MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY
University Academic Senate Minutes
January 22, 2018
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.
AMU, Ballroom CD

Members in Attendance: Ms. Iman Ajaz, Dr. Julia Azari, Mr. Bruce Boyden, Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay, Dr. Joseph Domblesky, Dr. Kim Factor, Dr. Marilyn Frenn, Mr. Kurt Gering, Dr. Arndt Guentsch, Dr. Todd Hernandez, Dr. Brian Hodgson, Dr. Rick Holz, Dr. Kristof Kipp, Mr. Patrick Loftis, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Tim Melchert, Dr. Dan Myers, Dr. Michelle Mynlieff, Dr. Therese Novotny, Dr. David Papke, Dr. Anne Pasero, Dr. James Richie, Dr. John Su, Dr. Doris Walker-Dalhouse, Dr. Jennica Webster, Mrs. Janice Welburn, Ms. Mary Jo Wiemiller, Dr. Susan Wood, Dr. Doug Woods, Dr. Wanda Zemler-Cizewski

Members Excused: Dr. Abir Bekhet, Dr. Ana Garner, Dr. Paul Nolette, Dr. Brian Till, Ms. Jean Zanoni

Members not in attendance: Ms. Melissa Meyler-Warlow, Mr. Benjamin Vazirani

Guests: Dr. Allison Abbott, Ms. Valerie Beech, Mr. Brian Dorrington, Dale Kaser, Dr. Cecilia Landin, Ms. Lora Strigens, Ms. Toni Uhrich.

I. Call to Order by Dr. Cheryl Maranto at 3:04 pm.

II. Reflection was given by Dr. Michelle Mynlieff.

III. Approval of December 11, 2017 minutes

- Motion to approve: Dr. Tim Melchert
- Second: Dr. Jim Ritchie
- Vote: Passed by unanimous voice vote

IV. Chair’s Report – Dr. Cheryl Maranto

- Call attention to discussion of faculty service; how it is/isn’t rewarded, allocated, can we do it better.
- Recent editorials in Wall Street Journal and Washington Post re: McAdams case. Exec Committee considering whether there should be an appropriate response from our faculty.

V. Vice Chair Report – Dr. Michelle Mynlieff

- Faculty Council update
  - Tasked with the 4-year review of statutes, review of titles and leadership structure within Senate and Faculty Council, and Scheduling of Faculty Forum
    - Have looked at historical perspective of statutes; have collected information from peer institutions
    - Names/terms of office for executive committee will be done as part of statute review
    - Faculty Forum will be April 11, 3 to 4:30, in Weasler Auditorium with Dr. Kati Berg moderating; will include the opportunity to submit questions.

VI. Secretary’s Report – Mrs. Mary Jo Wiemiller

- Election Update
  - List of open Senate positions will soon be distributed. There are 3 at-large and 2 positions on Faculty Hearing Committee for full-time, tenure-track faculty.
  - Dr. Paul Nolette has a teaching conflict in the spring; someone will be appointed to fill his seat this semester.

VII. Provost’s Report – Dr. Dan Myers, Provost

- Enrollment Update
  - Undergraduate: Still early in the process considering that at least 55% of the class comes in between April 15 and May 1. Leading indicators remain excellent. Model suggested if we admit 12,000 students, we would make class and meet budget, etc. Have admitted more than that; are up 12 to 13% compared to last year. About 250 deposits to date, which seems to be tracking appropriately.
  - Graduate: Doug Woods shared that Grad School and GSM are up across the board for spring 2018; for fall 2018, increase in apps, admitted and deposited students.
    - Did Grad School also send out earlier than normal?
      - Was a decision to increase the class size for the ORBIS nursing program in Pleasant Prairie.
VIII. University Board of Graduate Studies – Dr. Allison Abbott, Chair

Informed on Decisions:

1) MS in Applied Economics – Terminate specialization in International Economics
2) Executive MBA (EXBU-MBA)
   a. Terminate specialization in Economics
   b. Terminate specialization in Finance
   c. Terminate specialization in Human Resources
   d. Terminate specialization in Marketing
   e. Terminate specialization in Management Information Systems
   f. Terminate specialization in Total Quality Management

This action is just general bookkeeping relative to specializations no longer being used.

