really help us diversity our student body.
    - Question: Under these articulation agreements, would the completion of an associate’s degree mean automatic admission to Marquette?
      - No. The purpose of the articulation agreements is to make our requirements more transparent so that students who ultimately want to go to Marquette know exactly what they need to do in order to transfer the right credits when the time comes.
    - Question: Does this change the quality of our students?
      - No, this does not change the quality. Students will still have to meet our academic requirements.
    - The intent is to provide students with a clear picture of what they need to do to meet our requirements and to transfer courses. For some students, it is a simple fact of life that they cannot afford four years at Marquette. These articulation agreements should assist them in completing the appropriate requirements prior to transferring to Marquette.
    - Currently, many of our transfer students come from other 4-year schools rather than from 2-year schools. We believe there is an untapped market available.
• How important is increasing our selectivity in growing enrollment?
  o The goal is to move all markers in the strategic plan uphill – to incrementally change our student body and not to do any one at the expense of any other. This is tricky and we have to be careful as we don’t have a lot of budget to play around with in the process.

• Enrollment Update
  o Application deadline in this next cycle was December 1. We were basically in the same place we were last year, maybe a slight bit ahead. That is not surprising because we didn’t do many things differently than last year. The changes will be in what we do after making admission decisions, with a goal of achieving a higher yield. Financial aid packages will be sent earlier, etc. We should have better yield with lower discount. Graduate School enrollments are making some upward progress, but we are still early in the graduate cycle.

• Executive Vice President for Operations Search Update
  o This search continues. Airport interviews were held and all felt there were good applicants. One candidate seemed extraordinarily good and final interviews with that candidate are being conducted. If that does not pan out, will look at other candidates in the pool, which remains open.
    ▪ Questions: When would this person begin?
      • As soon as possible, hopefully the early part of next semester. The start date will be a part of the offer negotiation process.

• Questions:
  o Is there any update on the Athletic Performance and Research Center?
    ▪ No; the various work groups are still working. Should have some updates after the first of the year.

VIII. Center for Cyber Security Awareness and Cyber Defense – Dr. Rebecca Sanders, Chair Department of Mathematics, Statistics and Computer Sciences, and Dr. Tom Kaczmarek, Adjunct Assistant Professor
  a. Motion to Recommend Approval
    ▪ The purpose of the Center is alignment with the strategic goal of human wellbeing.
    ▪ There has been an increase in the importance of cyber security, with several national initiatives that have taken place.
    ▪ Effort began several years ago when it was realized that Wisconsin did not have a center for academic excellence in cyber security. Marquette would be the only 4-year institution in the state of Wisconsin that would be designated nationally as an academic center of excellence for cyber security education.
    ▪ This would be a specialization within the computer science curriculum.
    ▪ Needs to expand beyond the cyber community. People need to be aware of the things in their domain that are involved in cyber security. Hoping that other programs will include modules that highlight cyber security.
    ▪ Would also work to establish business relationships; increase awareness, etc.
    ▪ Questions:
      o Are there resource implications for the university and department?
        • The courses already exist and are being taught. If it became very popular, would become necessary to expand faculty, but that would be a good problem to have.
        • Current director of graduate studies would take on director responsibilities
      o Would community engagement generate revenue?
        • Ideally, yes. Can see places where this could happen.
      o There are a number of benefits that would provide for interesting collaborations. But, does this designation make us a target for additional threats?
        • The heightened designation should make us more impenetrable as it would increase awareness, etc. on campus.

Motion to recommend approval: Dr. William Thorn
Second: Dr. Brian Hodgson
Vote: Passed by unanimous voice vote
Informed on Motion:
To amend membership of Executive Committee to include Chair of Faculty Council

- Executive Committee of Academic Senate has suggested revisiting the possible amendment of executive committee membership to include the chair of Faculty Council as a regular member of the Senate Executive Committee. The primary reason for considering this change is to promote seamless communication. The vice chair is obviously able to relate that information, but sometimes being in the room and present to discussion is beneficial. When this was mentioned in August, there were some issues raised. This discussion will address those concerns, and then be open to the floor for further discussion.

