I. Call to Order by Dr. Cheryl Maranto at 3:05 pm.

II. Reflection was given by Ms. Courtney Warren

III. Approval of March 20, 2017 minutes

Minutes of the prior meeting were amended to include the following motion and second relative to adjournment of the meeting:

- Motion to adjourn: Dr. Marilyn Frenn
- Second: Dr. Tim Melchert

- Motion to approve with the above additions: Dr. Tim Melchert
- Second: Mrs. Courtney Warren
- Vote: Unanimous voice vote

IV. Chair’s Report – Dr. Cheryl Maranto

- Faculty Forum will be held on April 12 from 3 to 4:15 in AMU 227. All were reminded of this and asked to attend, and to encourage their colleagues to do so.
- At the May meeting, there will food and beverages available before the meeting. All are encouraged to arrive early and participate in fellowship with other members of Senate.

V. Vice Chair Report – Dr. Anne Pasero

- No report

VI. Secretary Report – Mrs. Mary Jo Wiemiller (3:10 to 3:15)

- Results of elections for new at-large senate positions was shared:
  - Full-time Faculty: Drs. Paul Nolette and Todd Hernandez
  - Part-time Faculty: Dr. Therese Novotny
  - Representatives to Faculty Hearing Committee
    - Dr. James Marten
    - Dr. Owen Goldin
    - Dr. Michael Wert
  - Faculty representatives from various colleges were announced:
    - Newly appointed:
      - Dr. Kim Factor (Arts and Sciences)
      - Dr. Guentsch (Dentistry)
Appointed to a new term:
- Dr. Cheryl Maranto (Business Administration)
- Dr. Joe Domblesky (Engineering)
- Mr. Bruce Boyden (Law)
- Dr. Marilyn Frenn (Nursing)

Dean representatives:
- Dr. Brian Till
- Mrs. Janice Welburn

Graduate Student Organization Representative
- Mr. Tim Boerger

MUSG Representatives have not yet been announced

UAS Leadership Elections (Presentation)
- Ballots at each seat
  - Call for nominations for UBUS and UBGS liaison positions.
  - For each position, may select the person who has decided to run, or can write-in. If choosing to write-in a name, it is best to have spoken with that person to make certain they are interested.
  - Please make sure to sign the orange sign-in sheet. Those who have not signed the sheet will receive an electronic ballot. Those who have signed in should be voting on the paper ballot provided.
  - New senators, outgoing senators, and continuing senators are all eligible to vote.
  - Final Results of the Leadership positions will be announced at the May UAS meeting.

VII. Provost’s Report - Dr. Daniel Myers (3:15 to 3:22)
- Enrollment Update
  - Still doing well. We are about halfway there; ahead of where we were last year, and 34% ahead of two years ago.
  - Traditionally, half the class commits in the last two weeks.
  - Minority population and scores on ACTs are both looking good.
  - All colleges except one are up in commitments; recently had a faculty call-a-thon; that has helped.
  - Transfers are still early, but appear to be similar to the numbers for last year
  - Grad School applications are up across the board. We are getting more students to matriculate, even though down in numbers, so the ones that are applying are truly interested.
- Update on CFO search
  - No real change since last meeting. Search committee will convene on April 24 to review apps; fly-in interviews will be in early May.

VIII. University Board of Graduate Studies - Approved by unanimous vote - Dr. Carrianne Hayslett, Associate Dean and Director of New Program Incubator (3:22 to 3:25)
Informed: New Specialization in Ethically Centered Data Science (Att. VIII)
- Discussion/Questions:
  - Two changes are being proposed: Vice Chair of Senate becomes the Chair-elect, serving as vice chair the first year, then as chair the second year. Changes are suggested to achieve more continuity. Considering the difficulty of getting folks to run for chair, decided that perhaps the two-year term as chair was not realistic.
Having the vice chair be on the University Leadership Council gets them involved and creates better preparedness and continuity.

