I. Call to Order at 4:05 pm

II. Invocation by Fr. Michael Class, S.J.

Members in Attendance: Dr. Albert Abena, Dr. Lea Acord, Dr. Robert Bishop, Prof. Bruce Boyd, Mr. John Brenner, Prof. Patricia Cervenka, Mr. Joseph Ciccone, Fr. Michael Class, S.J., Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Evelyn Donate-Bartfield, Dr. Alexander Drakopoulos, Dr. Marilyn Frenn, Dr. Steven Goldzwig, Dr. Jeanne Hossenlopp. Dr. Peter Jones, Dr. Sarah Knox, Dr. Christine L. Krueger, Ms. Meghan Ladwig, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Daniel Meissner, Dr. Gary Meyer, Mr. Terrence Neumann, Dr. Maureen O’Brien, Dr. Bill Oliverio, Dr. John Pauly, Fr. Philip Rossi, S.J., Dr. Heidi Schweizer, Dr. Guy Simoneau, Dr. James South, Dr. John Su, Dr. Siddhartha Syam, Dr. William Thorn, Dr. G.E. Otto Widera, Dr. Joyce Wolburg, and Dr. Wanda Zemler-Cizewski

Members Excused: Dr. Sharon Chubbuck, Ms. Ann Hanlon, Dr. Alexander Ng, and Dr. Linda Salchenberger

Members Not in Attendance: Dr. William Cullinan

Guests Present: Mr. Matt Blessings, Dr. Belen Castaneda, Dr. Roberta Coles, Dr. Kerry Egdorf, Fr. John Fitzgibbons, S.J., Mr. Dale Kaser, Mr. Chuck Lamb, Dr. Linda Lee, Dr. Judith McMullen, Ms. Georgia McRae, Dr. Susan Mountin, Ms. Mary Pat Pfeil, and Mr. Dominik Tortoric (Tribune Reporter)

III. Approval of September 20, 2010 Minutes

Dr. Deahl felt that the minutes for the September meeting did not adequately reflect the full range of discussion about leadership. Dr. Krueger noted that a draft of the minutes was sent to Senators in advance to solicit comments and corrections from individuals so the most accurate version could be approved by the Senate, posted to the website and shared with the campus community. Senators were encourage to send an addendums to the September minutes to Dr. Daniel Meissner.

A motion to table the approval of the September minutes until the November meeting was unanimously approved.

IV. Provost’s Report - Dr. John Pauly

a. Transition meetings are being scheduled for Fr. Pilarz, S.J. for October and November.

- The university has launched a $30 million endowed scholarship initiative through the end of the fiscal year. The effort is targeted at gifts of $50,000 or more with goals to raise $10
million from trustees; $8 million from trustees emeritus; and $12 from at-large gifts. Four $1 million gifts have already been pledged.

- In addition to these $1 million gifts, other donations to support scholarships included seven gifts of $50,000 or more in the first quarter of this fiscal year.
- Fundraising for Eckstein Hall continues, with $200,000 in gifts since the dedication in early September.
- Fundraising also continues for the Discovery Learning Complex, including two anonymous $1 million gifts and an in-kind donation of nearly $200,000 for the facility this past quarter.

V. Budget Overview – Mr. John Lamb, Vice President for Finance

A printed copy of Mr. Lamb’s powerpoint presentation was distributed to Senators.

The University ended fiscal year 2009-10 with a surplus of one million dollars, marking the 14th year in a row of operating surpluses.

Mr. Lamb reported that the university continues to earn a strong credit rating, based on a debt of $255 million and an endowment of $357 million. The debt is about average for a university the size of Marquette, but servicing this debt requires $26 million annually.

Mr. Lamb also outlined the process for developing the operating and capital budget for the university. The Finance Office bases its budget on a three-year plan that considers internal costs and external trends, data collection from various units, projected income from tuition and endowments, and the major expenditure: salaries and benefits. He noted that Marquette is in the bottom quarter of universities in terms of its reliance on tuition to meet budgeted expenses.

