1. The meeting was called to order at 7:40 P.M. by the Chairman, Professor Gerald L. Jones, who called on Reverend Leonard N. Banas for the opening prayer.

2. Old Business - As a matter of information for the members of the Senate, Professor Jones reported on results of recent campus elections.

   a. Student Life Council
      1) Professor Julian R. Pleasants
      2) Ms. Maureen L. Gleason
      3) Professor Thomas A. Werge

   b. Advanced Student Affairs Council (by the Graduate Council)
      Professor James P. Danehy

   c. Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees
      1) Professor Philip J. Gleason
      2) Professor Thomas R. Swartz

   d. Members of the Academic Council selected by College Councils to serve ex officio on the Faculty Senate
      1) Professor James E. Robinson - Arts and Letters
      2) Professor Mario Picconi - Business Administration
      3) The College Councils of the Colleges of Science and Engineering have not as yet selected an ex officio Senator.

3. Mr. Richard Lynch was called out of town and so was unable to address the Faculty Senate concerning University budget matters. He will be invited to address the Faculty Senate in the next academic year.

4. Standing Committee Reports

   a. The Committee on Administration and the Committee on Faculty Affairs had no report to make at this meeting.

   b. Student Affairs Committee
      1) Professor John J. Uhran gave a summary report on the Activities of the Student Life Council.
2) Professors Uhran and Michael L. Doria gave a presentation of a Report on Campus Security. After an extensive discussion and slight modification the report was accepted by the Faculty Senate without dissent.

5. Changes in Membership of the Faculty Senate

a. Retiring Members
   Salvatore J. Bella          William H. Leahy
   E. William Chapin          Robert Leader
   Frederick Dow              Albert Miller
   William M. Fairley         Gerhart Niemeyer
   Thomas S. Fern             Albert A. Nordin
   Edward A. Goerner          William G. Storey
   Richard W. Greene          Thomas R. Swartz
   Theodore B. Ivanus         Dolores W. Tantoco (resigning)
   Richard Lamanna
   Kenneth Lauer

b. New Members - term expiring in 1976
   Kenneth Jameson - Economics
   Vincent DeSantis - History
   Elizabeth Fiorenza - Theology
   James Bellis - Sociology and Anthropology
   Waldemar Goulet - Finance
   Linda Hildebrand - Library
   Paul A. Rathburn - English
   Joseph A. Tihen - Biology
   Joseph Scott - Sociology and Anthropology (term expires 1974)

c. Ex officio Members
   (Listed above)

6. New Officers for 1973-74

   Chairman: Norman B. Haaser
   Vice Chairman: James P. Danehy
   Secretary: James T. Cushing
   Treasurer: Paul F. Conway

7. Acting Chairmen of Standing Committees

   Faculty Affairs: Rev. Leonard N. Banas, C.S.C.
   Administration: Joseph A. Tihen
   Student Affairs: Daniel H. Winicur
8. On the motion of Professor Paul A. Rathburn, seconded by Professor John J. Lyon, the Senate expressed its thanks to Professor Gerald L. Jones for his excellent year of service to the Senate as Chairman.

Respectfully submitted,

Norman B. Haaser
Acting Secretary
Professor Norman Haaser called the meeting to order at 7:35 P.M. and then opened it with the Lord's Prayer.

Twenty-eight members were in attendance.

The minutes of the May 7, 1973 meeting, reproduced in Notre Dame Report 18 (1972-73), were approved without change by a unanimous voice vote.

Professor Haaser informed the Senate that Professor Charles Murdock had resigned from the Student Life Council since he will be on leave for the current academic year. His term expires in the spring of 1974. There was no objection raised to the traditional procedure of filling a resigned post with the candidate having the second largest number of votes in the election held for that office. Accordingly, Professor Joseph Nahas will replace Professor Murdock. Faculty representation on the Student Life Council now stands as follows. The date of expiration of each term is given in parentheses.

