

Minutes  
Faculty Senate  
September 6, 2006

The meeting opened at 7 pm with introductions of all senators present.

An opening prayer was offered.

I. Minutes from the May 9 meeting were approved.

II. Chair's report. Two goals for tonight's meeting:

1. Refine agenda for the year, select issues on which to focus, and make plans, mainly in committee meetings.

2. Discuss the library. Seth Brown has served on the longstanding library taskforce: he noted that different faculty use the library in very different ways, but it is central to all of us in scholarship and teaching. He thanked Jennifer Younger and John Weber for coming to speak with the Faculty Senate and Chris Maziar for providing a draft of the taskforce report on the ND libraries.

III. Presentation by John Weber, Chair of the University Libraries Committee.

Information technology has been changing very fast: technology and cost are the "primary drivers" of the library "macro environment."

Digitization of library materials is important because of increasing dependence on fast desktop access to journals and other materials (e.g., books and government records), among both faculty and students.

Traditional measures of assessing collections (e.g., size of physical collection) no longer apply, though print collections are still regarded as critical. (How long will it be until non-copyright, public domain, humanities collections are available?) Instead, speed and comprehensiveness of access are key.

A challenge: "deteriorating information literacy" among students whose first approach to research is to use Google.

Costs, especially of e-journal access, are an ongoing issue—subscription "bundles" are very onerous, with prices much outpacing the consumer price index. ND and other research libraries can't afford everything. ND has opted out of one bundle at a savings of \$180,000, and chosen individual subscriptions instead. Cost constraints come from both budgetary pressures and rising prices.

Is the role of the research library changing? Will brick and mortar matter less, and consultative functions matter more, with specialized staff facilitating access to reliable materials and training users in information literacy?

University Committee on Libraries is a link between the library and different university committees. Faculty outreach is of great interest.

About the taskforce report: the general assessment is that the system is doing well in setting goals, addressing challenges, and capitalizing on available opportunities. Weber went on to list a number of goals and concerns that the taskforce has identified.

#### IV. Presentation by Jennifer Younger, Director of University Libraries

Younger finds the work of the taskforce to show that it is important to proceed by discipline, since needs differ so greatly. In general, science places a high value on desktop access, humanities on browseable collections.

Fiesta Bowl money is a help, and a reminder that many of the library's problems are ones solvable by money.

One million dollars to history collection: a core discipline with holes in the collection—this is a big opportunity to solve an existing problem.

\$200,000 for new department of Africana Studies. (Asian Studies also has need but will have to wait for another Fiesta Bowl. Spreading the funds too thin would not be a good idea.)

\$150,000 to IEEE digital engineering library.

\$150,000 for Web of Knowledge/Science citation database backfiles to 1975.

Consortia: collaboration has become important for libraries. ND belongs to Northeast Research Libraries consortium as a buying club for licensing electronic materials, but as a loose group it doesn't have the uniform approach, and hence clout, of something like the UC system. It has saved ND a lot of money nonetheless.

ND is also a member of the Academic Libraries of Indiana organization, which "leverages resources to make resource-sharing easier." Links with IU and Purdue have a lot of potential; efforts are in early stages. ND is contributing funding for 5-day delivery service for small libraries of which we make a lot of use, e.g., Bethel College and St. Mary's collections in areas like education and nursing. Cooperation does entail cost and some loss of autonomy—the task is to ensure that the benefits outweigh the costs.

Other ongoing issues: author rights and copyright, especially in terms of classroom use; support for expanded public access to federally funded research (possible early expiration of copyright for such research, though legislation is unlikely to pass).

Costs are still rising at a staggering rate, and choices must be made.

#### **Questions:**

Q: How is ND doing in the rankings of research libraries?

A: Some of the measures are outmoded, but still useful. The Association of Research Libraries is in the process of revamping the measures.

Q: Has there been any initiative to compare ND area collections against those of other institutions specializing in those areas?

A: Yes, ND is benchmarking by subject area, using different appropriate peer institutions, both to refine the sense of the collections and establish goals for them.

Q: Is there a mechanism in place for considering what's going to be needed 75 years from now? Obsolescence of technology is a big concern.

A: That's also being handled at a disciplinary level. The main focus is on current research needs. Retrospective and comprehensive collecting will proceed by discipline. The library is thinking proactively about technology and archiving of material.

Q: What motivated the decision to allow food and drink in the stacks? How has it worked out, and what are the current hopes and concerns about the use of the library building itself?

A: There are few people willing to use the library without something to drink at least—it's a compromise between the needs of the users and preservation of the collections. We are in competition for students' time and attention. Enforcements would also be a big headache.

Q: What is usage of reference desk like these days?

A: The number of questions asked is declining, but time spent on them is greater because they are more complex.

Seth Brown concluded the session with thanks and a request to the UCL and libraries in general to consider the Faculty Senate a resource to draw on.

The Senate then broke for committee meetings at 8:20 pm. The meeting resumed at 9 pm.

#### V. Benefits Committee report (Nasir Ghiaseddin, Chair)

Major issues for the year: benefits changes and faculty salaries.

The committee will meet with Tom Burish and raise issues about lagging salaries relative to peer institutions.

Environmental issues were raised at the May meeting—the committee will issue an invitation for discussion of air and water quality at ND, possibly in the second semester.

Living wage initiative: the University seems to be responding; at this point Benefits Committee is not planning on pursuing it.

Possibility of taxation of tuition benefits: no longer an active issue in Congress, so nothing to be done at the moment.

The committee and chair met with Human Resources over the summer to discuss planned benefits changes. Two possible approaches: a three-tier system of single, two-person, and family rates; or premiums scaled by salary (30K or less, 30-60K, and 60K and more). There are about 4,000 employees, about 25% of them faculty. The committee takes a dim view of the salary-based approach, which would in its view disproportionately affect faculty. It has suggested making the changes incrementally over five years instead of all at once, with very substantial sudden increases—this may be a possibility.

Comment: At the May meeting, there was sentiment that it wasn't fair for low-paid people to pay the same as well-paid people here, so opposition to tiered premiums

shouldn't be taken for granted. There was also concern about penalizing those who have large families.

A: But faculty shouldn't be penalized in order to compensate others—there are other ways to help low-income workers than to have the faculty essentially subsidize them.

The chair noted that the subject was a good one for future discussion by the Faculty Senate as a whole, and he requested that the committee draft a resolution for the Faculty Senate to consider.

Some more discussion followed, in which issues of fairness and cost were raised, as well as the possible ramifications of changing the basis for differing premiums.

#### VI. Student Affairs Committee Report (Kelly Jordan, Chair)

Issues for the year:

New Honor Code training system: committee would like to look at it, especially from the student perspective.

Security on campus, especially within dorms and on big event weekends.

Support for upcoming eating disorders conference.

#### VII. Academic Affairs (Colin Jessop, Chair)

Issues for the year:

Consistency of standards for renewal and promotion of SPF's: the committee will be seeking involvement in the process of establishing these standards.

Alerting faculty at large to possible effectiveness of Faculty Senate, especially as a direct line to Academic Council.

Number of Catholic faculty and ND efforts to retain and hire them.

#### VIII. Administrative Affairs (Charles Barber, Chair)

Issues for the year:

Reorganization of the Graduate School—committee may invite someone for discussion with the Faculty Senate as a whole, since it is an issue of broad interest.

Question of the proper application of Academic Articles in hiring, e.g., in the case of Tom Burish.

#### IX. Old business

Memorial resolutions for deceased faculty: responsibility for these will be given to the senator for the relevant department, with notification by Rose Mitchell.