- Chair of Faculty Council – have increased responsibility this year over last year; statutes were changed so that vice chair of UAS is not chair of Faculty Council. This change also provides buyout for chair of faculty council. A lot now gets funneled through Faculty Council, so work load is quite significant.
- “University Faculty Council” should be changed to “Faculty Council.”
- If making changes to the vice chair position/role, then should also consider the 3-year term. Add a statement to #6 to say something like “may serve in that position for up to 2 years.” Clarifying for vice chair, if someone is elected vice chair, then their term starts over; according to this, they are supposed to roll into the chair position. What happens if they are at the end of their term? Would the vice chair have to run again, or is it just assumed that they would continue as a member of Senate? They would have to run again.
- For both Senate and Faculty Council, consider language such as “should the vice chair be in their third year on Senate or Faculty Council, they would retain their membership on the body the following year as an extra member.” It would not mandate that their respective college choose them again; they could simply take one of the at large seats if available.
- As it is not possible to account for every exception and contingency, suggest that this be considered if it arises. There should be a contingency clause indicating what would happen if the stated succession plan could not go into effect. “If the succession plan cannot be carried out, the Exec Committee will provide for an alternative election.”
- The spirit of this proposal is to attain continuity of leadership. History would indicate that chairs normally do better in their second year. This proposal almost goes against that idea by saying right off that they would serve one year as vice and one year as chair.
  - Dr. Maranto responded that if the vice chair is truly viewed as chair elect, many of the benefits of continuity are achieved. She suggests that it is better to leave this as flexible as possible. She agrees that the ideal would be a two-year term, but that doesn’t seem to be a reality.
- The pattern of the vice chair serving as a chair-elect is common in professional organizations and other senates.
- There are two choices: Delay this decision for a year or go ahead with the changes that are proposed. Ideally, if were to go ahead with these changes, would be able to see if some tweaks could be made to address a second term for the chair.
- Members were hand-vote polled to decide:
  - Keep the same as current (no show of support)
  - Make the change and see how things work next year (several supporters)
- It was suggested that adding something to the amendment to indicate that if for some reason the succession would not work, the Executive Committee would provide guidelines on how to proceed.
- The amendment to the statutes will be presented for a vote at the May meeting. Suggested language will be distributed prior to that meeting.

X. Core Revision – Dr. John Su and Dr. Sarah Feldner- Chair Core Curriculum Review Committee (3:35 to 3:45) (Att. Xa) (Att. Xb) (Att. Xc) (Core Revision Website)

Motion to Approve: Revised CORE

- Discussion/Questions:
  - During Faculty hearing sessions, issue of transfer students came up; under current core, transfers are course by course. The question is how do we remain transfer friendly while still preserving our mission.
  - One of the committees will work beginning this spring to come up with some method to approve courses. There are several models to consider. Some courses/levels will be easier to consider as transfers than others. We want students to have a distinctive Marquette experience, but also want to be transfer friendly. Don’t want to decrease our transfer options (or increase our graduation time) because of the Core, but also want to be certain that Marquette graduates, regardless of transfer status, are truly getting the Marquette experience. These discussions will continue as we move forward with implementation of the Core.

- Vote: Approved by unanimous voice vote

XI. Doubling Research – Dr. Jeanne Hossenlopp, Vice President for Research and Innovation (3:45 to 4:10) (Presentation)

- Presentation:
• Want to build on tradition of research at Marquette.
• Both Carnegie and Center for MUP look at numbers of PhDs and the dollars expended. Dollars give a good approximation of research activity, but it is the faculty who provide the critical resource for university success; CMUP looks at the number of significant faculty awards and membership in national academies. We want to expand on the list and make sure we are nominating our high-quality faculty for these awards where appropriate.
• Double what? Move R&D to $50M by 2020; hope to get faculty awards to increase to 12 (from 6 this year) by 2020. Using the MUP list allows us some opportunity to benchmark.
• R&D expenditures give us a measure of all sources of research support on campus: internal funding, grants, foundations, and donor support
• How do we support research across the university? Supported with internal funds (SFF/RRG, Innovation Funds, Way Klinger fellowships, sabbaticals, young scholar awards, and conference travel awards.
• We sat flat for several years with few increases in R&D. Started an upward trend in 2010. Some of it was about the way we reported, but much of it was truly about an increase. Reaching $50m by 2020 is quite aggressive.
• Looking at changes in hiring, additional faculty lines, etc., gets us part of the way, but not all the way.
• Internal funding is the source of 41%; university is supportive of efforts. ORSP will get an extra line. Government funding is the next largest source. Have taken steps to increase (for example, have joined a science coalition). Donor support also needs to increase, e.g., named professorships and support for centers and institutes.
• None of this happens without investment, but we must also consider the teacher-scholar model, as well as new opportunities. Lunches for new faculty encourage collaboration across disciplines, etc. It is a collective goal, and is not about everyone doing twice as much. Doubling the number of publications is not necessarily the answer.
• How do we engage with the challenges; what are your priorities for research support?