Ms. Maureen L. Gleason (1975)
Professor Joseph J. Nahas (1974)
Professor Julian R. Pleasants (1975)
Professor John Roos (1974)
Professor Fred W. Syburg (1974)
Professor Thomas Werge (1975)

The Senate then discussed a suggestion by Professor Cushing that the notes of Faculty Senate meetings list the names of those members who do not attend a given meeting and who provide no explanation for such absence. Professor Jones, last year's Senate Chairman, stated that in 1972-73 there were thirteen members, most from the College of Arts and Letters, who attended no meetings, in spite of the fact that he had asked every member of the Senate by letter whether or not they would be able to serve and suggested that those who were not resign so that their colleges could replace them. Apparently there has been some problem in the past about people having been elected to the Senate without having first been asked whether or not they would be willing to stand as nominees. In response to a suggestion that written approval be a precondition for nomination to stand for election, Professor Haaser pointed out that the Faculty Senate has no control over the college elections, this being the business of the nominating committees in the various colleges. Professor Haaser will contact each nominating committee.
to discuss this problem before the elections in the spring of 1974. It was also suggested that the Senate Bylaws be changed to make attendance a requirement for continued Senate membership.

Professor Cushing then made a formal motion, seconded by Professor Lyon, that all unexplained absences be recorded in the minutes to each Faculty Senate meeting. The motion was carried by a unanimous voice vote.

Professor Conway asked that the Senate poll all faculty members in the University about their willingness to serve in various elected offices (e.g., College Councils, Faculty Senate, Student Life Council, etc.). The returns from this poll would then be turned over to the appropriate nominating committees in the University to provide them with lists of potential candidates. Professor Haaser agreed to do this.

The next item of business was an amendment to the Senate Bylaws which had been discussed at the previous meeting and which had been circulated to all Senate members more than the required ten days prior to the present meeting.

The proposal was to replace the present Article II, Section 1 of the Bylaws by

"II. Section 1. The Committees of the Senate shall be an Executive Committee, and standing Committees on the Administration of the University, on Faculty Affairs, and on Student Affairs. The Chairman shall annually appoint each member of the Senate to one of the Standing Committees excepting that members of the Senate who are also members of the Academic Council will not serve on any Standing Committee unless they so request."

This is identical to the current text of this section except for the addition of the underlined phrase.

It was finally decided that the current Bylaws require a simple majority vote of the full Senate membership to amend the Bylaws. (Professor Jones and Tihen acted as our mentors as the Senate faced its first crisis of the year.) Professor Haaser announced that with the resignations of Professor Thomas Jemielity and Professor Paul Rathburn, the active Senate membership stood at forty-five so that the twenty-eight Senators present constituted a majority. The amendment was passed by a voice vote with no dissenters.

As a result of the confusion over the Bylaw requirements which arose in this case, Professor De Santis requested that a copy of the Senate Bylaws be sent to all Senate members. Professor Haaser agreed to do this.

A brief recess was called at 8:00 P.M. to allow the three standing committees of the Senate to caucus and elect permanent Chairmen. The results were the following:
Chairman of Committee on Administration - Professor Richard Lamanna
Chairman of Committee on Faculty Affairs - Professor Leonard Banas
Chairman of Committee on Student Affairs - Professor Daniel Winicur

At 8:20 P.M. Professor Richard Lynch, the University Comptroller, addressed the Senate on University budget procedures and projections. Professor Lynch explained that after the 1969 cash deficit of $937,000 the University budgeting procedure was revised to avoid the budget overruns that had been common prior to that time. The fundamental philosophy adopted was to begin with known or predictable resources and income (exclusive of gifts and endowment income) and to divide these among the various academic and nonacademic areas of fiscal responsibility. On the academic side, for example, each dean, and in turn each department chairman, is informed of the funds available to him for the coming fiscal year. In principle the chairmen and deans can appeal to the Provost for more funds within the over-all fiscal constraints set by the Administration. A lively discussion of this point followed in which several members, and notably Professor De Santis, pointed out that this appeal process has not always been particularly effective in practice in the past.

Professor Lynch responded to several questions from the floor concerning just who it is that makes the initial, largely binding, budget decisions which affect the academic life of the University, the budgetary effect of the 65% (or so) overhead assessed by the University on sponsored research grants, and several other points. Professor Lynch pointed out that the University's fiscal policies now allow it to avoid deficits and to charge the students a tuition which is $300-$500 per year less than other universities considered our academic peers.