Questions:
- Would it make the executive committee too large?
  - Going from 7 to 8 members does not seem to make the group too unwieldy.
- Faculty Council wants to be independent of Senate.
  - Executive Committee endorses that, and believes that having someone sitting in executive committee meetings should not change that.
- What happens in situation where Faculty Council Chair might not be on Senate?
  - The Faculty Council chair is elected by the Faculty, so whether they are or are not on Senate, they are still an elected representative of faculty.
- Faculty Council is somewhat of a gatekeeper.
  - Virtually any issue that the Senate starts has to go through Faculty Council. Improving and keeping communication open can only be a good thing.
- Concerns that sitting on Senate Executive Committee might be too big a commitment for Faculty Council Chair.
  - The additional commitment is only one to two hours per month.
- Suggested that Senate chair could simply invite the Faculty Council Chair to attend the Executive Committee meeting.
  - That is true, but if it is important enough to make sure that the person is included, then they should get the service recognition for their commitment.

Discussion
- This discussion was triggered when it was decided to separate the vice chair from officially being the chair of Faculty Council. Originally, the Chair of Faculty Council would have automatically been a part of the Senate Executive Committee.
- The Chair of Faculty Council is required to attend Senate. If the person were not already a member of Senate, they would still attend Senate meetings, but would not have a vote.
- It is the responsibility of Faculty Council Chair to make sure that all items from Senate are pushed through the appropriate process.
- Should Faculty Council discuss this?
  - Faculty Council talked about it earlier and discussed course release and how that might be handled. Shared governance takes time and if nobody organizes the meetings, they are a waste of time. Faculty Council Chair is a big job. Discussion of release time could be added to the Council charge relative to terms of Senate chair, etc.
- Issues in front of Faculty Council play into the agenda of Senate. In terms of efficiency, there is a benefit to Faculty Council Chair being on the Senate Executive Committee. This is also true relative to shared governance and the unification of the two bodies.
- Appears that the next step is to go back to the Faculty Council and, in collaboration with the Senate Executive Committee, prepare the proposed changes to the Statutes. This should be done independently of, but related to, the terms and composition of Academic Senate positions.
- The vice chair of Senate is no longer a member of Faculty Council so that each (Senate and Faculty Council) is an equally functioning and separate body. Additionally, the chair of Faculty Council need not be a tenured/tenure track faculty member, whereas the vice chair of Senate is.
• **Motion** to table the discussion to the January meeting. (Dr. William Thorn)
  o Motion carried to table discussion.

X. University Board of Graduate Studies – Dr. Allison Abbott, Chair

Informed on the following academic program decisions:

a. New specialization proposal for Elementary Education—Teach for America; College of Education
b. New specialization proposal for Secondary Education—Teach for America; College of Education
c. New specialization proposal for Dual Primary Care and Acute Care Pediatric Nurse Practitioner; College of Nursing

• Discussion
  o None

XI. University Board of Graduate Studies and University Board of Undergraduate Studies – Dr. Gary Meyer, Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Faculty Credentialing Policy

**Motion:**

_The University Board of Undergraduate Studies and the University Board of Graduate Studies move to adopt the Faculty Credentialing Policy, effective August 21, 2017, that delineates faculty credentials associated with undergraduate and graduate education at Marquette University._

• Discussion
  o Motion came through University Boards of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies. Are now seeking Senate endorsement of this faculty credentialing document. In March 2016, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) came out with guidelines around which faculty should be credentialed. The guidelines from the HLC are not directed at Marquette or institutions like us. In almost every single case, we meet those minimum guidelines/threshold. They do mandate that we have a policy approved and the documentation in place, so that should anyone want to see that document, it is available.
  o As can be seen by reviewing the documents provided, there are three areas of credentialing: undergraduate teaching, graduate teaching, and research.
  o Are not trying to set up a hierarchical system. Are being asked by HLC to have a policy in place for credentialing around undergraduate teaching, graduate teaching, and research.
  o Questions:
    ▪ Is this leading toward a graduate faculty?
      • There won’t be a distinction as such, because that is not really where this is headed.
    ▪ Is there conversation about all faculty having some baseline for the university as a whole, or is it just part-time, etc.?
      • Applies to everyone. There would be some type of credentialing form in each college office for all faculty.
    ▪ Would faculty in a co-curricular area (e.g., English as a Second Language) need to be credentialed?
      • Did not consider in the discussions, but yes, they would have to be credentialed.
    ▪ Is there a timeline that HLC is requiring?
      • Yes, in fall 2017. We don’t really have a choice in this; it is a requirement. It is active scholarship oversight, etc.