IX. Master Planning Update – Ms. Lora Strigens, Vice President for Planning and Strategy

Have made good strides on Master Plan. Many dominoes to move around behind the scenes; some are gradual changes necessary. Project management staff within FP&M (4 positions) are touching about 200 projects at any one time. Updates on current projects were provided:

- 707 Hub: opened in last year. Directly related to innovation planning, etc. Has been a great success; came from strategic innovation fund and was driven by 2 students.
- Wild Commons: great progress being made, on schedule and on budget. Students in fall 2018 will be a mix of freshmen and sophomores. Trying to keep a pricing balance between new and existing structures.
- Infrastructure projects: apologies for any disruption, but very convenient to bundle these with other projects.
- The Marq: will be Marquette’s possession in Fall 2018; coordinating all the various pieces around bringing these 612 beds into Marquette’s inventory. Facility responsibilities will be taken on by Harrison Street Partners; interior programming will be handled by Marquette Residence Life.
- APRC Phase 1 Project: pivoted project to site at 12th and Wells. Many reasons, but once it was determined that fieldhouse was not terribly important because of the dome, became clear that we should make changes to the original plan. Michigan Street site is valuable to us and therefore important to use it in the most strategic manner possible. Decision on 12th & Wells considered that these programs should be close to the center of our campus. Research space will be about 7,000 to 8,000 square feet. Will also house strength and conditioning facility to serve all athletes and will relieve some of the pressures on the strength and conditioning center in the Al. Lacrosse and golf sports teams will have locker room space, etc. (these sports were of interest to a major donor who is providing some funding). Should be ground-breaking within the next month. Construction will move very quickly. Remainder (Phase 2) of APRC will reach out into the current green space on the corner of 13th & Wells.
  - Is this still in partnership with Aurora?
    ▪ Yes; continue to have good discussions with Aurora.
  - Was there ever any discussion to close 12th from Wisconsin to Wells?
    ▪ Yes, but it was not very serious.
  - Will there be anything built in for student safety regarding traffic?
    ▪ Currently working with Office of Public Affairs, a student group, and Facilities Planning and Management regarding increasing safety of Wells Street. Are also looking at testing some traffic control measures on 16th and 12th. Are considering some long-term efforts to make 16th and 17th two-way. Are also working with educating the campus, especially with student athletes leaving the Al.
- Parking: When APRC Phase 1 completed, part of existing Lot F will be re-installed. The recently demolished space on the corner of 12th and Wells will become short-term surface parking.
What’s next:
- Marian Grotto: will be located just behind Joan of Arc Chapel. Hope to have in place by May – month of Mary – so that we can dedicate the space. This will help kick-start renovation of several sacred spaces on campus.
- Physician Assistant Studies: Working on a new location for this program as they have outgrown 1700 W Wells building. Are looking for a new facility that will house PA program.
- Clinical Facility: Working on a facility at 6th and Michigan (the old Herzing building).
- Innovation Alley: Pictures and renderings that have been seen were prepared for master planning. Will bring engineering and business together into one facility to make the most opportunities for collaboration, etc. Scale and scope of project will be considered as part of the planning, etc. Have presented ideas to Board; they are supportive of the plans.
- Health and Wellness: seeking an integrative approach to this facility. Working with a consultant to initiate a campus-wide information gathering process as part of the overall planning. Demands continue to increase in this area.
- Demands continue for parking, space, and infrastructure improvements. Master plan process is seeking to balance plans on those needs and addressing the highest priorities.

Questions/Discussion:
- Is BioDiscovery still on the table?
  - Lora Strigens: Is the next project in the queue. In terms of academic space need, this is a high priority. Are proposing some efforts with animal facility upgrades in the next year’s capital budget.
  - Dan Myers: Funding is paramount to making this happen as we don’t have the money laying around for any of them. Have received money for the next steps in the planning process for Innovation Alley and Health & Wellness, so they continue to move forward into the next phase of planning.
- What clinical programs are being discussed for the space at 6th and Michigan?
  - Doug Woods: Master’s in technology and applied behavior analysis have been approved. Space for clinical labs, etc. is needed. Current autism research needs space. Those are the types of clinics that are being considered.
- Do any of these spaces include large spaces that would be available to broader use by the campus community?
  - Lora Strigens: One of the ideas for Innovation Alley would include meeting space, etc. However, we need to look at space needs campus-wide. We also need to carefully look at management of all spaces across campus.
- What happens to McCormick, and when, etc.?
  - Lora Strigens: Are assessing when the best time is for demolition. In an ideal state, we would want to capitalize the demolition costs along with the building costs. Are considering when the best time is to take it down. Not needed for residential capacity; will consider ways to use parts of it while making that final timing decision.

