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

II. Reflection was given by Rev. Michael Class, S.J.

III. Approval of January 25, 2016 minutes
- Motion to approve: Dr. Tim Melchert
- Second: Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay
- Voice Vote: Unanimous

IV. Chair’s Report – Dr. Cheryl Maranto
- The President has received the FHC report on the Dr. John McAdams case and has expressed his appreciation for the care and thoroughness with which it was prepared. There will be no further update until after the upcoming Board of Trustees meeting.

V. Vice Chairperson’s Report – Dr. James Richie
- Faculty Council is getting ready for the Forum with President Lovell which will be held on April 13th from 3:00 to 4:30 p.m. in AMU Ballroom CD. Questions are still being solicited and can be e-mailed to facultycouncil@mu.edu no later than February 19th. Faculty Council will review and consolidate into a series of questions. It is likely that not all submitted questions will be asked. There will be time for some Q&A. Colleagues should be encouraged to attend. This is an important function of the Senate and Faculty Council.

VI. Secretary Report – Dr. Noreen Lephardt
- Invitations for nominations for the at-large senate seat as well as an invitation to all tenured faculty for the FHC nominations have been sent. Thus far have received 3 nominations for at-large senators and 2 nominations for the faculty hearing committee. This is good news. Nominations end on February 19th.
- Everyone should seriously consider a role on the executive committee. Those positions are selected from both seated senators and senators-elect. A sign-up sheet will be circulated at the next meeting for those who might be interested in one of the UAS leadership positons.
VII. Provost’s Report - Dr. Daniel Myers

- Searches for open positions are in the same state as reported at the last meeting.
- Enrollment for fall 2016. We have 101 deposits. We are still early in the process, but are ahead of where we were last year. Actions in this area will start to pick up in the next couple of weeks as financial aid packages are sent out. Prospective student visit activities seem to be going well, with engaged parents and students.
- Strategic Plan update that we’ve been working on is more or less completed at this point. Will go to the Board of Trustees next week. When that meeting is completed, all will be able to look at the website and see the progress that is being made. *A Culture of Inclusion* is now a sixth strategic theme. Dr. Myers strongly supports the strategic plan. The reason that a website will be available vs. a document to place on the shelf is that this is a living document and will need to be updated from time to time.
- There is an ongoing long-standing issue with the library budget, especially regarding electronic resources. Electronic resources have been subject to severe inflation over the years, with some companies ramping prices up by 10% or more per year. This has become a problem for the library budget. Key stakeholders met recently to discuss the budgeting issue. The primary discussion is whether these costs are capital or operating expenses. Depending on the language and how we account for them, some of the expenditures could be considered capital expenditures, but most are considered operating expenses. The bottom line, however, is not really whether we are classifying as operating or capital, but rather how we can fund this extraordinary expense. For the time being, we are trying to shift money toward the operating budget to see if we can support the purchase of these important resources, while some have been moved to the capital side. These are an important resource for research, etc. and we are working to do what we can, but how we account for them does not solve the problem of the increasing costs.
- Questions from the senate:
  - Having been asked to give up certain electronic resources, and given the emphasis we have on research productivity and the need for these resources, is there some long-term strategic vision beyond robbing Peter to pay Paul, in order to bolster the budget?
    - Will have to continue looking this year after year. Simply don’t have the resources to continue looking at 10% inflation every year. Mrs. Janice Welburn has been working to join a consortia to help us with economies of scale but this is difficult in Wisconsin. We aware this is a big issue with expanding research; unfortunately, there is no clear road out of the mess.
  - Are talking specifically about journal subscriptions; we have had to cancel a fair number of those in the last couple of years. To Mrs. Welburn: Are we looking at having to cancel more journals?
    - We are okay for the current year; subscriptions are on different time schedules. Scott Mandernack added that we have cancelled what was necessary for this year. Not knowing what budget will be for next year, have been able to capitalize some agreements which has allowed some shifting of funds. Are still waiting on some of the bigger subscriptions.
  - Could Mrs. Welburn briefly explain the program review question of not being a part of the state consortium?
    - There is some unique rule in Wisconsin that keep us from being a part of the state school consortium. We are a part of the Wisconsin association of Independent Colleges and Universities, but several of those schools are not research-oriented. There is no incentive to make the UW system let us in. Some of our AJCU counterparts are in with a state consortium, but Wisconsin is a state where state schools and private schools are separate. Looked at joining with MCW, but our rates are cheaper than if we were in that consortium.
  - Do the Jesuit universities have any ability to form a consortium?
● No, because some of those schools are in larger consortiums and would not benefit from making a change.
  ○ Is the rule governing the Wisconsin consortium by legislation, i.e., should we look at lobbying the Legislature?
  ● Mrs. Welburn would have to look at this, but doesn’t think it is a lobbying issue. The consortium has to let state schools in, but they don’t have to let private schools in.