Vote: Passed by unanimous voice vote

XII. Capital Campaign and Fundraising Metrics – Mr. Michael VanDerhoef, Vice President for University Advancement

• Provide an overview of University Advancement (UA) and where we are today, and then will see what kinds of questions there are.
  o UA is a centralized function at the direction of the president and provost, and partners with deans, athletic director, art director, etc.
Michael Vanderhoef has been here three years. Over that time, UA has raised an average of about $60 million for the university.

Often asked how much is current and how much is deferred.
- About 80% is current money, with the remaining 20% in deferred gifts. There are, however, several who have likely made an estate plan gift that we don’t know about.
- As we become more aggressive in our fundraising, we will try to use deferred gifts as a way to bolster our endowment.

Scholarship support in a year?
- $12,000,000 raised for scholarships; 80% is available to use right away.
- We receive a lot of endowment support for scholarships.
- Are pushing for current use scholarship funds to help with the unfunded discount.

How much is raised through Athletics per year?
- About $8 million per year for intercollegiate athletics. About $5 to $6 million of that is for scholarship support.

On Friday, the Board gave us the go ahead to build out a comprehensive campaign for Marquette. Have been planning for it for the last 15 months. Have talked with significant donors and friends. Campaign will take about 8 years. Will have an endowment component, a current use component, program support for current priorities. Will include a capital component, especially as it relates to the Campus Master Plan. The campaign target is $750 million. The last campaign raised about half of that. The first four years of the campaign will be spent in what is generally referred to as a quiet phase; we will refer to that as the private phase. During those four years, we will be talking with our closest and most wealthy donors. At the halfway point, we will become more public with the campaign.

Questions:
- How will the priorities for the capital campaign be determined?
  - Received approval for a direction around priorities. All priorities will:
    - tie into the strategic plan, and
    - be relative to the campus master plan, or
    - be relative to significant program needs
  - We’ve done a study with those priorities to see how our major donors feel about them.
  - There will be two layers of priorities for the campaign:
    - Overall vision for the university
    - Individual college or program priorities; deans have been asked to make sure their priorities tie in with the strategic plan.

  What is our current endowment?
  - $550 million

  When it comes to the priorities, when will we learn what those are?
  - Master plan priorities have been identified as the first steps to be done in the first five to ten years. APRC, Business and Innovation Alley, Student Housing, BioDiscovery (life sciences), Recreational Health and Wellness. Bear in mind that this is what we are talking about JUST through philanthropy. Some of the money for these will also come through other areas, such as collaborations, etc. Endowment covers a lot of territory – faculty, programs, and scholarships. We’ll have significant efforts to endow as much as we can so that we can sustain what we are doing at Marquette. Faculty positions are important in that discussion.

  Of the $750 million goal, what portion goes to capital and what to other areas?
  - $350 million will be for endowment. That amount, plus investment income, gets us to our goal of a $1 billion endowment.
  - $250 million will go to capital projects.
  - $150 million will go to programs.

  Dining Rooms are not a part of that discussion?
  - Are currently raising funds for Dining Rooms.

  What are the expected administrative costs of a campaign?
  - Project those costs to be about $18 million over the 8 years of the campaign.
  - Relative to corporate partnerships, what are the priorities that will be pushed?
There is already interest in the APRC and Innovation Alley. We are also aware of, and have people expressing an interest in, the business school and BioDiscovery, and in rec and wellness.

- How are we doing with better connecting with our alums? And better staying in touch with them?
  - Asked national alumni board, “how do we make sure this campaign re-energizes our alumni, etc. and creates more opportunities for them to stay connected?”
  - Will be continuing that conversation with them in January. We see the campaign as an incredible way to be certain that we reconnect.

- The connections mentioned often occur at the undergraduate level. It is important to also connect at the graduate level.
  - Doug Woods and Michael VanDerhoef continue to have that conversation and seek ways to do so.

- How many staff will you be adding?
  - Will add about 12. Are currently at about 125, which is down from about 153 when Michael VanDerhoef started. That increase will occur over a 2-year period.

XIII. Adjourn at 4:44 p.m.
- Motion to Adjourn: Dr. William Thorn
- Second: Dr. Jim Ritchie
- Vote: Unanimous voice vote

Respectfully Submitted,
Mrs. MaryJo Wiemiller
UAS Secretary

The next meeting will be Monday, January 23, 2017 at 3:00 p.m. in AMU Ballrooms C/D