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I. The Chair observed a quorum and called the meeting to order at 3:01 pm.

II. Reflection was given by Mrs. Janice Welburn

III. Approval of August 31, 2020 meeting minutes
   o Motion to approve: Mrs. Janice Welburn
   o Second: Dr. Joshua Burns
   o Passed without objection

IV. Chair’s Report – Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay
   o From this meeting onward, we will be recording the virtual meetings. I have received a lot of requests from faculty who have teaching conflicts during this time.
   o We are in the final stages of planning the listening sessions; look for an email from me about these.
   o Last year in the fall we were discussing UPPs; they are housed as PDFs on Office of Finance website. These UPPs will now be moving to individual websites. This change will help with ADA accessibility and search capability but will potentially result in format conversions. There will be no content changes. The plan to migrate is mid to late
October.
  o The UAS website will be moving to another platform that will be better in terms of accessibility.
  o We will be soliciting nominations for positions related to campus planning. The planning process will be described by Doug Woods later in the meeting.

V. Vice Chair’s Report – Dr. Allison Abbott
  o Faculty Council met last Wednesday and discussed some budget issues and planning for faculty engagement. We got some great feedback and great ideas for engaging in the process. You will hear more about this later in the meeting from Doug Woods.

VI. Secretary’s Report – Ms. Rebecca Blemberg
  o The School of Dentistry re-elected Dr. Arndt Guentsch to Senate. We are working to fill the Library Senate representative vacancy that was previously filled by Heather James.

VII. Provost’s Report – Dr. Kimo Ah Yun, Provost
  o Campus updates for fall
    • Enrollment is a key driver of revenue (3/4) for the university. We now know we are 424 students short of our budget for this fiscal cycle; much of that will carry over for the next 3-4 years. We are 363 students down in our first-year class, 24 fewer transfer students, and a drop in 37 continuing students. This is one of the challenges we are facing with our budget issues.
    • The Schroeder quarantine is at 7 of 14 days. President Lovell and I visited with the students on Saturday. They were in great spirits and they were able to get outside. They were grateful to the faculty.
    • I have been working with Faculty Senate Executive Committee regarding budget challenges. We want to engage faculty throughout the process. Ian presented at the last UAS meeting and Joel will present today. Doug Woods will talk about faculty processes and how we are seeking input.
    • You also are welcome to join my bimonthly virtual coffee chats to learn more and ask questions.
  o Spring planning
    • With planning underway for the spring 2021 semester, Human Resources has shared key dates and actions for academic faculty, staff and student employees (this includes graduate teaching and research assistants) requesting COVID-19 temporary alternative work arrangements. The deadline for academic faculty and staff to submit requests for COVID-19 temporary alternative work arrangements for the spring semester is Sept. 25.
    • We are also considering whether or not Spring Break may need to be rethought.
  o Board of Trustees meeting
    • The Committee on Academic Excellence meets today (9/21) and Wednesday, 9/23. The full Board of Trustees meets Wednesday, 9/23. Topics include racial justice, US News and World Report college rankings, looking forward/planning ahead, academic response to the pandemic, fall 2020 enrollment, and updates on the College of Nursing and College of Business Administration.
  o U.S. News and World Report
    • Marquette is now at #88 (down from #84); we are tied with eight other schools.
    • Other rankings include: Best Value Schools – 52; A+ Schools for B Students (list only, no rank); Most Innovative Schools* – 42 (not ranked); Best Undergraduate Teaching* – 18; *Ranking based on peer assessment
  o Other updates:
    • The first of three virtual town hall events this semester will be held Sept 28, 3 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. Please save the date; details will be shared soon in Marquette Today. This semester’s town hall events will cover such topics as COVID-19, the university’s financial landscape and Marquette’s steps to address racial injustice, among others.
    • The next virtual Coffee Chat with the Provost will be held via Microsoft Teams on Tuesday, Sept. 29, from 3 p.m. to 4 p.m.
  o Discussion/Questions:
    • Q: Do you know what bumped us so high in the undergraduate education rankings? What changed?
      • A: Kimo – We do not know the specific metrics. It is based off of reputation; there is an annual survey that goes out to presidents and provosts. It is amongst this group that our reputation has improved.
    • Q: I was wondering if our reduction in class size affected that.
A: Kimo – I am not sure that is commonly known.

Q: I had a question around the projection that we will continue to be about 400 down for the next 3-4 years. It assumes that cohort of students just vanishes, right? Any chance that students this year who are not attending for obvious reasons would want to return for a more traditional college experience if things get better?