#### X. New business

Kelly Jordan is willing to substitute this semester on the Campus Life Council for Gail Bederman, who has a teaching schedule conflict: he was elected by acclamation.

Salama Saddawi noted the problem of dealing with difficulties such as technology breakdowns, resulting in, e.g., class cancellations, on staff holidays. The question of why classes are held on federal holidays was also raised and referred to the Administrative Affairs Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Marvin  
Co-Secretary

Attendance  
September 9, 2006

**Present**

1. Al Miller
2. Anthony Trozzolo
3. Barry Keating
4. Carlos Jerez-Farran
5. Charles Barber
6. Chris Beesley
7. Claudia Polini
8. Colin Jessop
9. David Klein
10. David Ladoucer
11. Gail Bederman
12. James Rakowski
13. John Adams
14. John Gaski
15. John Robinson
16. Judy Fox
17. Julia Marvin
18. Kelly Jordan
19. Kevin Misiewicz
20. Lei Li
21. Linda Sharp
22. Mark Dehmlow
23. Mary Prorok
24. Michael Brownstein
25. Mike Etzel
26. Nasir Ghiaseddin
27. Noreen Deane-Moran
28. Orlando Menes
29. Philippe Collon
30. Robert Howland
31. Robert Norton
32. Salama Saddawi
33. Seth Brown
34. Susan Youens
35. Tim Scholenharl
36. Tom Gresik
37. Vaughn McKim

**Excused**

38. Christine Becker
39. Collin Meissner
40. Don Sporleder
41. John Stamper

**Absent**

42. Cynthia Mahmood
43. Jeff Talley
44. Peter McQuillin
45. Richard Pierce
46. Timothy Ovaert

**Departments without  
Representatives**

47. Political Science
48. Psychology
49. Theology
50. Computer Science and Engineering
51. Electrical Engr

Minutes  
Faculty Senate  
October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2006

1) The meeting was called to order at 7:05 pm; Seth Brown chaired.

The senators introduced themselves.

Kelly Jordan gave the opening prayer.

2) The minutes from the September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2005 meeting were approved. Robert Norton questioned why some academic departments (*viz.*, Political Science, Theology, Psychology, Computer Science and Engineering, and Electrical Engineering) are without Faculty Senate representation. The chair responded that these departments simply have not elected a representative and that the reasons for this have not been voiced by the individual departments.

3) Chair's Report:

The chair stressed the importance of salaries and benefits in recruiting and retaining faculty. Denise Murphy and Bob McQuade were invited to highlight recent changes in benefits and to address concerns about the perceived erosion of some aspects of the faculty benefits package.

The floor was given to Denise Murphy who gave an overview of changes to the benefits package, effective 2007. Regarding medical and prescription plans, total and individual costs continue to rise. A program entitled "Healthy Campus Strategy" is being initiated in an attempt to control long-term health care costs by promoting healthy lifestyle choices. Meritain will administer all three medical plans (PPO, Select HMO, and CHA HMO). New ID cards will be issued to all subscribers. These will also function as ID cards for the prescription plan. For all plans, the \$20 co-payment for yearly preventative office visits has been eliminated. For the HMOs, the emergency room co-payment has been increased by \$20 to \$120. This increase was initiated to steer patients into an urgent care facility (\$40 co-payment) rather than an emergency room in an effort to keep insurer costs down. Tim Ovaert asked if urgent care versus emergency room visits have been examined by case, not just volume insofar as ER visits may very well be warranted in many situations. Denise responded that both case and volume were taken into consideration. Gail Bederman asked if services exist to aid in directing patients to either the ER or urgent care. Denise indicated that written guidelines are in place and added that calling the urgent care facility and describing the situation can aid in the decision-making process.

Another change in the 2007 HMO plans is that the inpatient hospitalization deductible will be \$350. The subscriber will co-pay 15% of costs up to \$800.

For the prescription drug plans, the co-payment has been reduced. A 4<sup>th</sup> tier has been initiated for expensive specialty drugs.

Regarding medical plan premiums, the university is eliminating the \$400 payment to those ND employees who opt out of medical plan coverage and who are covered through their ND-employed spouse. Premiums have increased across all three tiers (individual, individual +1, family).

Preventative incentives are being continually implemented by the University in an effort to keep health care costs down, since 50-60% of costs are driven by lifestyle. Noreen Deane-Moran pointed

out that many of the offered programs are scheduled during “traditional” lunch hours, but that many faculty teach through these time slots. Gail Bederman asked if there was evidence of lower-income staff opting out of health-care coverage due to the expense and inquired as to the percentage of their salary that is deducted for health care. Denise indicated that approximately 8% of the salary of lower-tier income earners would need to be directed to premiums (family coverage). Seth Brown pointed out that while the 8% figure is sizable, lower-income staff benefit in a disproportionate manner to higher-income earners, particularly in instances requiring surgery, hospitalization, etc. A question was raised as to whether some thought had been given to a United Way program to subsidize health-care costs for lower-income staff, perhaps through a payroll deduction. Bob McQuade said the current program was designed to assist families in catastrophic situations. Judy Fox commented that subsidizing premiums through United Way would be a poor public relations move, raising questions in the community, and beyond, as to why the United Way would help pay for what the University will not.

In dental coverage, the HRI plan has been dropped. Delta is now the provider on both plans offered (Premier and Preferred). The decision to drop the HRI plan was prompted by the rate break offered by Delta as single provider. Current HRI subscribers must actively elect for another plan for the coming year otherwise their coverage will default to no coverage. Many local dentists who are in the HRI network are negotiating to become part of Delta’s network.

For the EyeMed Vision plan, the co-payment for the annual eye exam has been dropped. More providers have been added. Frame and contact lens allowances have been increased.

A summary of the 2007 benefits options, including important points regarding life insurance and flexible spending accounts, were summarized in a sheet circulated at the end of Denise’s presentation and overview.

5) Recess to committees.

#### 6) Committee Reports

Academic Affairs: Colin Jessop reported. The committee has been focusing on a proposed “code of standards” for the review of Special Professional Faculty (SPF’s). Chris Maziar has agreed to meet with Colin to discuss issues related to SPFs. These include whether members of the SPF should be designated by category (lecturer, demonstrator, etc.), and whether each department should generate its own independent code of SPF standards and practices or if such a code should be university-wide.

The committee also discussed ways to make Faculty Senate a more effective body. Committee members agreed, as did the Faculty Senate, that increased publicity is necessary. Colin mentioned the possibility of initiating a Faculty Senate web newsletter and having the minutes published in the ND Report on a regular basis.

The Academic Affairs committee discussed President Jenkin’s recent address to the faculty and identified several aspects of the address that needed clarification. These include the President’s mention of “the distribution of resources” towards initiatives in which the University has the greatest potential for impact. Will faculty input be sought in identifying areas for allocation of funds? The committee also desires a clarification of what the President referred to as “active” Catholicism on the part of faculty. Lastly, given the President’s emphasis on developing a great

research university, the committee would like the President to expand on his vision for engineering and sciences in this regard.

The committee also discussed how TCEs are currently being used to factor into tenure decisions. Philippe Colon mentioned that there has been limited circulation of a new document that specifies the use of TCEs in promotion and tenure. How to make best use of TCEs is an issue of ongoing concern. The value of a multi-item scale was emphasized by John Gaski. Several senators voiced concern over the seemingly undue emphasis placed on student response to “question 17” (i.e., “please evaluate only the quality of the instructor’s teaching”).