He also pointed out some of the major financial challenges for the university:
- Financial aid: 95% of students need assistance
- Endowment: the number and amount of unrestricted gifts has declined. Completion of the Engineering building will be delayed until the funding goal is achieved.
- Local economy: Wisconsin ranks behind only Alabama and Mississippi in terms of economic growth.
- Credit crunch: parents are finding it more difficult to borrow money for tuition. The Perkins Loan program ends next year, and the WI Tuition Grant which covered 25% of tuition will now cover less than 7%
- Health care: expenses continue to rise
- Building maintenance: several buildings on campus need refurbishing. The newest residence hall is 40 years old.

A question was asked if summer school is a growth opportunity for the university. The profit margin is much higher for these programs as there is no discount. They are looking at revenue sharing and cost sharing to look at increasing enrollment. An additional opportunity may be for more study aboard and exchange programs.

In response to a question about long-term enrollment goals, Mr. Lamb outlined four priorities:
1. Meet enrollment and budget goals
2. Improve quality of incoming students. The budget is already stressed with an unfunded discount of 36 percent, making scholarships for top students more difficult.
3. Diversity of the student body
4. First generation students. Proving to be more and more challenging as these students as a group cost more than any other group

Responding to an inquiry about the campus master plan, Mr. Lamb indicated that it is a public document that is available through Mr. Art Scheuber. Priorities are discussed with Deans and Senior Administration. The final approval comes from the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Lamb noted that a major financial issue is Marquette’s low endowment. Boston University has a $1 billion endowment, and St. Louis has twice that of MU. Marquette’s ranking as 75th best university is a remarkable achievement given out budget constraints.

Responding to an inquiry about strategies to improve income, Mr. Lamb noted that savings across campus are being obtained with no new staff positions and minimal salary increases, and that the debt is being refinanced.

VI. Chair’s Report – Dr. Christine Krueger
   a. Motion: To invite contingent faculty to participate in Coalition on the Academic Workforce survey [http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/conversion.htm](http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/conversion.htm)

   Contingent faculty is defined as those faculty who are not currently on a tenure track line. It was noted that gathering more data is always a good thing and that there was no real downside to encourage faculty to complete the survey. One objection was that this survey may be more an AAUP recruitment tool than fact finding endeavor.

   The vote was taken: 29 approved, 3 opposed, and 2 abstentions.
   **The motion carried.**

   b. Report on UAS website update with links to committee duties (Dr. Dan Meissner)

   Dr. Meissner announced that descriptions of each of the committees drawn from the faculty statues can now be accessed on University Academic Senate. Faculty, staff and students interested in serving on committees can access the site to learn more about the general issues and specific charges of various committees.

   c. Due to the number of business items the senate must consider this year, a meeting has been scheduled for December 13.

VII. Vice Chair’s Report—Dr. Marilyn Frenn
   a. **Motion:** Election bylaw changes to move up UAS elections

   Revised wording would be:
   “Subsection A of the bylaws would result in the election will be held in February. Number of vacancies is only one of the reasons for this proposal. A discussion ensued about if two nominations needed to be sought or if a candidate could run unopposed. In previous years
due to various circumstances the second place candidate was needed to be placed into service."

This motion addresses the serious problem of filling senate and committee vacancies. Earlier nominations and elections will allow for all committees to be fully staffed and ready to address charges by the beginning of the academic year. Dr. Frenn noted that two candidates for each position are needed in case of vacancies, where by-laws call for the candidate receiving the next highest number of votes to fill the position. If there are any additional concerns, please contact Dr. Marilynn Frenn.

The vote was taken: 35 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstention.

The motion carried

b. Announcement of the Faculty Council discussion on academic excellence
   Remind your colleagues to send in ideas. This is a great opportunity for all faculty to meet with a member of the Board of Trustees.

VIII. Other Business
   a. University Board of Undergraduate Studies
      Dr. Gary Meyer reported that an Entrepreneurship Minor for non-business students has been approved to be offered from the College of Business Administration. The committee approved it unanimously.

      Dr. Meyer indicated that there was some overlap with Social Entrepreneurship, but this minor is clearly distinct from Dr. Snell’s program.