A: Kimo – That is always a possibility, and our enrollment team continues to work to generate as much interest as possible. We work with fairly sophisticated modeling around enrollment. We anticipate about a 250 smaller size class next year. Things could substantially change. We do know that roughly 363 will carry over. Could we beat our estimate? We would like that. But right now we think we will be short again. It is possible we will beat our estimate, and we are working on it.

Q: There was some discussion about possible mergers or reorganizations of colleges or schools. Are there any updates with that? Or any schedule for those decisions?

A: Kimo – We talk about the six different buckets we have for changing the shortfalls. One of these would be a change in administration structure in a variety of ways – reducing vice presidents, reducing deans, etc. This is always on the table as a possibility. This is one of the workstreams that Doug is going to talk about. How do we close the $45mil gap? Administrative structure is one opportunity.

Q: I was wondering with the announcement of changes in CDC guidelines last Friday if we will hear updates about how Marquette is going to handle this and if they will start testing asymptomatic people?

A: Kimo - There is an article out there that this was a rough draft put out by the CDC, and that was inappropriately uploaded. We are waiting for the dust to settle on that one.

Q: You said we are 250 smaller for next year’s class. Is that smaller than this year or smaller than pre-COVID expectations?

A: Kimo – Yes, it is smaller than pre-COVID and what we previously budgeted for. We have been around ~2000 class. Our enrollment folks are predicting based off a flat tuition and 2% increased discount rate, this will yield us a class of about 1770.

Q: If this year is 400+ short and is equal to a $450mil deficit, then what does that 230 equal?

A: Kimo – Typically our net revenue for tuition for each student is $23k and R&B is another $10-11k. The bigger part is that this stacks. If we have 360 now and stack another 230 next year, then for the next few years we will be down that many in students for tuition and R&B.

Comment from Senate Chair: if you have not joined the UAS Teams site, please send me an email and I will add you to that site. As we start the planning process, we will post updates in this Teams site.

VIII. Presentation on the MOCES Calendar and Instrument by Modality for Fall 2020 Semester – Ms. Alix Riley, Director of Institutional Research

OIRA is responsible for administering course evaluations on behalf of the university according to the course evaluation policy. While no changes have been made, changes to the academic calendar and how courses are being delivered may cause courses evaluations may feel different this semester. So as stewards of the course evaluation process, OIRA wants faculty to be aware of how these course evaluations are being administered in 2020 and how it may be different from previous semesters. The Office of the Provost sent out an email to all faculty a week ago about this; this was also posted in Marquette Today.

Three areas that we would like instructors to be aware of are: the course evaluation calendar, evaluation instrument, and updates to P&T report.

- The course evaluation calendar is tied to the academic calendar and it is available on the OIRA website mu.edu/oira/ceval. Course evaluations are administered during the last two weeks of classes based on the last date of class.
  - Normally course evaluations open on a Monday, but because the last day of class is a Tuesday, the course evaluation for session 1 opens on Wednesday, November 11 and closes on Tuesday, November 24. The results will be available to instructors on Wednesday, December 16 (day after final grades are due).
  - No different than previous semesters in that the evaluations are open for two weeks, but will open on a Wednesday rather than a Monday.

- Course evaluation instrument by modality: for close to 10 years now, the MOCES evaluation system has consisted of three instruments based on modality of instruction: 1) in-person instruction, 2) distance-learning, 3) blended classes.
  - All evaluation instruments include the four core items used in the P&T documentation. The instruction mode/delivery determines which instrument the class receives. These questions are
available on the OIRA website (see website above).

- Instructors who are teaching a blended or distance-learning class should review course evaluation instruments because they will likely be different from the past. Instructors should review CheckMarq or Class Search based on instruction mode. They can also ask their department chair or dean, or email courseval@mu.edu

- Updates to P&T: to facilitate future interpretation of results in P&T dossiers, additional information will be included in FAD (Faculty Activities Database) report:
  - Instruction mode/delivery of current and previous classes
  - Note indicating spring course evaluations suspended due to pandemic
  - Note indicating faculty may have taught fall 2020 classes in instruction mode different than previous semesters due to COVID-19 pandemic

Discussion/Questions:

- Q: Many of our faculty with students in quarantine now must teach both in-person and simultaneously through live-streaming. How will that get factored in? Students who are not in-person will experience the course differently.
  
  A: Alix – Yes, that is absolutely true. What we are recommending is that the evaluation instrument be based on a particular instruction mode, and we note that the class may have had distance-learning students. This will be our best strategy for ensuring all students evaluate the class. And if there is a small percentage that are online only, we will have a consistent set of questions for all of the students to answer.