Administrative Affairs: Charlie Barber reported. Associate Provost Jean Ann Linney attended the committee meeting and addressed two issues at the committee’s behest; revision of the academic articles and the role of the Provost’s office in tracking the hiring and retention of minorities and women at the faculty level. Concerning the first issue, the 10 year review of the University’s academic articles is due in 2007. As a first step in revising the academic articles, Provost Linney will issue a call to submit specific suggestions. The individuals and bodies to be solicited will be the deans, the Faculty Senate, the Academic Council, the Provost’s Advisory Committee, and General Counsel. The tentative timetable for completion of this phase is November, 2006. A small working group, the composition of which will be later decided upon, will then be assembled to draft the new articles. These will then be submitted to the Board of Trustees for consideration at their May, 2007 meeting. One concern voiced in committee was the question of who actually polices adherence to the academic articles since it is perceived that some practices are out of sync with the letter of the articles.

Regarding the hiring and retention of minorities and women, Jean Ann Linney indicated that Notre Dame’s record was commendable and based this conclusion on data stemming from 10 public universities and Northwestern University pertaining to 1996-97 faculty hires. At these institutions, women and minorities were retained at slightly higher than 50%. For 1996-97 hires at Notre Dame, 60% of women hired at the Assistant Professor level were retained, while 67% of minorities hired at the Assistant Professor level were retained. She also pointed out that at the level of department chair, mechanisms are in place to ensure consideration of women and minority candidates from the applicant pool. Chairs are also directed to state why a minority/woman candidate was not selected for a position. Jean Ann Linney has also begun to conduct exit interviews on faculty.

Benefits: Nasir Ghiaseddin reported. The consensus in committee is that the route to guaranteeing reasonable salaries and benefits for faculty must go through the Provost and Vice-President, not Human Resources. Hence, the Benefits committee is planning to discuss their concerns with Tom Burish and John Affleck-Graves. A specific issue includes the erosion of ND faculty salaries in comparison with those at peer institutions. Seth Brown mentioned that Chris Maziar has acknowledged that a salary problem does exist.

The Benefits committee will also look at a recent report on campus air quality. A comment was made that air and water quality on campus ultimately tie into the Human Resources initiatives for enacting preventative health care measures.

Student Affairs: Kelly Jordan reported. Student concerns over technological deficiencies (cable wi-fi, wireless service) in dorms were duly noted. The committee discussed “honor training” for

freshman, namely the on-line honor training and test, and agreed that this should be addressed from the faculty standpoint. This would involve reviewing the tutorial and taking the test.

Campus security is a major issue with students. Currently, 30 full-time NDSP officers are employed, with extra traffic and security personnel hired for football weekends. Concerns about dormitory safety have been raised by the students. It was acknowledged that some of the onus for compromised dorm security must rest with the students themselves, e.g., unlocking doors for non-residents. Students living off-campus also desire more security, but must be mindful that the local police are poised to enforce all laws, including those related to noise and under-age drinking, and not just those that just those that pertain to student security.

The committee has also agreed to disseminate awareness of the conference on eating disorders to be held on campus this February.

A new graduate student health insurance plan is needed. The graduate student representative in attendance said that minimal graduate input has been solicited. This is a possible agenda item for the Academic Council.

Kevin Misiewicz raised a question about security measures in place for faculty and staff. Noreen Deane-Moran asked about procedures for assisting handicapped staff and faculty in case of emergency. It is not clear whether a firm plan exists regarding campus emergency preparedness.

7) Old Business. None

8) New Business. Philippe Colon voiced a concern over the frequent power outages that occur on campus. These are especially problematic for experimental scientists and can result in damage to instrumentation and ruined experiments. Deficiencies in the quality and level of services provided by OIT was also mentioned.

Vaughn McKim asked if any actionable outcomes might result from the current meeting. Colin Jessop volunteered to begin looking into a Faculty Senate web newsletter. It was asked why the FS minutes fail to appear in the ND Report. Seth Brown replied that the minutes are being submitted to the ND Report, but are not being published. Possibly linking to the minutes through Inside ND will be examined.

Meeting adjourned at 9:50 pm

Faculty Senate  
University of Notre Dame  
Meeting of November 7, 2006  
(Revised)

The meeting opened at 7 pm with the introduction of the senators present and with a prayer.

1. The minutes from the October 4, 2006, meeting were approved, with one correction to the attendance roster.

2. Chair's report.

A. The chair briefly described potential "problem spots" that Senators identified in the Academic Articles, which are up for their regular review, and he handed out copies of the resulting memo to Jean Ann Linney. Charles Barber is on the relevant University committee and should be informed of any additional concerns.

B. John Affleck-Graves will be coming to the December meeting: Senators should contact Nasir Ghiaseddin with any issues they would like to see raised.

3. Proposal for electronic approval of minutes from monthly meetings.

The chair explained that the proposal is designed to streamline and expedite approval of the minutes, so that it will not take a month or more for them to be approved. Any member would be entitled to call for discussion and approval to be deferred until the next Senate meeting in case of any substantive concerns.

Brief discussion followed, and a motion in favor was made and unanimously approved.

The Senate then broke for committee meetings and reassembled at 7:45.

4. Benefits Committee report.

The committee met to generate questions for John Affleck-Graves, and it will solicit questions by e-mail from the Senate as a whole. The committee will put together a list to be sent to Affleck-Graves before the meeting.

A question was raised about possible lowered participation by local dentists disadvantaged by the "preferred" dental plan. Another senator's dentist apparently had found the "preferred" plan to offer better compensation.

Another issue: how to seek increased participation and time for the committee to respond to proposed benefit changes in the future.

5. Student Affairs Committee report.

Honor Code test: the committee saw some samples of scenarios included on the test. It wondered if the students should take the test every year instead of once in their careers, and if faculty might find it helpful to take the test as well, since it raises issues that may not be familiar to them, given the pace of changes in technology. Another question: that of graduate students, who are not subject to the Honor Code.

Health care for graduate students: graduate students are not included in the discussions; the cost of health care, especially for families, is a recruitment issue, and it may be appropriate to bring a resolution forward on the matter.

Faculty Senate  
University of Notre Dame  
Meeting of November 7, 2006  
(Revised)

6. Academic Affairs Committee report.

SPF standards for renewal and promotion: Judy Fox from the Law School provided a list of issues, among which are those of titles and codification of standards. Chris Maziar met with Colin Jessop, and there will be a larger meeting to discuss the issues further.

President's and Provost's fall speeches: copies are not yet available. The committee will have a separate meeting to discuss the speeches and feedback on them from faculty, in hopes of formulating a list of issues to which to respond.

Use of TCES: Question 17 has taken on inordinate importance. Committee will meet with Dennis Jacobs to find out about the status of TCE reform before taking further measures.

7. Administrative Affairs Committee

The Administrative Affairs committee did not meet or give a report.

No old or new business was raised, and the meeting adjourned at 8:15.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Marvin  
Co-Secretary

Faculty Senate  
University of Notre Dame  
Meeting of November 7, 2006  
(Revised)

**Present**

1. Anthony Trozzolo
2. Christine Becker
3. Colin Jessop
4. Don Sporleder
5. James Rakowski
6. John Adams
7. John Gaski
8. John Robinson
9. John Stamper
10. Julia Marvin
11. Kevin Misiewicz
12. Lei Li
13. Mark Dehmlow
14. Michael  
Brownstein
15. Mike Etzel
16. Nasir Ghiaseddin
17. Noreen Deane-  
Moran
18. Orlando Menes

19. Philippe Collon
20. Salma Saddawi
21. Timothy Ovaert
22. Tom Gresik
23. Robert Howland
24. Seth Brown

**Excused**

25. Charles Barber
26. Claudia Polini
27. Collin Meissner
28. David Klein
29. David Ladouceur
30. Judy Fox
31. Kelly Jordan
32. Linda Sharp
33. Mary Prorok
34. Meredith Chesson
35. Robert Norton
36. Susan Youens

**Absent**

37. Al Miller
38. Barry Keating
39. Carlos Jerez-  
Farran
40. Chris Beesley
41. Gail Bederman
42. Jeff Talley
43. Peter McQuillin
44. Richard Pierce
45. Vaughn McKim

**Departments without  
Representatives**

46. Political Science
47. Psychology
48. Theology
49. Computer Science  
and Engineering
50. Electrical Engr

Minutes  
Faculty Senate  
December 6, 2006

1) The meeting began at 7 pm. Seth Brown chaired. The senators introduced themselves and an opening prayer was offered.