VIII. Vice President for Finance – Mr. Chuck Lamb
● Provided an update on Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 overview and the current financial picture of MU through FY2017. A PPT handout was provided to Senators highlighting his presentation.
● Questions:
  ○ The cost of administration has fallen to 2%; what was it previously, and what is included in those administrative costs?
    ● As may be remembered, a couple of years ago we finished the year with less than $1m in the operating budget. The decision was made to freeze lines and cut budgets. For FY14 we decided to do more with budget reductions which focused on the administrative side; no faculty lines were cut. Expenses were reduced by consolidating executive VP offices and cutting operating expenses. We looked at efficiencies in administrative areas and cut more from the budget this last year. We looked for ways besides budget reductions to reduce expenses. There was approximately a 2.5% reduction. All units were asked to submit suggested budget reductions, but the cuts were not made completely across the board. For example, Finance took a 17% reduction and University Advancement a 15% reduction.
  ○ Does administrative services include staff?
    ● No.
  ○ Please speak a little about unfunded discount for student scholarships.
    ● Marquette is one of the schools that has been at the bottom end of unfunded student discounts. We try to keep the discount rate in the neighborhood of 25 to 30%; it has grown to about 39%. We are watching this very carefully. One of the priorities in the campaign has to be raising money for scholarships and endowments. We are behind peer institutions relative to endowments. This does not give us the kind of financial stability we seek.
  ○ How are decisions made for capital projects?
    ● University capital planning committee reviews and rates capital projects based on security, safety, academic quality, etc. Their results and remarks are then passed on to the budget committee. The budget committee reviews, etc. and then passes to the President and Provost, who decide what will be passed on to Trustees for approval.
  ○ For the composite financial index, what is bringing it down?
    ● Have determined that this is primarily related to endowment.
● The Office of Finance web page includes a dashboard, which will give a much more in depth understanding of monthly finances of university, and includes Key Performance Indicators. We are also working on a dashboard to give deans and college administration a more thorough understanding of finances, etc.

IX. University Board of Undergraduate Studies - Dr. Behnam Ghasemzadeh, Chair
Dr. John Su requested that in his absence the UAS Secretary provide the following information regarding recent decision the UBUS. All decisions were unanimous.
● Informed on:
  a. Modifications to University Honors Program Curriculum
  b. New Minor – Interdisciplinary Culture, Health, and Illness
  c. New Minor – Interdisciplinary Law and Society
● Senate does not need to vote on these.
● Questions:
Would like to have further information on what has changed in the Honors Program Curriculum.

- Dean Rick Holz shared the following information. Dr. Amelia Zurcher proposed this modification to engage other colleges across the University, so that the honors program is more inclusive than simply humanities. The agreements that she has from other colleges are what is outlined in the program. The purpose is to bring the honors curriculum up to the industry standard. It is not a curriculum change as much as it is an adjustment in the program in order to expand opportunities? These modifications are across all colleges, and will make it easier for students in all colleges to have honors in their major.

- Have been informed and will move forward.

X. For Discussion – Health Care Benefits for 30-37 hour/week employees – Faculty Council motion

- This discussion is relative to the University’s decision not to provide health insurance to employees working under 35 hours. Members of Senate received several comments and concerns, and asked faculty council to draft a motion to address those concerns.