Discussion/Questions:
• What should we add to this list of things to consider?
  ▪ Work load – service is an important part of faculty jobs. Faculty kind of know how to manage teaching load, but how do we manage our service load?
  ▪ University is trying to cut down on adjuncts – how do we balance that against release for research?
  ▪ If we got to $50 million in just 3 years, it would be perfect. The master planning process is a longer time frame. Are there discussions about how we project for 10 years out?
    ▪ Want to thrive as a university and therefore we want to aim to continue increasing.
  ▪ Regarding promoting our research and increasing funding, how do you do this with increased teaching?
    ▪ One of the problems is teaching load balance. If faculty are not performing well with research, they get a higher teaching load, which becomes a double-edged sword because then they really don’t have time for research. Need to be aware of and careful about going down that spiral.
    ▪ Look carefully at not-for profit and the expertise of individuals. ORSP and IRB are looking at bottle-necks in the timing of submissions and getting the research underway.
    ▪ Teacher/scholar model. It appears we have developed a plan for increasing our research. How are we going to maintain that teacher-scholar model? There’s not a plan that shows how we are going to do that. If we are going to jettison the teacher/scholar model, then what model are we going to adopt? Seems there is no systematic plan for the colleges relative to how they can support that change. And relative to service load, we seem to have a very heavy service commitment. Maybe we need to have a conversation about what the teacher/scholar model means. Very different in Madison than here, but they would contend that they are teacher/scholar as well.
      ▪ Teacher/scholar model is a continuum, and everyone is on a different place on that continuum.
    ▪ Should not confuse quantity with quality. But if we want research to increase, we must free up some time. The quality of research or teaching doesn’t go down as one is teaching fewer classes. We need to consider how to reduce the amount of time devoted to teaching to free up time for research.
    ▪ Must find ways to move more money into research assistantships.
    ▪ Consider support for student funding as a part of this. A little bit of a cushion to support younger grad students would be appreciated.
    ▪ Target for 2020 in number of PhDs awarded is 82. Increase for grad students in areas of national need. Have recently had a second NSF fellow named.
Nursing report advocates for greater partnerships for clinical partnerships. Budgets are in disarray because of the healthcare industry – industry may have more money with this administration so perhaps there will be good money available.

- Good to hear that there will be another position in ORSP to better support the process.
- Will have an electronic grants management system – this will be very helpful in many, many ways for submission and tracking both.
- With growth being projected, is the goal to move up to R1?
  - We will probably never get to R1 on expenditures only because we are small. We might get there on per capita, though. Getting to $50m may possibly move us higher in R2.

XII. IPE Activities and Introduce New Coordinator – Dr. Marilyn Frenn and Ms. MaryJo Wiemiller (4:10 to 4:20) (Presentation)

- Presentation:
  - Started because this training is a prevalent model in healthcare related professions, and also an accreditation requirement for most health related programs. There are also increasing numbers of health professions.
  - Jordan Cannon is IPE coordinator. Her time is split 50/50 with MCW and Marquette. She is housed in Center for Teaching and Learning, currently working with College of Nursing, Dentistry and Health Sciences, but is also interdisciplinary: for example, palliative care and elder law are IPE topics in development.
  - Are seeking to develop interprofessional experiences in the clinical rotations sector as well (outside of the classroom).
  - Students want to do this! Faculty want to do this, it’s what is necessary for our graduates to appropriately function in their jobs. Possibilities are endless. Jordan is here to help make it happen. Email has been created IPE@marquette.edu.
- No discussion or questions:

XIII. University Board of Undergraduate Studies – All three programs received unanimous approval-Dr. John Su (4:22 to 4:30)

Motion to Approve
New Major in Applied Physics – Klingler College of Arts and Sciences (Att. XIIIa)
- No discussion or questions
- Vote: Approved by unanimous voice vote

Motion to Approve
Terminate Athletic Training Major – College of Health Sciences (Att. XIIIb)
- Discussion/Questions:
  - They are no longer accepting new students; being replaced by a 5-year master’s degree program.
- Vote: Approved by unanimous voice vote

Informed
Terminate Speech Pathology and Audiology Minor – College of Health Sciences – (Att. XIIIc)
- Discussion/Questions:
  - Terminating due to lack of student interest; can better use resources elsewhere.
- Vote: Approved by unanimous voice vote

XIV. Strategic Plan Resourcing and Implementation – Dr. Dan Myers and Mr. Dave Lawlor, Executive Vice President of Operations (4:30 to 5) (Presentation)

- Presentation:
  - Extensive planning on campus in the past couple years with lots of participation by campus community. This is the next step of putting this planning into action.
  - Lots of work around campaign planning; work on enrollment planning; colleges have been working on their strategic plans – in some cases starting from scratch, and in some cases re-mapping existing plan to coordinate with Beyond Boundaries.
  - Need to stay pro-active and have a plan to avoid some of the pitfalls that have befallen others (SLU laying off folks, others stopping construction projects, etc.). The cost of inaction is very high relative to the operating margin.
  - Are not asking community to do more with less; it is about increasing investments so we can do more. All initiatives have cost and effort associated with them.
Need to make sure we have a healthy flow in each component of the university’s fiscal health.

Many positive things have happened:

- Housing fundraising: building a new dorm with donor gifts; this is an important piece in driving other pieces (good housing attracts students)
- Transfer students: have underperformed in bringing in transfer students; have signed an articulation agreement with a community college system
- Undergrad enrollment: producing new programs and increasing collaborations
- Research
- Growth in the graduate and online programs: Orbis online program in Pleasant Prairie which is partially online and partially face-to-face.

Waterfall chart: by the time we get to the end of the waterfall chart, we will be at a very different place than we are now.

- Don’t want the message to be that it is all about finance. It is not – it is about mission and values, but is also important to look at the finances involved.
- Need to invest in our future. Cutting costs is not the answer.
- Going from a balanced budget to the point where we are investing nearly $100m annually in initiatives of our choosing.
- Moving from the macro-strategy to an operational and implementation level at a very detailed level.
- M12 (Marquette 12) are the building blocks to our plan. Sponsors are President Lovell, Provost Myers, and EVPO Lawlor. There are 12 teams that will address the various objectives, with Owners leading the way.
- In a short period of time, Owners have provided concept papers and assembled core teams to work on their respective domains. Have been working on an 8 to 10-page business plan, which will flush out in more detail the concept paper: the risks; how to mitigate those risks; and a project management plan.
- Want to get started quickly. Board has approved. Transparency to the entire campus has been appreciated.
- Work will be summarized and the Board updated in May.
- Concept papers have been created, with weighted mapping to the master plan.
- The Board of Trustees will be provided with progress reports.
- Project management protocol is not standardized on campus; incumbent on us to become proficient in project management.
- Will have an active roll-out over the summer

Discussion/Questions:

- Where do we fit?
  - Share ideas
  - Foster discussion
  - Challenge assumptions
  - Be engaged

- At what point in the process as it is envisioned will the Senate be involved?
  - Normal protocols for processes on campus will continue to be used.
  - Hope to provide periodic updates.
  - Different members of senate may be involved on various task forces

- How are the consulting companies shown on the chart identified?
  - No consultants were engaged. What is on the chart is “Owners.” People that are already working on campus with similar responsibilities were those selected as the Owners.

XV. Adjourn at 4:55 p.m.

- Motion to Adjourn: Mrs. Janice Welburn
- Second: Dr. Brian Hodgson
- Vote: Unanimous voice vote

Respectfully submitted,
Mrs. Mary Jo Wiemiller
The next meeting will be Monday, May 8, 2017 at 3:00 p.m. in AMU Ballroom C/D