2) Chair's report.

The chair welcomed the evening's guest speaker, John Affleck-Graves, Executive Vice-President of the University, who was present to address questions related to University finances.

3) Guest speaker, John Affleck-Graves.

Affleck-Graves opened with a power point presentation. The first slide highlighted the total operating expenses of Notre Dame and *ca.* twenty peer institutions for 2005. The operating budget of Notre Dame was about \$700 million in 2005, which was considerably lower than most of the other universities included in the graph. Total expenses per FTE student in 2005 were also near the bottom of this grouping.

A percentage breakdown of university sources of revenue in 1994 and 2005 was then presented. Also included on this slide were the targeted percentage revenue sources for 2015. These are summarized below:

- i. Tuition and Fees 2005 = 43%; 2015 = 25%
- ii. Auxiliary (e.g., Bookstore) 2005 = 20%; 2015 = 20%
- iii. Endowment 2005 = 21%; 2015 = 30%
- iv. Grants and Contracts 2005 = 11%; 2015 = 15%
- v. Giving (University societies) 2005 = 6%; 2015 = 10%

Affleck-Graves stressed that tuition at Notre Dame has essentially "maxed-out". Hence, no increases are projected over the next several years. With auxiliary sources of revenue expected to remain steady, increases must necessarily derive from the endowment, grants and contracts, and giving. Society dues have not changed in about 30 years, so dues will be raised and increases in the giving category are thereby expected (although it was acknowledged that some donors may opt out of society memberships when these increases are implemented). The generosity of Notre Dame alumni was duly noted: Princeton, Dartmouth, and Notre Dame are the top three universities in terms of percentage of donor alumni (*ca.* 50%). The endowment has been a major revenue driver in recent years, but the university is conservatively planning on a more modest return on the endowment in the future. Hence, grants and contracts are being earmarked as a major source of future revenue. Income stemming from the contract with NBC and bowl game appearances are mostly applied to undergraduate financial aid, with some being directed to the graduate and professional schools. Vaughn McKim remarked that money derived from grants and contracts is often "contained", for example, to support graduate students and purchase equipment necessary for the funded research, and not necessarily available to the university at large. Affleck-Graves pointed out that some universities (e.g., Princeton) fund graduate student tuition out of grants and contracts.

Vaughn McKim asked for comment on the recent New York Times article that touched on the large amount of revenue (\$61 million) generated by the football program. Affleck-Graves responded that the income from athletics, 90% of which derives from football, is used to fund all varsity and intramural sports and to maintain campus athletic facilities. Affleck-Graves pointed out that only 9 or 10 universities, Notre Dame included, make a profit from their athletic programs.

Philippe Collon indicated that many universities with medical schools are sustained by donations from the pharmaceutical industry--this inflates the proportion of grants and contracts income. The question was raised as to how best to grow grants and contracts dollars. Affleck-

Graves responded that having superior faculty is key, in addition to obtaining seed funding for research projects and improving the campus scientific infrastructure.

John Gaski raised the possibility that Notre Dame's total spending relative to its US News and World Report ranking may position it at the top of an efficiency comparison among peer institutions.

Affleck-Graves expanded on the increase in the operating budget between 1994 (\$292 million) and 2005 (\$702 million). Of this, about \$200 million went to academic initiatives while the remainder went towards central operations (primarily benefits) and was spent under the direction of the executive vice-president and the president. The endowment is currently over 5 billion and has outperformed the market in recent years. Affleck-Graves acknowledged the efforts of Scott Malpass and the investment office in this regard.

A slide tracking the returns on the investment pool and payout over the past several years showed large yearly fluctuations in payout percentage. After the poor market performance in 2001-2002, the board cut spending. Hence, the graph displayed a reduced payout in 2003, despite good returns on the investment pool for that year. Similarly, the payout for 2001-2002 was high, even though losses on the investment pool were incurred during those years. This was attributed to excellent market performance in the preceding years. Affleck-Graves stressed that keeping the payout more level is a major priority, such that deans of the colleges can expect a yearly payout increase of about 5%.

Gail Bederman pointed out the increase in grants and contracts will derive primarily from science and engineering. That means that science and engineering will be sustained by grants and contracts. How will arts and letters be supported? Affleck-Graves indicated that arts and letters support will come from the endowment. He also stressed that the undergraduate mission of the university and the research component should not be at cross-purposes. We can, and do, excel in both areas. Bederman also voiced concern that budget cuts might filter down to the service employees on campus and that more outsourcing might be seen. Affleck-Graves noted that outsourcing is not necessarily a negative, and that it has worked well with respect to the bookstore and its employees.

John Adams asked two questions pertaining to the research infrastructure. The first of these asked how the university planned to grow grants and contracts. The second asked that since the master plan lacked any significant addition to the proposed research infrastructure, what was the plan to have more people doing research. Affleck-Graves answered the first question by saying that the faculty will be more productive and the second question by saying that a new small engineering building was in the planning phase.

Seth Brown directed Affleck-Graves' attention to the four questions generated by the benefits committee. The first of these concerned faculty salaries and cost of living (COL) pay raises. Affleck-Graves emphasized that faculty salaries are competitive when factoring in the low COL associated with the South Bend area. Also, faculty can expect significant salary increases upon promotion, otherwise yearly raises will reflect the COL increase. Nasir Ghiaseddin pointed out that raises were lagging behind inflation and other senators agreed. Affleck-Graves said that, on average, faculty raises exceed the COL. In light of these disparate views, Ghiaseddin and Affleck-Graves agreed to share their respective figures/data with one another. Tom Gresik suggested that raises accompanying promotions should be separately financed. Otherwise, money available to the department chairs for COL salary increases is depleted. Regarding how Notre Dame faculty salaries compare to those at peer institutions, Affleck-Graves responded that they have been declining in recent years, but that a plan is in place to boost faculty compensation.

The second question asked what incentives exist to encourage faculty, especially senior, tenured faculty to pursue competitive external funding. Affleck-Graves responded that professors should be motivated by their commitment to their discipline and not driven by salary. Philippe Collon pointed out that the NSF budget makes no allowances for expenditures incurred by undergraduates conducting research. This is a serious limitation when competing for NSF dollars. Seth Brown raised the possibility of implementing differential salaries. Affleck-Graves affirmed

that the university must adopt more of a “market” culture with respect to differential salaries and teaching loads. He noted that at some other peer universities, professors can buy down their teaching load with research dollars.

The third question: Of the top 25 Ph.D. granting universities (US News & World Report) only Notre Dame and Dartmouth do not match retirement contributions for summer salaries. What are ND’s plans for providing this matching contribution? Affleck-Graves responded that the university is working on this matter and there are at least two options to examine: insuring a pension contribution with every paycheck received, or establishing a budget-neutral special class of faculty with respect to summer salary.