- Q: So when you say that there is a consistent set of questions for all of the students to answer, do you mean that there are certain questions that apply to both modalities?
  
  A: Alix – No. We think for the classes where there are students who are taking an in-person class online, they should still answer the evaluation using the in-person questions, and we will note on the reports that there were students in a remote environment. If you look at the evaluation instrument, you will notice there are two open-ended questions where students can give context.

- Comment: I know that this has come up in other meetings, and it makes faculty anxious. It is putting faculty in a difficult position if the online students are evaluating them for something that may have been a last-minute arrangement. If we can put in a note that it is a mixed modality situation, that will help.

- Q: About a year ago or more, there was consideration to switch to a different course evaluation instrument. Is that discussion continuing or has that question been postponed?
  
  A: Alix – the Committee on Teaching was the committee discussing this potential new instrument, and they would probably have an answer about whether or not they are still considering it.

- Q: I have pulled up the document you have that compares the instruments across modalities, and I have some questions about the reasoning or logic behind the differentiating. I am teaching an online class. The in-person course evaluation says things like, “This class positively impacted my ability to communicate orally and in writing.” Then for the distance-learning says things like, “This class deepened my understanding of the subject matter.” The questions are structured very differently for in-person vs online, and the reasoning is unclear. The in-person has a question about an interesting teacher, but it is not included in the distance/blended instrument. This is just a little puzzling. I am all for removing that question given our long-standing established gender and racial biases in student evaluations. But maybe you could just speak a little bit about some of the reasoning behind the phrasing of this – what guided your decisions on this?
  
  A: Alix – OIRA did not design the evaluation instrument; we are just the stewards of it. We just ask the questions that the Committee on Teaching and the Provost’s Office have as part of the university’s course evaluation instrument. I can tell you that the questions for the distance/blended evaluation instrument was developed by a faculty committee led by Heidi Schweitzer out of CTL at that point in time. I was not part of their process for developing the questions, so I can’t speak to decision-making on the phrasing. However, if there are questions in future semesters that we would like to adjust, my office would be happy to collaborate with the Provost’s Office and the Senate on.

- Comment from Senate Chair: I was at the Committee on Teaching meeting when Alix presented this, and one of the comments from the students is that they would appreciate if faculty could have the students do the evaluations during class time. That is something for you could consider. Also, if you have additional comments or questions for Alix, please send them my way and I will get those to her.
IX. Presentation on Strategies regarding Endowment to Address Economic Impact of Budget Shortfalls – Mr. Joel Pogodzinski, Senior Vice President/Chief Operating Officer

