

Minutes of Notre Dame Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2015
DeBartolo Room 140

Attendees: Matthew Capdevielle, Mark Caprio, Dominic Chaloner, Christopher Chowrimootoo, Xavier Creary, Meredith Doellman, Mary Frandsen, David Galvin, John Gaski, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Michael Hemler, Michael Kirsch, Byung-Joo Lee, Hai Lin, Adam Martin, Mary Ann McDowell, Paul McDowell, Paul McGinn, Michael Mogavero, Hildegund Müller, Walter Nicgorski, Chris Pratt, Joe Urbany, Sandra Vera-Muñoz, Jeanne Romero-Severson, Nidia Ruelas, Christopher Shields, Joshua Shrout, Anna Simon, Cheri Smith, Marsha Stevenson, Meng Wang, Hannelore Weber, Sophie White, Shauna Williams, Xiaoshan Yang.

Excused: David Thomas, Richard Williams

Called to order at 6:02pm

1. Opening Prayer (Jeanne Romero-Severson, Chair)
2. The minutes of the October 6, 2015, meeting were approved
3. Chair's Remarks

- a. Core Curriculum

We will have a speaker at the next meeting.

- b. CIF Committee Process

The University's CIF Committee held its first meeting; a list of committee members was listed in the faculty senate agenda. The committee discussed the perceived purpose of CIFs; there was near unanimity that CIFs might not be measuring what we think they are measuring (e.g., quality of teaching); concern was expressed that CIFs are being used inappropriately.

Members of the Faculty Senate expressed a number of concerns regarding the CIF Committee, including

- why are only 3 of 12 committee members female, given the concerns raised in the faculty survey? Jeanne said that wasn't explicitly discussed at the first meeting.
- why is there only 1 committee member from Science and Engineering? Jeanne said she was surprised, too, give the purported importance of quantitative skills for this committee.

- are there any underrepresented minorities on the Committee? Jeanne said she is not certain, but doesn't think so.

Paul McGinn (the past Chair of the Faculty Senate) mentioned that 4 of the 5 individuals recommended by Paul last year were put on the committee; it was suggested that future recommendations by the Faculty Senate regarding University committees should take into consideration appropriate gender and minority representation.

Jeanne mentioned concern about the lack of actual CIF data provided at the 1st meeting.

It was suggested that the committee should examine the extensive literature and research in the course evaluation field.

c. Trustee Meeting Report

Jeanne previously distributed via email the Power Point slides she presented to the University Trustees.

d. Policy on Reimbursement of Flight Bookings Before a Trip Occurs

Jeanne explained the new University policy (which reverts to the pre-2008 policy) to not provide pre-trip advance reimbursements for self-paid University travel (individuals wishing to avoid personal advances can use Anthony Travel); this is consistent with what most other universities do; the Executive Committee did not have objections to the change.

e. Consolidated Appeals Process

This process is nearing conclusion. Only one original class member remains. The Women's committee has offered suggestions. Kathleen Brickley plans to discuss the issue with that committee one more time, and plans to attend the December Faculty Senate meeting to make a presentation on this topic.

f. Academic Honor Code Revision

VP and Associate Provost Hugh Page asked to meet with Jeanne regarding a University committee considering possible Honor Code revisions. Hugh is not asking for a Faculty Senate representative on the committee, but merely wants to solicit the senate's "perspective". There appears to be widespread concerns about effectiveness of the honor code

Xavier Creary, who serves on the committee (although not as a representative

of the Faculty Senate), noted that there appear to be two main issues: how do we write a code that covers all cases (e.g., if the involved students or faculty are no longer at the university) and how do we get students to buy into it (e.g. concerns about students not upholding their obligation to report knowing violations).

A comment was made that faculty reluctance to confront students might be tied to CIF score concerns; Jeanne said this concern was raised at the CIF committee meeting

4. Old Business

Faculty Senate members were reminded to update their departments on faculty senate proceedings.

5. Committee Meetings

Faculty Senate committees met in break-out sessions.

6. Committee Reports

a. Administrative Affairs (Josh Shrout)

The committee is working on updating the Faculty Senate website (there have been problems obtaining access to the old site, which is run through OIT; the new site will be run through the Provost's office and will be easier to update). The committee is considering what should be on site.

b. Academic Affairs (Paul McDowell)

There has been a positive response to the choice of ACC Scholar. The committee discussed last year's proposal for a new emeritus rank. The Provost and deans rejected the proposal on the basis that it should be addressed college by college (given the significant differences in retirement cultures, space resources, etc., among colleges); Dean McGreevy of Arts & Letters showed receptiveness to addressing the underlying concerns for productive scholars.

c. Benefits (Nasir Ghiaseddin)

As of the last report, only 49% of eligible participants have enrolled in open season, with only 3 days remaining; HR plans to track people down who don't enroll to make certain they understand that affirmative re-enrollment is required to maintain health insurance. Voluntary plans (e.g., accident plan) are available for an additional fee; other plans might be approved in the future (e.g., parental leave with pay).

There may be some problems with the open season confirmation page; Nassir will discuss this with HR.

d. Student Affairs (John Gaski)

The committee discussed the possibility of the Faculty Senate offering feedback regarding the Honor Code. Tentative thoughts involved the importance of not only increased student awareness, but also student engagement; perhaps the penalties should be reviewed (whether the penalties may not be severe enough, or whether they may be too severe and thereby discouraging student reporting).

7. New Business

The University's REEL Committee addresses the Royal Excursion Express Line Chicago shuttle (which transports people who live in Chicago to and from the ND campus). The shuttle is underutilized, but it is very important to those who use it. Rich Williams agreed last month to represent the Faculty Senate on that committee.

8. Next Meeting – December 1, 2015, 6:00pm

Kathleen Brickley will address the Faculty Senate; Jeanne will also invite John McGreevy.

9. The meeting adjourned at 7:48pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Kirsch
Professor of Law
Co-Secretary