The last question was directed as to how faculty participation in the budgeting process can be increased. Affleck-Graves replied that faculty play a role through their department chairs and college deans. Vaughn McKim noted that in the past, a Faculty Budget Priorities Committee had existed. This committee approached the Board with recommendations on spending. Though no longer extant, such a committee represents an additional approach to faculty input on the budget.

Kevin Misiewicz asked about the decision process for spending bowl money. Affleck-Graves said that this decision is made solely at the discretion of the President. Misiewicz also asked about the need for new dormitory construction. Affleck-Graves stressed that residence life is a cornerstone of Notre Dame’s character and that the University actually lags behind the national average with respect to individual student space. James Rakowski asked if Notre Dame was experiencing too much or too little faculty turnover. Affleck-Graves replied that he regards the turnover rate as about right. Gail Bederman mentioned that the turnover rate is higher for women faculty, which Affleck-Graves also acknowledged. He also remarked that as the university continues to improve, greater faculty turnover has to be expected.

The senate broke for committee meetings at 8:30 pm and reconvened at 8:45 pm.

#### 4) Committee Reports

Academic Affairs: Committee chair Colin Jessop was not in attendance, but filed a report that was read by Seth Brown. A joint meeting of the Academic Affairs committee with an organization of Special Professional Faculty (SPF) members was held on November 30<sup>th</sup>. Associate Provosts Jean Ann Linney and Chris Maziar also attended. It was agreed that current SPF titles have little meaning outside of Notre Dame. Linney requested that the SPF submit suggestions for new titles. Issues related to SPF promotion were also discussed and are an ongoing concern of the committee. The Academic Affairs committee will also be meeting with the provost to specifically discuss his October address to the university. Also, Associate Provost Dennis Jacobs has agreed to meet with the committee to discuss the status of the TCE situation.

Administrative Affairs: Charlie Barber reported. The working committee assembled to revise the academic articles will be meeting in January and February to review the suggested changes and to put a draft in place early next semester for the university community to examine. Many of the proposed revisions relate to SPF descriptions and categories. The committee also plans to return to the topic of minority faculty recruitment and retention.

Benefits: Nasir Ghiaseddin reported. The committee discussed the discrepancy between their assessment of salary raises/inflation compared with that of Affleck-Graves. Data will be compiled and exchanged with Affleck-Graves and his office.

Student Affairs: Kelly Jordan reported. The committee will meet with the Honor Committee representative before the next Faculty Senate meeting to review the salient features of the new Honor Code program and to communicate these to the faculty. Campus security issues and guidelines were also discussed. The campus Student Life Committee will soon be promoting issues

related to student campus safety. Safety in off-campus housing will also be included. The status of graduate student health care was also raised in committee. Next year will be a bridge year in making our plan competitive with that of peer research universities. Vaughn McKim asked if the newly remodeled Student Health Center could be a first response option for graduate students and their families. Tim Schoenharl, the graduate student representative in attendance, responded that the center is indeed a part of basic care. When the center is closed, the other option for graduate students is emergency room care. Further discussion of the current status of graduate student health care ensued. While the plan for single graduate students is reasonable, the current family plan is viewed as inadequate.

5) Old/New Business. None Raised

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Mary Prorok, co-secretary

Attendance Roster

December 6, 2006

**Present**

Anthony Trozzolo  
Carlos Jerez-Farran  
Charles Barber  
Claudia Polini  
Dan Lindley  
David Klein  
David Ladouceur  
Don Sporleder  
Gail Bederman  
James Rakowski  
John Adams  
John Gaski  
John Robinson  
John Stamper  
Judy Fox  
Kelly Jordan  
Kevin Misiewicz  
Lei Li  
Mark Dehmlow  
Mary Prorok  
Michael Brownstein  
Mike Etzel  
Nasir Ghiaseddin  
Noreen Deane-Moran  
Orlando Menes  
Philippe Collon  
Robert Howland  
Robert Norton  
Salma Saddawi  
Seth Brown  
Susan Youens  
Timothy Ovaert  
Tom Gresik  
Vaughn McKim  
Dan Lapsley  
Tim Schoenharl

**Excused**

Al Miller  
Barry Keating  
Chris Beesley  
Christine Becker  
Collin Meissner  
Colin Jessop  
Jeff Talley  
Julia Marvin  
Linda Sharp  
Meredith Chesson

**Absent**

Peter McQuillin  
Richard Pierce

**Departments without  
Representatives**

Theology  
Computer Science and  
Engineering  
Electrical Engr

## Minutes of the Faculty Senate Session of February 6, 2007

The meeting opened at 7:03 with a prayer. Professor Brown gave the Chairs's Report.

After the Chair's Report, Professor Brown asked Professor *Jessop* to report to the Senate on the results of his survey of Notre Dame's Early Childhood Development Center (ECDC). Professor *Jessop* explained that the Center is really a spin-off of the Early Childhood Development Center that has existed at St. Mary's College for several decades and is still functioning today. Notre Dame's ECDC opened in 1986. It is located on Bulla Road, just east of Juniper Road. It serves just short of 200 children between the ages of 3 to 5 each year. All of the children served by Notre Dame's ECDC are the children of Notre Dame faculty, staff, or students. Unfortunately each year there are between 50 and 70 children of Notre Dame faculty, staff, and students who are, in principle, eligible for admission to ECDC but who don't go there because ECDC is filled to capacity. In addition to the overcrowding issue, there are some parents who find the cost of sending their children to ECDC to be prohibitive. There are also some parents who would like to have a facility like ECDC for children who are younger than three years old.

Professor Jessop explained that he has been asked by John Affleck-Graves to serve on a committee tasked with coming up with solutions to the problems just sketched. One apparently attractive solution to two of the problems just sketched - expanding the ECDC building so that it could serve more children every day - won't work because the current ECDC building is so located that its expansion is, as a practical matter, impossible. A second apparently attractive solution to all three of those problems - a commitment by the University to spend significantly more money each year on ECDC appears to be impracticable in light of the University's current spending priorities. Other potential solutions, Professor Jessop explained, are inevitably piecemeal in nature. One of these solutions would involve parents being charged significantly less for a second child at ECDC than for the first child who is there. Another would involve encouraging parents of wait-listed children to enroll them at the ECDC at St. Mary's College.

In the discussion that followed Professor Jessop's presentation, a consensus seemed to emerge in favor of encouraging the University Administration to invest in the expansion of ECDC and in subsidizing the services that it provides. Consideration of proposing a Senate resolution to that effect was referred to the Administrative Affairs Committee of the Senate.

After Professor Jessop's presentation, the Senate broke into committee meetings. After it reconvened, Professor Etzel was unanimously elected as chair of the Administrative Affairs Committee, succeeding Charlie Barber, who stepped down. In this committee chair's report, Professor Etzel said that his committee would not offer any resolution on the ECDC situation to the Senate until after Professor Jessop had met with his colleagues on the Ad Hoc Committee on ECDC and negotiated further with the University administration with regard to the problems that he had sketched in his report. Professor Etzel also reported that his committee would be involved in the review of the University's Academic Articles that is to take place this spring.

Professor Kelly Jordan, the chair of the Student Affairs Committee, reported on the Committee's meeting with Professor Thomas Flint, who oversees the implementation undergraduate Honor Code. Professor Jordan said that the committee was generally pleased with the tutorial on the Honor Code that all of our incoming undergrads are required to view. Professor Jordan also reported that there is some sentiment on his committee in favor of developing a common honor-code pledge that all undergrads would be asked to take. Professor Jordan reported, further that his committee is looking into the procedures that should be followed in the event of a classroom emergency of one sort or another, with a view towards the development of better guidelines for those situations. Professor Jordan reported, finally, that Professor Donald Pope-Davis, the Dean of the Graduate School, is making progress on a set of problems that relate to providing health-care insurance for our graduate students. Professor Pope-Davis's report on this matter should, Professor Jordan said, be released in April. The Senate will need to act promptly on that report if its views are to be heard.