- I will spend some time talking about the economic landscape and the various actions that the university is taking. It is important to take a step back and take a look at the different actions we’ve taken at different points in time for different reasons. This will lead nicely into the stage for the discussion about using the endowment.
- For this FY that we are a few months into, we had estimated risks between $20-25mil largely tied to the smaller freshman class (~1650). We embarked on a series of temporary actions: discretionary budget spending reductions, 403b suspension, suspended merit increase, leadership pay reductions for ELT and ULC.
- We had a very short window in which to implement those measures after COVID, from mid-March to July 1, and these actions were ones that we could put into place quickly. It allowed the university time to more strategically address longer-term challenges in a thoughtful way. This year, even though we have taken these actions, we are looking at a potentially larger gap than originally anticipated for FY21. We have to further de-density residence halls to gain Milwaukee Health Department and Board of Directors approval.
- We are estimating the risk in FY22 will be in the range of $45mil+ due to a second smaller enrollment cohort. We are modeling in the range of 1770-1800 students, but we have a long way to go in the admissions cycle. The gap will be greater as we look ahead to the later years (FY23 and FY24) with likely lower cohorts.
- The temporary actions we took this year are not sustainable for the long-term (i.e. 403B suspension). We are looking for more permanent actions to address the gap. This prompted the creation of the workstreams in Academic Affairs and across the university. We will be refocusing on the strengths of the university and eliminating non-core and under-utilized resources and programs.
- It is important to understand this concept as we move through the process. We have to reduce our costs because it is our responsibility not to outspend the revenues that we generate. Three-quarters of our revenue comes from tuition and R&B; so when the revenues drop from lower cohorts, we need to right-size our spending. Debt/cash reserves/endowment are not long-term solutions. They could plug a short-term gap, but these gaps are we are talking about not short-term.
- Lower revenue is a new normal for us, and next year there will be a second class of this. We do expect lower enrollments to continue. The demographic cliff follows the impact from the pandemic. The pandemic has just accelerated the same actions we were contemplating for the demographic cliff. Once we get four cohorts in, we will be very close to that demographic cliff. This is not a one-year event or a two-year event where you can pick a pool of resources in a point in time to bridge a short-term gap. We are looking for permanent, strategic, long-term actions. The workstreams will help us look for permanent and repeatable actions that reflect a cost-structure of our new normal.
- There is still a potential for large, short-term, unrecoverable events. This is still a possibility for us in FY21. If we find ourselves in a position of community spread and shift to a remote campus, and/or not have a basketball season, we could have a significant short-term large-scale event with tens of millions of dollars of impact. In the event that we find ourselves with another $11mil loss of R&B, we could and likely would use cash reserves and debt to partially mitigate a short-term, large scale crisis situation. This past spring, we did issue new corporate bonds (debt) to ensure the university has a sustained and improved liquidity situation. This means that institutions invested $150mil into Marquette that they would be paid back on over time. We have shored up our liquidity, and it is possible if we find ourselves in a large-scale, short-term event that we could use cash reserves to bridge a short-term problem. But we are mostly dealing with longer-term structural changes. So we go through cost-reduction actions and our strategic alignment, the potential for short-term cash usage, and endowment would be a last option for us after all of those other pieces. At this point we are not anticipating using the endowment for short-term or long-term actions.
- Some people have pointed to the disclosure on our financial statement that we have $102mil of endowed funds that can be liquidated in a year. The primary purpose of that disclosure is really for our investors. When we issued debt this past spring, we asked investors to invest $150mil into Marquette. They want to know what our assets look like, what our endowment looks like, and what our liquidity situation is. So we share that our endowment has funds that technically are able to be liquidated; and in the event of a worst-case scenario, there is additional liquidity available to them so they can ultimately be repaid. All or most of the endowed funds have restrictions and cannot be immediately spent.
- More importantly, we do not want to overspend our available resources. We want to right-size our organization to align our spending to the revenue available to us. This is not unlike our personal budgeting situations.
- The endowment does not accumulate. We generate spendable off of that endowment every year (~$30mil/year) and we rely on that to balance our budget every year. Taking money from our endowment also lowers our ability to pay for ongoing programming. Additionally, when we look at all of the available resources to us, we want to right-size the funds we are able to spend. The university has about $350mil in debt and cash available to us in our
operating reserves. It may be cheaper for us to use cash reserves from our debt issuances in some cases rather than the lost endowment returns.

- There is a set of national guidelines called UPMIFA that we follow. One of the core components is generational equity. All cohorts should benefit in an equitable manner from the use of our endowment; this drives our endowment investing strategy and our endowment spendable strategy. We should not further disadvantage other cohorts in the future.

- The impact of the use of the endowment would be significant. For example, if we had anecdotally used $50mil 10 years ago, we would have a $575mil endowment vs a $700mil today. It would also impact our annual spendable funds, and more importantly it would only solve a one-year gap.

