

Minutes for Faculty Senate Meeting
7:00 pm, Tuesday, September 2, 2014
Room 140 DeBartolo

Attendees: Gail Bederman, Karen Buranskas, Matthew Capdevielle, Xavier Creary, Matthew Devine, John Duffy, David Galvin, John Gaski, David Gasperetti, Liangyan Ge, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Alexandra Guisinger, Michael Hemler, Michael Kirsch, BJ Lee, Lin Hai, Linda Major, Adam Martin, Paul McDowell, Paul McGinn, Hildegund Muller, Walter Nicgorski, John Polhamus, Jeanne Romero-Severson, Joshua Shrout, John Stamper, Marsha Stevenson, Joe Urbany, Sandra Vera-Munoz, Meng Wang, Sophie White, Richard Williams

Excused: Richard Cross, Liz Dube, Donald Kommers

Absent: Mark Caprio, Sylwia Ptasinska, Tom Stapleford,

1. Meeting opened at 7:03 in DeBartolo lecture room 140.
2. Opening Prayer
3. We had a Moment of Silence for faculty members who passed away during the 2013-14 academic year
4. Introductions
5. Minutes of the May 6, 2014 were approved by acclimation.
6. Chair's remarks
 - a. What is the role of the Faculty Senate?
 - i. Chair described the role of the faculty senate with references to the Faculty Handbook. Described the job as generating opinions and sending them to other offices or committees.
 - ii. Note that the Faculty Senate has no power other than to change its own rules.
 - iii. Four committees (Academic Affairs, Administrative Affairs, Benefits, and Students Affairs). Each committee has a chair that serves on the Academic Council. The council determines the general academic policies and regulation of the University. Chairs serve on that, as do department chairs, elected faculty members. Council agenda set by an Executive Committee on which serves the Chair of the Faculty Senate. Through this route the Faculty Senate has a path to raise issues.
 - iv. Common actions include reviewing proposals that will rise to the Academic Council. Paul provided path of proposal upward.

- v. Other committees of note. First Year of Studies Committee. Core Curriculum Review Committee which will review general course requirements. Many, many others that can be found in the handbook. One of note, the Academic and Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees to which the Senate Chairperson is invited to discuss issues of concern. Where do we fit in? If we make a lot of noise, the Provost listens, so this is a good place to get things started.
- b. Requests for volunteers to serve in Faculty Senate positions.
 - i. Academic and Administrative Affairs need Chairs who will serve on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee as well as have a position on the Academic Council.
 - ii. Campus Life Council is filled by David Galvin.
 - iii. Bookstore committee is filled by Walter Nicgorski.
 - iv. ECDC – Alexandra Guisinger
 - v. Student Senate – Gail Bederman
- c. 403b Problems
 - i. A meeting with JAG, Bob MCQuade, Nasir Ghiaseddin, and Paul McGinn is being scheduled
- d. Advancing Our Vision II (AOV II)
 - i. In July, a meeting was held in Chicago to review suggestions from the committee about how to save more money for the University. Chair, Paul McGinn noted expense of holding a meeting off site as well as a need for all sections of the University (including sports) to document equivalent savings.
 - ii. Will be on going through the year.
- e. Understanding the Budget
 - i. Attempting to schedule a meeting with John Affleck-Graves to explain how budgeting is done at Notre Dame in October or November.
 - ii. A slight preference noted for November, because Denise Murphy from HR is coming in October.
 - iii. Please come up with any questions for JAG in advance about how the budget is set. Send them to Monica or Paul and they will make sure to get them to JAG before the Nov. meeting.
- f. Background Checks
 - i. University is proposing background checks on all faculty
 - ii. Using driver license information to determine whether the University needs to undertake further research (color coded gradations looking for felony and above legal issues). Candidate would sign initial agreement, but in addition, if problems arose, then Candidate would be informed and would have an opportunity to correct, explain, or stop.
 - iii. Gail Bederman said that she called the American Association of University Professors and discovered that they had a policy against it as intrusive and unnecessary. They noted that there had been a push 10 years ago, but most schools pushed back. Bederman noted concerns that if peer, private schools did not have a similar policy then it could cause difficulties in hiring.