Professor Nasir Ghiaseddin, the chair of the Benefits Committee, reported on the committee's discussion of John Affleck-Graves recent letter on salary increases. With regard to that letter, Professor Ghiaseddin expressed some concern about the accuracy of the inflation rate that was used in it. On another front, Professor Ghiaseddin reported that the committee had expressed concern with the slow pace at which health insurance claims are reimbursed. In discussion following Professor Ghiaseddin's report, one senator said that, when a family's health insurance claims reach a certain amount (\$250,000 was the figure used.), reimbursement becomes particularly difficult, leading Professor Ghiaseddin to speculate that the University may need to reconsider its current insurance policy governing catastrophic injuries.

Professor Jessop, the Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, reported on the committee's meeting. Its first item of business was to prepare for a committee meeting with Dennis Jacobs that was scheduled to take place later in the month. At that meeting, Professor John Gaski promised to make the case for more effective exploitation of the data that is collected by way of the Teacher Course Evaluation form that is currently in use at Notre Dame. The committee's second (and related) item of business was a discussion of how the ACPET process (where "ACPET" refers to "The Advisory Committee to the Provost on the Evaluation of Teaching") applies to the special professional faculty. That discussion, Professor Jessop said, led to a general discussion about the need for greater transparency in the way that tenure and promotion decisions are made.

After the committee reports had been made, Professor Brown opened the floor for new business. In response, Professor McKim suggested that the Senate look into the Integrity Initiative currently underway in the University. Professor McKim expressed concern both about the process by way of which this initiative came into being and about the form that it has taken, especially with regard to collegiality. Professor Brown referred the matter to the Administrative Affairs Committee. Finally, Professor Sporleder announced that April 8 to April 14 would be a special week for our School of Architecture, culminating in a symposium on the ideal college down on April 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup>.

At 9: 34 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.

Faculty Senate  
March 7, 2007

1) The meeting began at 7 pm. Seth Brown chaired. The senators introduced themselves and the opening prayer was offered by David Klein.

2) Chair's report.

The Chair brought four items to the Senate's attention:

i) Because the Senate has not met with Father Jenkins this year, an invitation was extended to him to have dinner with the Faculty Senate. Father Jenkins has accepted this invitation and a dinner/meeting will be scheduled in late March or April as Father Jenkins' schedule permits.

ii) The Chair made mention that he is sitting on a recently formed University committee that will explore how best to recruit outstanding Catholic faculty. The chair will soon send out a general e-mail asking faculty to report on practices (good or bad) that they have seen implemented during the interviewing/hiring processes for prospective Catholic faculty.

iii) As the new Senate will convene in May, the chair asked the current Senate to consider nominations for new officers. The nominating committee will be chaired by Philippe Collon.

iv) The current Senate has issued few formal proposals and resolutions this academic year. If a Faculty Senate committee wishes to put a proposal or resolution forward during the current academic year, this must be done at, or before, the final meeting (in April) of the '06 Senate.

The senate broke for committee meetings at 7:15 pm and reconvened at 7:55 pm.

3) Committee Reports

Administrative Affairs: Mike Etzel reported. The first issue discussed was the status of the Academic Articles revision. The floor was given to Charlie Barber, who mentioned that a draft of the revised articles was imminent. Discussion of their circulation prior to the April meeting of the Academic Council was not yet resolved. Barber stated that he would advocate their presentation to the entire Faculty Senate. Approval of the revised articles was originally slated for the May '07 meeting of the Board of Trustees, but this deadline is not likely to be met.

Secondly, it is the intent of the Administrative Affairs committee to put forth a resolution on the recently concluded ECDC review. The committee will draft a resolution when a formal report on the ECDC review is issued by Colin Jessop and other members of the ECDC review team.

Academic Affairs: Mark Dehmlow reported. The committee discussed their recent meeting with Dennis Jacobs regarding the status of TCEs. The meeting included a discussion of the move to an on-line format for TCEs and the advantages of using a multi-item measure versus a single-item (Question 17) measure for evaluation. Vaughn McKim questioned the mechanics of the on-line TCEs and how student responses might differ between a TCE completed on-line and one that is filled out in the classroom. The motivation for the on-line format was also questioned. It was acknowledged that on-line forms will clearly expedite processing and tabulation. Departments can also tailor on-line TCEs. Seth Brown pointed out that the on-line format circumvents a problem that can arise in smaller classes, i.e., the possibility that an instructor may recognize students' handwriting. Mark Dehmlow indicated that the on-line format is not necessarily permanent and that the move to on-line evaluations can be considered a pilot study.

Benefits: David Klein reported. The Benefits committee has recently met with Denise Murphy from Human Resources to discuss health care issues. The meeting focused on the prevention and wellness programs that are being proposed for university employees. Studies suggest that employers save three to six dollars for each dollar invested in such programs. As currently planned, employees would voluntarily complete a health risk questionnaire (*ca.* 60 questions) to provide a medical profile that would drive the selection of a wellness/prevention program for participants who are at risk of developing medical conditions. The committee has concerns about the privacy of this initiative since the employee's name and e-mail address must be provided on the questionnaire. However, the university plans to use a third party, possibly WebMD, to screen the questionnaires and generate profiles. Lifestyle coaches will then contact and work with high-risk individuals. As incentive to participate, the University will deduct \$10 from the monthly premiums of each employee who completes the questionnaire. Some discussion followed, with senators voicing their concerns about both the effectiveness and intrusiveness of the program. Linda Sharp suggested that the questionnaire is "self-selecting" insofar as those involved in high-risk behaviors and life styles are not likely to participate, while more health-conscious individuals will comply. Noreen Deane-Moran voiced a concern regarding the professional qualifications of the lifestyle coaches and their ability to direct a program that is suitable for each participant. David Klein indicated that the questionnaire (a prototype was distributed at the meeting) has not been finalized and can be revised. It was suggested that a straw poll be conducted to more accurately gauge the Senate's disposition on this topic. The question, as formulated by Seth Brown, asked the Senators if they had an objection to having the University move forward with the prevention/wellness plan. Seven senators objected, while thirteen did not object.

Student Affairs: Kelly Jordan reported. The committee is drafting a resolution related to the new graduate student health care plan. The resolution will stress that the plan should be comprehensive and be comparable to plans offered at peer institutions. Also, there are some concerns that some levels of care might be dropped in the new health care package. Hence, the resolution will state opposition to any compromise in the current coverage. With the assumption that better health care will attract better graduate students, it is the view of the committee that improved health care for graduate students is in keeping with the University's goal of improving its profile as a research institute. The health care plan is due to be unveiled in May or June.

4) Colin Jessop reported on the Academic Affairs committee meeting with Dennis Jacobs regarding TCEs. Discussion points included the advantage of using a combination of TCE questions for evaluating teaching effectiveness as opposed to question 17. The operationalization of ACPET, the Advisory Committee to the Provost on the Evaluation of Teaching, was also discussed. The perception that instructors may be inclined to "teach" to the TCE was also mentioned. The latest ACPET report recommended reducing the emphasis on TCEs in important tenure/promotion decisions. It was suggested that four other elements should also be considered: Course design, implementation, evaluation of student work, and student perceptions. (These are further expanded upon in the document "Evaluating a T & R Faculty Member's Teaching" that was made available at the meeting). In short, a department is expected to closely follow a candidate's teaching history for several years and use more comprehensive criteria for tenure and promotion decisions. These ACPET recommendations will not apply to SPF. Evaluation of SPF teaching will be done in a department-specific manner.