- Discussion/Questions:
  - Q: I have questions about the assumptions guiding your models. You presented us with revenue estimates for FY20-22, but the claim that is being made is that these are long-term revenue trends. If there is a long-term trend, what is the data for FY23-24, and how sensitive are the point estimates and to what variables are they sensitive? Given the scale of these revenue estimates, I would like to know the assumptions upon which they are being based. A lot of this would seem to come down to whether or not we are seeing this as a one-time exogenous shock or a multi-year structural, secular shift. There seem to be a lot of assumptions underlying decisions about endowment use.
    - A: Joel: We know a couple of things. We know this class is 1650 and we are doing long-term strategic planning and annual planning. Long-term planning has not always been done. The further you go out, the greater degree of risk you have in those numbers coming to fruition, but we have to do them. A lot of the planning done for enrollment is being done in the academic planning group. They are looking at modeling trends and programs across the country. We are looking at enrollment models in the 1770-1800 range with only slight increases in the next couple of years (FY23-24). It is not too much after that time that the demographic cliff, about which we have very clear data, occurs. This dropoff will happen more heavily in the Midwest than other areas. We think we have a different cliff in front of us in the meantime. This certainly has been true this year, and we think it is going to be true next year. We do know the first two years we have a certain degree of certainty, and when we get to the demographic cliff, we have a certain degree of certainty. The couple of years in-between, we think we have some models that have been forecasted pretty well with lower levels. So it behooves us not to pretend this is just a one-year event.
  - Q: Following up on the previous question, we know that in modeling you use the best data that you can, but there is so much we don’t know about what other universities are going to do. There might be fewer students, but there also might be fewer colleges and universities. So there do seem to be a lot of unknowns. My question is if we are planning for a smaller Marquette with lower enrollment, how committed are we to that lower enrollment? If some of these models aren’t right, will we shrink and then possibly not be prepared if we should grow again?
    - A: Kimo: In the immediate future, what the data is showing is that we need to be a smaller Marquette. We need to look at opportunities to engage in growth opportunities and model that out. The challenge has become that we have built our budget around the assumption that we can get ~2000 students each year, and now we are not able to hit that and pay all of our expenses. If we can exceed it, we can cautiously decide how to grow. In the immediate future we will likely be a smaller Marquette, and we will need to right-size our faculty and staff around that. We have a downward trend even if enrollment grows after these first two years. We are replacing classes from four years ago, and our biggest class of students are juniors this year and will be coming off (~2150); so even if we drop to 2000, we will still drop below. This is going to be a challenge. We grew in those banner years and assumed we would continue to grow, and this does not seem to be sustainable.
  - Q: On January 29, President Lovell formally announced the plans for the new business school. I am assuming that project is no longer in the works. I am assuming that if we are in the situation where hundreds of faculty and staff eliminations are on the horizon, surely Marquette is providing for and protecting those faculty before they build and expand and create new facilities. Am I correct that is the case?
    - A: Joel: Our annual operating structure, our revenues and expenses are different than cash that we use for investing in the future. The capital and operating fund structure is slightly different. More importantly, the College of Business project has been in the works for quite a while. One of the major differences in this investment versus other investments is the level of philanthropy that is being developed for this project. We are being very mindful of the fact that we need to choose our investments very wisely. We have never said that we are not going to invest. We have also not said...
that we are not going to hire for strategic positions if we absolutely need to. We have a unique opportunity relative the College of Business with a significant level of philanthropy relative to this project. The Board has been very specific with us too that we should not be moving cash toward projects that don’t have a return or don’t satisfy the core mission or core strategy of Marquette. In this case, the College of Business is both – part of the core and we happen to have a large amount of donor interest. The Board has said we need to have these projects fully funded, and for this project, it is true. We are going to make sure that the building will be in line with the philanthropic contributions we have for it - in size, programming, outcome, etc. The university will not be investing a significant amount of money from cash reserves into this.

- A: Kimo – I would add that the monies given for this project is designated for that project alone. We cannot pay salaries or build a different building with it. When the gifts are made, it is for that specific building.

- Q: I want to pick up on something you kept repeating; it is a larger point to the administration. This is the use of the term demographic cliff, which comes out of Grawe’s book that the administrators read last summer. It speaks about this impending demographic shift happening, specifically in the Midwest. I was hoping to be more honest about the language we are using since we are all academics and ask our students to do this in our classrooms, and that is to be clear about the demographic cliff that we are talking about. This cliff is about having fewer White upper-middle class students that Marquette has traditionally gone after for our first-year classes. To me, this seems to run counterintuitive to the commitments that they university has already made in its Beyond Boundaries plans, as well as its commitments to its Students of Color, whether that’s our HSI initiative, and Black students and Black Student Council. Upper administration talked about expanding outreach and retention and opportunities for Black and Brown students at our university. I think what we are doing when we use this “demographic cliff” term is using this term to show demographic challenge that is coming from Marquette when in reality we should be talking about demographic opportunities and the ways in Marquette is going to do better to reach more students. Maybe we could use the terms demographic shifts or changes instead?

- Comment from Senate Chair: Those are good points. We will have more opportunities to offer some constructive ideas that might help. That is coming up in the next presentation today.

- Comment: I wanted to highlight a question from the chat to address the important and constructive points that Sergio made about demographics. Maybe we could reflect on them? I am wondering if maybe Kimo or Joel wanted to address this.

  - A: Kimo – address in what way?
  - Comment – it seems like there are racist assumptions about who belongs at Marquette. Many students are challenging this along with faculty and staff. I know at the university we are having really robust discussions for the first time in the decade that I have been here. To Sergio’s point about how we are understanding the enrollment challenges and what Marquette could actually do in this moment to position itself as an institution that can thrive. Sergio used the word opportunity. The history of Catholic education is to provide a pathway into the middle class, especially for newly arriving immigrants and their children. There are a lot of variables and uncertainty. Given this body as a deliberative one, I would like to hear from our leaders about how you see this. What Sergio has raised has been a point of conversation for students, staff and faculty. I would like to hear more vetting about how we are thinking about enrollment challenges and what Marquette might do to position itself to grow and thrive instead of shrinking.