- iv. Chair noted that all of the administrators go through it. Discussion about which areas this is appropriate – for example managing federal grants, working with minors, and other sensitive issues.
- v. Others noted that the policy was not going to be equally undertaken. Additionally the time frame (30 to 60 days for foreign hires) would cause problems for hiring, especially since it includes adjunct and visiting faculty. Pointed out that the rationale doesn't actually solve the potential problems. A background check would not stop a "Penn State" level problem. Another raised issue about cost-benefit of adding this. Others noted the potential costs for lawsuits. But it was questioned whether this would really be a solution, other than legal coverage. Matthew Devine (student rep) mentioned that background checks would not be a selling issue and understood hiring issues, although noted that students don't really think about these issues since most meetings with faculty are in classrooms. Also raised, the students and student employees aren't asked to do these background checks, and they are similarly representatives of the university. Question about whether this is a real issue and also how accurate these are. How many unnecessary red flags are brought up?
- vi. Questions about what to do? One suggestion would be to ask them to look at peer institutions. Further to this point, what does the review processes look like at other schools? Are these reasonable or not. What type of things gets disclosed? Does it turn into a blanket policy? Another would be that there should be a response by Academic Affairs. A suggestion for a two-stage process: response now with current reaction with a request for further information and explanation in the October session. Request for circulation of the AAUP policy. Also request to get information from the departments about how they saw the impact on the hiring process. A question was also asked about the timeline. The administration had proposed implementing this this year (hiring begins in October), this was noted as not possible.

Emeritus:

- vii. Proposal for a new emeritus level – "University Emeritus Professor"
- g. Obituaries/Remembrances
 - i. Currently obituaries and remembrances are scattered across the University.
 - ii. University of Wisconsin has a single site.
- h. Faculty Senate Website Improvements
 - i. Currently under construction to move to Conductor.
- i. Emeriti Poll
 - i. Proposal for social space for Emeritus but not clear what it would be. Chair requested a poll.
 - ii. Walter Nicgorski noted that such a survey was already in preparation.

6. Committee Meetings began at 8:15

a. Academic Affairs Rm. 140

b. Administrative Affairs Rm. 136

- c. Benefits Rm. 131
- d. Student Affairs Rm. 138

8. General Meeting Reconvened at 8:37 for Committee Reports

- a. Academic Affairs
 - a. Reviewed activities of prior year – especially the role of reviewing proposals with comments to Laura Carlson, briefings, and the initiations of a study on junior faculty mentoring.
 - b. New sources of business – creating and sharing criteria for reviewing proposals, initiating a review of AP policy credits, variation in foreign language requirements. Potentially considering more broadly how are students learning to write and how could they be improved.
 - c. Nominated a new chair Paul McDowell from Romance Languages.
- b. Administrative Affairs Rm. 136
 - a. Recommended Jeanne Romero-Severson for chair
 - b. Discussed background checks and would like to take this on as a committee. Requested permission to circulate draft and request feedback and encouraged unframed, neutral responses with suggestions to be sent first to faculty senate members and then to John with responses due before next Senate meeting.
- c. Benefits Rm. 131
 - a. Met over the summer with HR to discuss formulation of next year's benefits. This year changes appear to be moderate. Small changes in premiums. Again, changes in the formulary. The drug company that they are using –Express Scripts – not going to sell certain drugs because they can't get enough discount so those won't be available. This list is not yet compiled. Will be sent when available. Bigger changes in the following year when the Cadillac Tax starts up. May be removal of some HMO options.
 - b. A question was asked about if the share of cost is being shifted more to faculty and staff. Nassir said there was a slight shift to increase faculty share but varies across types of plans. Paul thinks target number is 19%.
 - c. Discussion about 403b. Will be able to talk to the committee making decisions about what goes into the funds.
- d. Student Affairs Rm. 138
 - a. Gail Bederman spoke to the Registrar about undergraduate student auditing.
 - b. Also, discussion about the survey of faculty on student department (still confidential).
 - c. Recognized 40 years of service by Xavier Creary.

9. New Business

- a. Mike Kirsch elected as second Secretary.
- b. Paul McDowell was elected as Chair of Academic Affairs
- c. Jeanne Romero-Severson was elected as Chair of Administrative Affairs

10. Adjournment at 8:58 pm.