The administration agrees on the value of multi-item TCEs. During the meeting with Jacobs, the question was raised as to whether TCEs actually improve teaching. It has been noted that the number of favorable TCEs has increased along with grades. Dennis Jacobs believes that the review of teaching should be more transparent. Because of a vacated position on ACPET, a third

member of the Faculty Senate is required to sit on the committee. Colin Jessop nominated John Gaski. He accepted the nomination and was elected by affirmation. It was asked if there had been any student input on the new approach to evaluating teaching. Seth Brown said that there had been student involvement in the early stages of the TCE overhaul. It was noted that ACPET does not have a student representative. The question of student compliance on completion of the on-line TCE forms was raised. Colin Jessop mentioned that some incentives are being discussed. Yale, for instance, releases grades earlier for those students who complete their on-line evaluations

Colin Jessop also provided an update on the ECDC review. A Faculty Senate resolution supporting the expansion of ECDC is to be drafted soon. The ECDC review committee recently met with John Affleck-Graves. He recommended that the Senate should forward a proposal to the Provost after reading the ECDC committee report.

5) Old/New Business. None Raised

Meeting adjourned at 8:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Mary Prorok, co-secretary

Attendance Roster

March 7, 2007

**Present**

Anthony Trozzolo  
Carlos Jerez-Farran  
Charles Barber  
Claudia Polini  
Collin Meissner  
Colin Jessop  
Dan Lapsley  
Dan Lindley  
David Klein  
Don Sporleder  
James Rakowski  
John Gaski  
John Adams  
John Robinson  
Kelly Jordan  
Kevin Misiewicz  
Lei Li  
Linda Sharp  
Mary Prorok  
Mark Dehmlow  
Michael Brownstein  
Mike Etzel  
Noreen Deane-Moran  
Orlando Menes  
Robert Howland  
Salma Saddawi  
Seth Brown  
Susan Youens  
Tim Schoenharl  
Vaughn McKim

**Excused**

Al Miller  
Barry Keating  
Chris Beesley  
Christine Becker  
David Ladouceur  
Gail Bederman  
Judy Fox  
Jeff Talley  
  
Julia Marvin  
Meredith Chesson  
Nasir Ghiaseddin  
Philippe Collon  
Robert Norton  
Tom Gresik  
Timothy Ovaert  
John Stamper

**Departments without**

**Representatives**

Theology  
Computer Science and  
Engineering  
Electrical Eng

**Absent**

Peter McQuillin  
Richard Pierce

Minutes  
Faculty Senate  
April 10, 2007

After the members present introduced themselves, Colin\* Jessup\* offered an opening prayer.

#### 1. Chair's Report

Seth Brown opened with thanks to all senators, especially those concluding their terms, and announced the evening's agenda items. The May meeting will be Tuesday, May 15, at 7 pm.

Philippe Collon urged members to run for offices in the Senate and noted issues that may be on next year's agenda.

#### 2. Review of Revision of Academic Articles

Charles Barber gave background on the process of the decennial review. The committee sought to resolve inconsistencies and bring language in line with actual current practice. The section on the appeals process has not been substantially changed but will be up for separate revision next year. He pointed out notable changes in the articles, of which copies including the proposed revisions, as well as an overview summary sheet, were distributed.

Discussion followed. A senator pointed out a number of places for which a fuller description of complete decision-making processes would be helpful and said that the language would generally benefit from further refinement. A senator suggested that the three- rather than six-month termination notice for one-year positions (in III.3) was too short. A senator raised a question on the appointment of deans (in I.4) with no faculty input beyond election of members to the search committee. A senator suggested that procedures for hiring the provost (II.1) could preserve confidentiality while including more faculty input, while another noted the limitations of making only tenured faculty eligible to serve on the search committee. A senator queried the language of the characterization of faculty responsibilities in III.12. Seth Brown reviewed the outcome for issues previously noted for the committee by the Faculty Senate, and there was discussion of whether further revision was still called for. The question was raised of adequate legal review of the articles from the perspective of all parties involved (both administrative and faculty).

An ad hoc committee was formed to follow up on these and any other issues that might arise concerning the articles, and then to report to the full Senate: John Robinson, Charles Barber, and Seth Brown.

John Robinson moved that the Faculty Senate recommend that the Academic Council postpone final action on the decennial review of the Academic Articles until after the Faculty Senate has had opportunity to study the proposed revisions and to make recommendations regarding them. Vaughn McKim seconded. Debate followed. The question was called, debate ended, and the resolution approved by voice vote.

### 3. Resolution from the Student Affairs Committee on Graduate Student Health Insurance

Kelly Jordan explained that the resolution was intended basically to express support for the Graduate Student Union's call for a better health plan, rather than to advocate specifics at this point in the process.

The floor was opened for debate. A senator noted the lack of "family" rhetoric, often employed at Notre Dame. Kelly Jordan noted that the resolution instead emphasizes the resolution's congruence with the University's major goal of improving as a research university. A senator who had previously served as a director of graduate studies for his department said that he had found stipends and improved health plans to be an either-or proposition: Kelly Jordan said that he believed it was no longer a zero-sum game. A senator noted that the net cost differed for graduate students in different colleges and programs and questioned the fairness of the situation; another senator argued that students in programs such as MBA and Law had different expectations for earning potential compared to, e.g., Ph.D. students in the humanities—for him the salient question was the competitiveness of Notre Dame admissions packages compared to those in other schools.

The question was called, debate ended, and the resolution approved by voice vote.

### 4. Resolution from the Academic Affairs Committee on Course Evaluations

John Gaski offered a brief review, with handout, of scholarly literature on the increased reliability and validity of multiple-item measures rather than single-item measures, by way of questioning the University's high reliance on Q. 17 in isolation to assess quality of teaching and suggesting that the University would be better served by using multiple-item scales. He noted that the issue under discussion was not the appropriateness of student evaluations as such, but how to make the best possible use and most accurate recording of student evaluations.

The floor was opened for debate. Questions of the consistency of scaling and language of the questions were raised, and the discussion refocused on the resolution itself, with some concern expressed for the accessibility of its language to readers untutored in the subject, depending on its intended audience.

The question was called, debate ended, and the resolution passed by voice vote.

### 5. Treasurer's Report

David Klein went over the year's expenditures; the Faculty Senate will run moderately over its quite small budget this year because of the upcoming dinner with Fr. Jenkins. It was noted that the administrative assistant's salary is not part of the budget but is instead paid by the provost's office.

The meeting was adjourned at 9 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Marvin  
Co-Secretary

Attendance Roster  
April 10, 2007

**Present**

Anthony Trozzolo  
Barry Keating  
Carlos Jerez-Farran  
Charles Barber  
Christine Becker  
Colin Jessop  
Collin Meissner  
Dan Lapsley  
Dan Lindley  
David Klein  
David Ladouceur  
Don Sporleder  
Gail Bederman  
James Rakowski  
John Adams  
John Gaski  
John Robinson  
John Stamper  
Julia Marvin  
Kelly Jordan  
Kevin Misiewicz  
Lei Li  
Linda Sharp  
Mark Dehmlow  
Mike Etzel  
Nasir Ghiaseddin  
Noreen Deane-Moran  
Orlando Menes  
Philippe Collon  
Robert Howland  
Robert Norton

Salma Saddawi  
Seth Brown  
Susan Youens  
Tim Schoenharl  
Timothy Ovaert  
Tom Gresik  
Vaughn McKim

**Excused**

Al Miller  
Claudia Polini  
Judy Fox  
Jeff Talley  
Mary Prorok  
Michael Brownstein  
Meredith Chesson

**Absent**

Peter McQuillin  
Richard Pierce

**Departments without**

**Representatives**

Theology  
Computer Science and  
Engineering  
Electrical Eng

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Tuesday, May 15, 2007  
MINUTES

Susan Youens, Nominating Committee Chair, called the meeting to order.