  - A: Kimo – we do not want to build a university on the hope that students will come. We have two challenges. We have an immediate challenge of our enrollment which has dipped and which we anticipate will stay down for another year. What are the opportunities? I am always looking for people to bring me opportunities to look at how we grow Marquette. With respect to what you would call the demographic shift, we know there is a reduction in the total number of students who will be going to college. This is a fact because fewer babies were born. You can draw a circle within a 200-mile radius around Milwaukee, and this is where the majority of our students come from. These are just the facts we know. We tend to be a regional institution. Do we want to expand? Absolutely. Our enrollment people are always looking for ways to expand outside of our region. Every other institution is facing this. We are just trying to be realistic about where we are heading, and obviously take advantage of any opportunity we see. We encourage you to begin to model out what is the specific opportunity that you are talking about and where are these students coming from, and what is it that they want to study? If we could come up with a revenue model, then absolutely. That’s what our enrollment team is looking at on an ongoing basis. We made a commitment to increase diversity. We remain committed, but we
know that we need to put together a model. When we get to whatever our student demographic looks like, whatever those total dollars are that we are able to collect from the students, we build a university budget that can be sustained based off of that revenue that comes in.

- **Comment: Doug Woods – I have spent a lot of time over the last year thinking about the Grawe book and working with it. Sergio, you are right. It is better to call it a demographic shift than a cliff, but from a budget stand-point with the way we are built right now and the way we have been built historically, it is a cliff. It doesn’t have to be, but we need to right-size ourselves in what we do (types of faculty and programs and support staff we have) in order to address this. Grawe states pretty clearly that if we can increase the likelihood that students of color come to a university like Marquette, that demographic cliff almost goes away. We will look very different and we will need different things to do that. This is part of the planning process. We need a long-term vision for this. Even if we start today, it will not fix the problem for the next three years. These classes are already small and they will be small for four years. We will have another small class next year to budget for, and there might even be another one the next year. The Grawe data would project a slight increase in enrollment in FY24-26 for incoming, but still lower overall for the university because of the previous years of lower enrollment. When the real demographic cliff hits in FY26, we will have done some things in the long-term to start negating the cliff and turn it more into a shift. You are absolutely right. We can do this in earnest right now, but it will not make a difference in the next three years. It won’t.

- **Q: We keep using the word opportunities and casualties. As a faculty member ready to go up for tenure, I am just curious, what is administration thinking in terms of down-sizing, becoming a smaller university and the opportunity to do so, as well as the potential casualties?**
  - A: Kimo – that leads into what Doug is going to talk about. Doug has been talking about what the process is to be able to think about how we address our short-term issues and how we put Marquette in a position for long-term growth as well.

- **Comment from Senate Chair: Based on what we have been hearing at the Executive Committee, things will get a little bit clearer in the coming weeks, and we will make sure everyone has information about this.

- **Q: Before we move to process, one of the things being mentioned is how are we thinking about reductions in force? Kimo are you thinking about attritions, retirements?**
  - A: Kimo – we do not have the opportunity to wait to have all of this addressed by attrition. If you think about the $45mil gap, that is about 450 people with salaries and benefits. We do not get turnover like that within a year or even three. There are other levers we can pull in the short-term. We can use operations and discretionary funds. The second thing goes back to the question earlier about opportunities and programs. I hear this in my coffee chats about targeting specific groups. I always ask to bring specific ideas to me and we can model it out. We need to know how it fits in the budget. There is no idea that we don’t run through the process to see if it is something that can help the university. We want to hear any ideas that will help the university.

- **Comment from the Senate Chair: thank you to Joel for joining us; we will probably invite you again if we have further questions. I will forward any unanswered chat questions on to be answered. We need to move onto the next agenda item.**

---

**X. Presentation on Plan for Faculty Engagement in the Academic Planning Process – Dr. Doug Woods, Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Studies and Dean of the Graduate School (See PPT)**

- When we think about this $45mil hole, not all of that is coming out of the academic affairs side; this is a campus deficit. We are one of the workstreams on campus. We have a steering committee (made up of two deans, VP for Research, a finance person, Fr. Voiss, Kimo, and Alix Riley from OIRA) has been meeting 1-2 times per week since April to think about long-term visioning as the university would start to face the demographic challenges. As April turned into May and May turned into the June 1 enrollment deadline, we started to pivot to think about short-term budget deficits. We have been meeting weekly with deans and vice provosts since May to address this. The deans and vice provosts have been thinking about three things: long-term vision for academic affairs, dealing with immediate budget situation (FY21-24), and planning for campus input and action.

