

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