- Discussion:
  - Ms. Mary Jo Wiemiller serves as the faculty representative to the Health Care Task Force. There has not been a senate member on the task force for a number of years and she believes it is important that there is now a senate liaison. Her role is to communicate to the senate, etc. Views this as a positive step that a senate rep is now a member. The task force meets sporadically, primarily in the spring. There are generally no meetings throughout the fall, and there has not been a meeting scheduled since she joined the group. She understands that there are representatives from HR, Provost’s Office, etc. on the task force.
  - Employee focus groups for faculty and staff will be held (an e-mail will be sent to faculty with information). This is an opportunity to weigh in on what is important in the healthcare benefit. Senators are encouraged to volunteer and to urge their colleagues to do so as well.
  - Across the university, there were 105 individuals who fell into this part-time category. Of those 105, 13 are staff and faculty, with the remainder being RAs. There is no information as to whether those individuals have access to healthcare through a spouse or parent, or whether they chose to go to the Exchange for health care coverage.
  - Did this go to the staff senate for endorsement? We believe it did.
  - Senators believe that there is a contradiction between the change in benefits and our guiding values. Does not appear that this change upholds the guiding values. We must also consider the unintended consequences of healthcare mandates.

- Questions:
  - With this suggestion coming from the Faculty Council, is the Senate to vote on this and then to whom is it being addressed?
    - The suggestion is that it would then go to the health care task force for their consideration.
  - Need more clarification. The preamble to the UAS discusses situations where Senate is censuring because decisions were made without due input from the UAS. Is that what is being considered here? Or is this UAS recommending versus Faculty Council recommending. UAS is not censuring, it is more informative of the voice of faculty through shared governance.
  - Where did the decision come from? Was it the health care task force, the president, the department of Human Resources? The Healthcare Task Force does not make decisions, they make recommendations. This should be addressed to the decision maker.
  - Faculty Council is responding to a charge from the UAS. The Task Force would make a recommendation to the President and the Board of Trustees. Senate would make a recommendation to the Healthcare Task Force.
  - Instead of a proposal, should this be a resolution of the Faculty Council that was endorsed by the Senate?
  - Did the Task Force gather specific information or were some assumptions made regarding whether the individuals had other health care options available? Should Senate be more forward-looking and
recommend the gathering of information regarding whether or not individuals are covered under another plan or the cost?
  o Do we know if anyone affected by the change has actually complained?
    ▪ Two people out of 105 have complained. Part time employees can purchase insurance through the university at full price. This is a very expensive health plan, so individuals might easily get a better deal through the Exchange. The graduate students had no way to voice their opinion.
  • The proposal/motion will be rewritten and presented to Senate for a vote. This final resolution will then be forwarded to the administration,

XI. For Discussion – UAS Officer Terms
  • The intention of this process is to address the issue of continuity in shared governance. Longer terms for officers allow for better continuity, etc. There is some concern over whether people are willing to step up for an officer position if they know they are on the executive committee for two or three years.
  • Dr. Lephardt drafted the provided document with various options as possible ways to amend the UAS statutes, with the basic notion being that a one-year term is not enough. The senate is being asked to provide feedback.
  • Comments:
    o As a past chair, Dr. Tim Melchert indicated he is in favor of more continuity, especially in the chair position. Issues get lost from year to year in the hand-off. He would suggest one of two options: a two-year term for the chair or adding a second vice chair. That allows the chair to have only one year as chair and perhaps addresses the time commitment concern.
    o Dr. Marilyn Frenn, when she was chair, asked Dr. Tim Melchert to run for vice chair with the intent that he would stay on as chair. Would be good to have longer terms if people were willing to serve. Marilyn also suggested including something in the changes that would address a faculty sabbatical. Has been sometimes challenging to get people to step up and serve.
    o If someone were on sabbatical while serving as chair, it would not allow the continuity that is being sought with this change.
    o Another executive committee structure is to have a vice chair, chair, and chair emeritus, each position being a one-year term.
    o There was support of the notion that the Vice Chair position was not tied to succession as the Chair of the senate.
    o Continuity has great value; seems the way to accomplish is to have a longer chair term; staggering two-year terms for chair and vice chair provides the best continuity. Chair emeritus can also accomplish this.
    o We will need to address all positions on executive committee, including secretary.
  • The FC will prepare the final document with what appears to be the consensus of the discussion (staggered two-year terms for chair and vice chair, chair emeritus, ice chair does not automatically have succession into the chair’s position).
  • Senate would have to approve and then would be submitted as a change to the by-laws.

XII. Adjourn at 5:04 p.m.
  • Motion to Adjourn: Mr. Kurt Gering
  • Second: Mr. Ben Zellmer
  • Voice Vote: Unanimous

Respectfully Submitted,
Noreen E. Haas-Lephardt, Ph.D.
UAS Secretary