- Work on long-term visioning: We started this by clarifying undergraduate enrollment targets. We looked at this with John Baworowsky’s data as well as the Grawe data, listened to the colleges, and used OIRA data too. We also talked about our status as a Research University. The deans thought we should consider being a focused R2 university. Data tools were created to facilitate decision-making. OIRA helped with this to look at likely job placement in future as well as historical enrollment trends. We also spent some time talking about envisioning
long-term priorities for undergraduate student body (long-term is FY26-32). The first priority was to diversify the student body, and this was supported by recommendations in the Grawe book too. We want to maintain our high academic quality as well as provide greater access to a Marquette education. We need to think about how we understand our value: the integration of Jesuit values/education into career readiness. Finally, we need to create and grow a more personalized, high-touch experience for the students. These were our guiding thoughts.

- Work on immediate budget cuts: We clarified the Academic Affairs target (it is not completely set yet); we make up about 66% of the expenses, so we would need to cut about $30mil. We also needed to have budget transparency across colleges, so data tools were created. We also thought about prioritized budget mitigation strategies; nothing has been decided, but these are all levers: workload adjustments (increased teaching load, targeted larger class sizes, etc.). We also think there is potential savings through the consolidation of colleges, elimination of administrators, and consolidation of staff functions and departments. There is also possible savings through program consolidation and/or closure of programs that have low enrollment, are revenue negative, or are not mission-critical to Marquette, etc. We also know that we can change the faculty workforce balance (TT vs. NTT. vs adjuncts). We can also do various discretionary cuts (eliminating consultants, reducing travel and food at events, tightening sabbaticals, etc.).

- Campus input and moving toward action: We developed a process between deans and UAS Executive Committee who provided feedback (we accepted all recommendations); this will be the final proposal going forward. We are trying to manage short-term budget reductions on the Academic Affairs side. We also have to consider that short-term plans could have long-term impacts; therefore, we need to do these in parallel. We need to tie-in this in with Beyond Boundaries.

- There will be multiple work teams that will address the short-term budget reductions along with the long-term planning process. One work group will be the Teaching Workgroup led by someone from the Provost’s Office and a representative from Academic Senate and populated by Committee on Teaching; they will focus on teaching loads, class sizes, etc. The Program Review Workgroup will be co-chaired by a member of the Provost’s Office and a faculty representative from UAS; it will be populated by members of the UBUS and UBGs with guaranteed representation across all colleges. The Program Review Workgroup will have two purposes: to look at programs put forth by colleges to investigate whether or not they should be continued. These are programs with low enrollment, declining interest, likely revenue loss, or clear or potential duplication across colleges, etc. They will be given a list of programs to look for budget reductions and make recommendations. It will also look at what structure to use for the evaluation and viability of the program review going forward. The College, Administrative Structure, Shared Services Workgroup will be looking at reducing the number of colleges, altering the makeup of the colleges, looking at the Provost’s Office and the structure of the administration, and looking at shared services across department and administrative activities. This will be co-chaired by member of the Provost’s Office and a faculty representative from UAS, and it will be populated by faculty recommended from each of the colleges by UAS. The final short-term group will be the Discretionary & Other Expense Reduction Workgroup which will look at expenses that don’t fall into any of the first three buckets. It will be co-chaired by a member of the Provost’s Office and a representative from UAS, a faculty administrator, and a representative from each college. There will be two additional long-term planning workgroups: a Research Workgroup (co-chaired by Jeanne Hossenlopp and someone from UAS and populated by the Committee on Research), and a Student Body Workgroup co-chaired by co-chaired by a member of the Provost’s Office and a representative from UAS as well as a broad representation from campus. Each work group will have faculty representation and will present to faculty, soliciting further feedback to bring back to the workgroup.

- Discussion/Questions
  - Comment from Senate Chair: Later today I will be sending out an email to all of the senators. I will be soliciting nominations for each of these positions. You can nominate yourself and others; we need your participation in this process.
  - Q: I am a little bit shocked right now, so I appreciate this presentation. I want to make the point that in your presentation you said that the university has never been on track to be an R1. But I want to note that this is not how faculty have been recruited in the past five years, so the chat is full of comments from the faculty who were told something else. This is an uneven message, even a pivot. My second point about being a research institution: because of our push to produce more research, the grant revenues have been going up. What happens when we reprioritize the balance or the mission of why the faculty are here, and how will that impact how much grant funding comes in? We are not talking about a proportional cut based on the 60%. We carry the labor; we are what makes the university a university, so if you could talk about that. I am heartened to know the
deans are concerned about diversity, and I’d like to know how we can retain minorities during a potential lay-off?