**Nominations and elections for Executive Committee members:**

The following members were elected Faculty Senate Executive Committee positions:

- Chair – Colin Jessop
- Vice Chair – Mark Dehmlow
- Secretary and Co Secretary – unfilled, no current volunteers
- Treasurer – David Klein
- Colin Jessop then assumed control of the session.

**Guest, Dennis Jacobs, Associate Provost, discussion of online TCE's**

Refinement of the teacher course evaluation process had been brought to the Academic Affairs Committee. At that time, it became apparent that the University was considering moving TCEs to an online format. This proposal sparked comments among Faculty Senate members, many of whom solicited the opinion of colleagues in their home departments.

Jessop summarized the concerns that had been brought forward by these members:

- Compliance – Under the current in-class paper format, the professor has at least some control over compliance. Since the TCE is relevant for the tenure and promotion process, it is important to collect this information as thoroughly as possible.
- Technical concerns – If students were to experience technical difficulties that often accompany online surveys, would they be motivated enough to work through the problems and complete the survey?
- Student motivation and sample bias – There is concern that only those students with a grievance would be motivated enough to complete the online survey, and therefore produce a biased sample.
- Comparative evaluation – If students complete evaluations of all courses at once, there might be a tendency to score them in a ranked or comparative fashion. This might exacerbate the rating differences between required vs. elective, or large vs. small courses
- Environment – Some faculty felt that it was more appropriate to conduct the TCE in the classroom environment which they had created during the semester.

Jacobs described the process which led to the proposed changes to the TCE. The process began with an attempt to expand the factors used to evaluate quality of teaching beyond the TCE. Weaknesses in the TCE itself were also identified, including: rigid questions that are not always applicable, misinterpretation of scores, focus on a single score, and lack useful feedback for improvement.

Jacobs noted the following benefits of moving to an online system:

- Chain of custody - The current system has several places where chain of custody and control of the TCE is weak, both in the classroom administration and collection of completed forms. In an online system, each student would log into the system, and complete only one evaluation per enrolled course. This system would not prevent absent students from completing an evaluation. Jessop asked whether there was any concern about student anonymity with an online system. Jacobs responded that no identifying data is linked to the evaluation once it is submitted. While the University would need to create a policy statement to confirm this anonymity, peer institutions who have implemented an online system have not found this to be a problem.

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Tuesday, May 15, 2007  
MINUTES

- Tiered questions – An online system would provide more flexibility to design a tiered question set. The first portion of questions would be used across the University, followed by questions that are college or division specific, then environment specific (large lecture, discussion, studio, laboratory), and finally instructor specific questions. The resulting data can be brought back into appropriate divisions for comparisons. Students and instructors would see a more appropriate set of questions for their course.

Jacobs addressed some of the concerns expressed by faculty:

- Response rate – With the current system, University-wide response rate is in the mid 70% range. Peer institutions with online systems generally have a response rate of 70-80%. In cases where the instructor stresses the value of the evaluation, response rates can be in the 90% range. Jacobs does not believe that the response rate would be vastly different if the University switched to an online format.
- Potential for biased response – Vanderbilt University compared paper vs. online evaluations across sections and semesters, and found no significant difference in the mean scores.

Godmilow asked whether the results of free response questions would still be kept private. Jacobs confirmed that the faculty members would still have full control over the free response comments. There is no change of policy being proposed for this information. Jacobs added that true anonymity on the free response questions was one of the advantages of the online system. There have been a number of cases, in particular in the Graduate School, where students have complained that their comments were not treated anonymously due to recognition of their handwriting by the faculty member.

Stamper asked how the online system would be introduced and whether a pilot study would be conducted. Jacobs responded that the ACPET (Advisory Committee to the Provost on the Evaluation of Teaching), is currently considering both the types of questions that could be asked in the tiered system and evaluating the technical requirements and commercial products available.

A member of the Senate asked whether the automated system was more cost efficient and could a faculty member see linked responses from an individual student. Jacobs believes that an online system would be cost neutral, with lower costs and time required for administration, but an increased cost of software licensing fees. He was unsure about the reporting of information, and whether it was possible for an instructor to see responses from each individual.

Godmilow asked whether departments could design their own questions, given that this information would then be used for tenure decisions. Jacobs responded that departments could design their own questions in the tiered system, and the results would also be compared within the appropriate tier. Cross-listed courses could be evaluated under either department tier and for team taught courses, specific questions could be provided for each instructor.

A senator followed up on the issue of availability of free response comments. He noted that making comments available would provide more information to students, and in fact a biased subset of comments is already available on NDToday.com. There was concern that an online format might promote more irresponsible comments, given the NDToday example. Jacobs responded that the informing course selection initiative will make available some student comments. He felt that students would buy into the system if the online evaluation were implemented along with the other initiatives.

Jacobs reported that the technical evaluation team is currently exploring software options, and that the ACPET will continue to meet over the summer to design questions. At the earliest a limited pilot would be run in December 2007, with the earliest implementation in Spring 2008. All question content will go through Academic and College Councils for approval. Godmilow

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Tuesday, May 15, 2007  
MINUTES

requested increased representation on the ACPET from the Arts, and indicated that she would participate as a representative for the Arts from the Faculty Senate.

The Senate discussed the possibility of incentives to encourage student participation in the TCE. Jacobs noted that Yale requires evaluation (with an opt out option) to access semester grades. This has resulted in a very high response rate. The committee is considering other methods including, repeated email reminders, Ipod raffle, or selective release of Course Selection information.

A senator asked whether the real issue with the current TCE was in fact the instrument itself, not the method used to collect the data. If this is true, then how could the new system be justified? Jacobs cited increased customization as one of the key benefits to an online system. The senator expressed concern about evaluating teaching across divisions with a variety of instruments being used. High stakes tenure and promotion decisions might in the end be made only based on the University-wide questions.

Jacobs indicated that he would accept continued comments on the matter via email. ([Jacobs.2@nd.edu](mailto:Jacobs.2@nd.edu))

#### **Nomination and election of Standing Committee Chairs**

Members recessed to standing committee sessions and selected a committee chair and outlined committee agendas.

- Academic Affairs selected John Robinson as Chair (pending confirmation of his participation). The Committee agenda includes: changes to the TCE, representation on TCE committee, information for selecting courses, grade inflation, University drop date, University Calendar, University Libraries, and classroom space shortage.
- Administrative Affairs selected Seth Brown as Chair. The committee plans to follow revision of Academic Articles, Catholic identity and hiring policy, and ECDC expansion.
- Benefits Committee selected Nasir Ghiassedin as Chair. The Committee will address rate of salary increase, inconsistency of death benefit, and the overall sense of community.
- Student Affairs selected Tom Noble as Committee Chair. The committee will address changes to the graduate student Commencement, and other topics of ongoing work of the Committee.

#### **Benefit Committee Report**

N. Ghiaseddin, Benefits Committee Chair, announced that the University will contribute to retirement for summer research income (if tied to salary), beginning next year.

#### **Appointment of representatives to additional Committees**

- Traffic Appeals Committee – John Shafer, one remaining position available.
- Campus Life Committee – Jill Goodmilow, Kristin Lewis
- Student Senate - Tom Noble, one remaining position available
- Bookstore Advisory Committee – Susan Youens, Nasir Ghiaseddin.

Jessop adjourned the meeting.