X. Topic for Discussion – Faculty Service
- Open discussion regarding faculty service – how it is valued, or not, and a perceived lack of balance in terms of who does service and who does not.
- Questions/Discussion
  - There is a national problem with women disproportionately doing service. Believes this is also true at Marquette, especially in some departments/colleges. Can be addressed either by equalizing how we do service or determining how we reward it.
  - Some get by with little to nothing; others get very bogged down.
  - Retirements have pushed the service burden as well. There is a big problem when replacing a retiring full professor with a new assistant professor. Tendency is to protect the assistant until they make associate, and then just throw everything at them. This is a dilemma because they are told not to worry about service while an assistant, and then suddenly upon receiving tenure, they are told to “do service, do service.” As part of faculty formation, we try to protect new people, but are not forming them into the culture of service.
  - How does one measure “quality” of service? Two people have committee membership on a vita, and how do you know whether they are the person that shows up at every meeting or the one that shows up at none of the meetings?
  - What is the appropriate way to reward service, particularly in terms of the promotion process? Need to have a discussion around service, especially as related to promotion and tenure. If we are serious about service, then we should require it.
Need to increase expectation of full professors and senior faculty; they should step up and chair major committees. Those who choose not to do anything are “rewarded” by having more time available for research, etc.

The gender balance of full professors in College of Education is probably 50/50, but overall faculty service is being done more by females. Education expectation and load is higher than in many colleges because there are only 18 faculty meaning fewer faculty must meet the college allotments for representation, etc.

Are always people in departments who do the most and from whom one gets the most bang for the buck. They are the ones that always get asked to serve on committees. There are also people that none of us would want in charge of a committee if we wanted to get something done. Can’t lose sight of that. We should consider some way to respect the people that DO the service.

Others commented that rather than letting people do nothing because they are not active committee members, there should be a way to provide some professional development for them to learn how to become good committee members. There are ways to find service that interests a person rather than just saying “we don’t want that person on our committee.”

One conundrum is how to produce a promotion process, especially for associate to full, that recognizes and measures service. How do we fix that? Those who are writing letters for a promotion dossier need to properly and thoroughly discuss the service performed by a faculty member.

Would the university consider different promotion tracks, i.e. a research track or a teaching track? The idea of a 40/40/20 split is not explicitly stated in our faculty handbook. As a group, would have to decide to implement that split, then have someone say they were going to go to an 80/20 research or teaching to consider different tracks.

In the past, have suggested a Management by Objective approach with faculty/department chair and then approved by a dean so that a faculty member would be committed to whichever track they chose. Should always be some teaching, research, and service for everyone.

Seems to be a perception problem regarding the status of service. Service in the community can be incredibly important and should be considered as well. How do you balance service to department, university, and in the community?

Might it be worthy of a task force with representation from all colleges to look at this? There is a gender issue, there is a rank issue, there is a department issue? Where are we at Marquette? Is there some mechanism to resolve this?

At least one college does not seem to have an issue with some of these points; perhaps that college could share their best practices as their contribution to the task force rather than providing representation?

Could there be flexibility for different faculty after tenure with different weightings for research, teaching and service? What do other places do? This discussion is not unique to Marquette and learning how others address might be helpful.

Any task force or discussion should include representation from clinical faculty as well. Even though it doesn’t affect tenure, it does affect teaching load, work load, etc. Clinical faculty have a lot of service requirements because of their minimal research.

Dr. Myers added that when he started chairing a department, it was noted that the full professors were shirking service. Made a rule that faculty had to be rated as “acceptable” on teaching, research, and service to get any raise. If any one of the three areas were not acceptable, there was no raise. Reward structure matters in this case.

Sounds as though people are generally in favor of a task force. The Provost suggested that this would be a good thing for Senate to own. Senate and the Provost can work together to figure out a way to make this happen.

XI. Adjourn at 4:25 p.m.

- Motion to Adjourn: Dr. Anne Pasero
- Second: Dr. Sumana Chattopadhyay
- Vote: Passed by unanimous voice vote

Respectfully submitted,
Mrs. Mary Jo Wiemiller
UAS Secretary

The next meeting will be Monday, February 19, 2018 at 3:00 p.m. in AMU Ballroom C/D.