- A: Kimo – if you look at the faculty handbook (largely driven by faculty senate) there are procedures around how we reduce faculty. That would be something, should faculty senate decide to change that policy, I am more than happy to consider what that change would look like. That is a faculty-driven enterprise; that is not what I do or what Doug does. We are going to follow the faculty handbook. Should this body want to change that, I am all ears.

- A: Doug – this is why we were talking about how important it is to not do short-term reductions in absence of thinking about long-term plans. We are thinking about programs and part of what might go into those programs is how much this can help us attract students of color five years from now. Even though it is a program with low enrollment now, it might be the wrong one to close because it is actually going to help us in the long-term. We need to pay attention to these things and keep our eye on the long-term without neglecting the short-term budget holes. With respect to R1, we will need to get Jeanne Hossenlopp on here. She said our goal has never been to be an R1; so I am not sure what individual faculty were told, but that came from the research area. The effect on grants, it depends on how the structure works. We can potentially grow grants in areas in which we focus. We can keep them high and grow them across disciplines. That does not mean the non-grant-funded research is not important.

- Comment from Senate Chair: I agree with Doug that we do not want to make decisions about short-term without thinking about the long-term ramifications; this is why we have the same members in both workgroups.

- Q: Budgets are moral documents and processes with which we create budgets are moral. I would like to suggest morals that we put into these documents. One of them should be that no one gets fired; this is an important value that lots of people have expressed today, especially in regards to the endowment conversation. The racial equity lens should also be applied to this project as a priority.

  - A: Doug – with respect to racial equity, this falls under the student body workgroup, but obviously that is not broad enough. The idea is to think about where we will be, including faculty and staff in an inclusive environment. This thought will be included across the themes; the heads of each of the workgroups will be meeting regularly to talk about each other about their work and inform each other’s work. We are hoping that there will be some consistency and ideas of influence.

- Q: I feel like as I am listening to the conversation today and seeing your presentation about the short-term budget reductions along with the long-term planning process, I am having a disconnect between that process and being told that 450 people are being laid off or fired. I don’t see a process in place for discussing how that happens. We would like to probably fire no one. Has this decision been made that 450 people are going to be laid off? Where was the transparency in that decision-making?

  - A: Kimo – I was trying to use the 450 to reflect the size and scope of this. The reductions will not all be people. The challenge is that 2/3 of our university expenses are people. If we are going to try to save everyone, then we need to essentially eliminate everything else that does not involve people. That would be very difficult; I do not see a pathway for that. That is what we have the work groups who can begin to dig in and present opportunities.

  - A: Doug – there is no way to get at this without some reduction in personnel. I have been trying to wrap my head around this since the end of April. You could entirely close a couple of colleges and it wouldn’t necessarily fix this problem. You could eliminate every discretionary dollar we spend in Academic Affairs, and it wouldn’t eliminate this. You could close Athletics, and it would not eliminate this. You could close Advancement and it wouldn’t eliminate this. It is going to be an all-strategies kind of approach; there is not going to be just one thing that can fix this. My guess is that nothing is really off the table. In terms of the short-term budget reductions, how does that turn into personnel? For example, if the Teaching Workgroup comes back and says TT faculty have to teach more, and everyone has to go to a 3:3 load across campus at TT, there would be more classes taught by TT and less by other faculty, so we would need fewer faculty who were not TT. That is one example. Or maybe the committee says we need small classes in the fall and large lectures in the spring? This will allow us to teach fewer classes, and we will realize savings this way. The Program Review Workgroup could identify five programs that can be consolidated or closed; these would need to be taught out, but by the end of the next three years, we will be able to eliminate 15 positions from those five programs.

  - A: Kimo – I know that there are questions about whether assistant professors need to be worried about being fired. There will be people who will want to retire or others who will want to leave Marquette based on the changes at the university. We always have a small number of people who leave. We likely would not refill those positions unless absolutely mandatory because no one was teaching in that area.
This is what the work groups will talk about.

- Comment from Senate Chair: please email me with any further questions. We will host a listening session soon, and that will provide another opportunity to ask questions. I will also be sending an email to solicit nominations because UAS Executive Committee will be making decisions soon.
  - A: Kimo – please come to my virtual coffee chat.

XIII. Adjourned at 5:03pm
  - Motion to adjourn: Marilyn Frenn
  - Second: Tim Melchert
  - Passed without objection

Respectfully submitted,
Ms. Rebecca Blemberg
UAS Secretary

The next meeting will be Monday, October 19, 2020 at 3:00 p.m. in Teams.