      It was asked if this minor was available to business students. Business students are not able to minor in any of the program offered in the College of Business Administration.

      Modest enrollment numbers of between ten and fifteen student are projected for the first year. The course offering currently have room. Only one course would require new resources. The department would work to make growth in numbers work.

   b. Committee on Faculty Welfare – Prof. Judith Mullen/Mr. Matt Blessing

      Currently one-third of the full-time tenure track faculty is age 62 or older. It is the general consensus that many of these individuals would like to retire but currently cannot due to their need for health insurance through MU. Health care costs continue to increase and so will the Medicare age. All those within a group need to be given equal options per General Counsel.

      At this time three options seems possible:
      1. A straight tenure buy-out, similar to what is currently an option. This does not seem popular with many who would prefer installments for tax purposes.
      2. A phased contract over two or three years, where faculty would teach at least 50% of a normal course load, earning a reduced salary and maintaining the option to obtain
subsidized insurance benefits.
3. A phased contract over two to three years of less than 50% normal load that would not include university health care coverage.

Might it be possible to offer various options so that this group of faculty can individually choose what is best for each individual?

Fr. Rossi stated that the phased contract would be of great benefit in aiding departments when planning for future.

Dr. Pauly indicated that Mr. Doug Smith has already done some preliminary work on this issue and has shared his results with the deans. It is important to him and he feels that if the fact finding initiative was approved today that he would make it a priority to have something back to the group hopefully in Spring.

Retirement plans from other institutions have also been reviewed.

Dr. Thorn noted that the University of Kentucky model allowed faculty to teach half of their normal work load for two semesters of the year (which may include summer session). However, this model would create a legal problem for Marquette faculty, who must teach 50% or more each semester to qualify for health care benefits.

It was noted that the motion does not indicate who will initiate the fact-finding. The group deliberately left it opens as not to be limiting. The Provost indicated that he would assemble a special committee to gather the budget information needed to move it forward. Senate members encouraged the inclusion of faculty in this fact-finding group.

Dr. Bishop indicated that in Texas there was no possibility of buyout, phased retirement was the only way to do it. Chairs were given flexibility in scheduling these individual as to the length of the term with the maximum being three years. Most faculty after having a taste of retirement stayed teaching for only one year.

Tenure buyout is not in the budget the funding comes from the faculty line. The position line is left open for the year of the buyout.

**Motion:** to initiate an investigation into the feasibility of phased retirement
The vote was taken: 33 approved, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

**The motion carried.**

The Committee on Faculty Welfare was thanked for their hard work.

c. Committee on Academic Policies and Issues
Dr. Lea Acord reported on the CAPI investigation into the status of contingent faculty conducted last year. The report focused on three questions:
1) How fair are working conditions and salary for contingent faculty?
2) Can policy recommendations be made at the department or unit level?
3) What budget measures can CAPI recommend?

Due to the complexity involved in the hiring, use, designation and salaries of contingent faculty in the various departments and units, this task was particularly difficult for CAPI to discharge. The report brought before the senate for consideration focuses on four recommendations:

- Fully fund permanent teaching positions
- Tie budgets more closely to instructional needs
- Improve transparency in the budgeting process
- CAPI will revisit this situation within the next five years

Discussion centered on:

- the administration’s willingness to address the committee’s recommendations
- the need for more academic input in budget deliberations and allocations
- equating salaries with contingent faculty contributions
- introducing a tenure structure for long-term contingent faculty

Dr. Bishop noted that currently there is not a university standard on what a teaching load should be. It can even vary from department to department within an individual college as it currently does in Engineering.

Dr. Pauly commented that the university budget begins with a $2 million deficit for contingent faculty salaries that is covered by drawing from surpluses in other budgets. As the budget is currently designed, there is no possibility of “fully funding” contingent faculty positions, particularly in these tight financial times. The Provost Office, however, is committed to finding solutions to the questions and recommendations raised by this report.

The vote was taken: 24 approved, 0 opposed, and 7 abstentions

The motion carried.

IX. Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.