In reply to a series of questions by Professor Cushing on the financial statement issued by the University for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972 summarizing the 1970-71 and 1971-72 budgets, Professor Lynch stated that annual unrestricted gifts ranging from one to two million dollars (not listed as an income resource for budget expenditures), which had previously been used for new buildings, is now put directly into the endowment fund and that of the approximately 1.4 million dollars unrestricted income from the endowment, something just over $900,000 was used as revenues for the academic budget, the remainder being put into the endowment fund. He also stated that the University budgets about $11 million a year for faculty salaries.

Professor Jones then observed that the emotional impact of a stated $937,000 deficit for a year is seen in a rather different light when one realizes that the University had available $2-3 million each year which it put directly into the endowment.

At 9:30 P.M. Professor Haaser and the Senate members thanked Professor Lynch for his time and a motion to adjourn was made.
Those members absent without explanation are listed below:

Joseph Bobik (Philosophy)
James Daschbach (Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering)
W. J. Gajda (Electrical Engineering)
Waldemar Goulet (Finance)
Sydney Kelsey (Civil Engineering)
John Kromkowski (Government)
Robert Leader (Arts & Letters)
Paul McLane (English)
Robert Rodes (Law School)
John Roos (Government)
Julian Samora (Sociology and Anthropology)
Joseph Scott (Sociology and Anthropology)
Edward Trubac (Finance)
James Ward (History)
Thomas Werge (English)

Respectfully submitted,

James T. Cushing
Secretary
Faculty Senate
Professor Norman Haaser called the meeting to order at 7:30 P.M. and Father Leonard Banas, C.S.C. opened the meeting with a prayer.

Thirty-two members were in attendance.

Professor Cushing reported that Professor Richard Lynch, the University Comptroller, who had addressed the Faculty Senate on September 25, 1974, requested the following amendments to the Faculty Senate Journal as reported in Volume 3, No. 5, of Notre Dame Report. On page 133 of the Report, fourth paragraph, fifth line, the parenthesis should read "(exclusive of gifts and endowment income in excess of that needed in current operations)," while in the sixth paragraph, lines three through five should read "...1971-72 budgets, Professor Lynch stated that, with respect to the application of unrestricted gifts ranging from one to two million dollars a year, the University is in the process of shifting its priorities from the strong emphasis of recent years on physical plant to the strengthening of our endowment funds... ."

Professor Danehy pointed out that the names of two faculty members on the Student Life Council had been omitted from the minutes. These are Professor James P. Danehy and Professor Daniel H. Winicur.

Professor Goulet objected vigorously to the listing in the minutes of those Faculty Senators who were absent without explanation. He felt that, since the Senate had just passed that resolution at its last meeting, the members of the Senate should have been given a grace period this once.

A motion to approve the minutes as amended was seconded and passed by voice vote with no dissents.

Professor Haaser announced the appointment of an Academic Manual Watchdog Committee constituted as follows:

Professor Paul F. Conway (Finance)
Professor Michael L. Doria (Aerospace)
Professor Gerald Jones (Physics)
Professor James Robinson (English)
The Committee wishes to receive reports on any actions which have been taken in apparent conflict with the new Academic Manual.

The Senate then moved onto the first item of business on the agenda, discussion of a report by Professor Paul McLane on the Step-Rate Retirement Plan at Notre Dame. (Professor McLane's report is appended to the minutes of this meeting.) As the social security base rises, the University's contribution to TIAA-CREF of 10% on earnings in excess of this base actually decreases. Professor Goulet made quantitative comparisons of the present step-rate plan versus Professor McLane's proposed University contribution of a straight 9% of the total faculty salary. For example, with a base pay of $13,200 the University presently contributes $660 to TIAA-CREF, whereas under the proposed plan it would contribute $1056 per year. With the present trend of an increasing social security base, Notre Dame's contribution to a faculty member's retirement fund continues to become less adequate and to fall ever farther behind that made by peer institutions (cf. Professor McLane's report).

In subsequent discussion Professor Rodes suggested that the added cost to the University of the proposed plan would most likely come out of that part of the budget allocated to faculty compensation thereby making faculty salary increases even more meager than they have been recently, which would reduce Notre Dame's competitive position in recruiting qualified faculty to an even more dismal level than at present. Professor Trubac responded that there is no fixed amount in the budget for faculty compensation, but that this is basically decided upon by an assignment of priorities. In the past high priority has been given to development of the physical plant and presently this has been shifted to building the endowment, as Professor Lynch had informed the Senate at its last meeting. As the minutes from that meeting show, the University has for each of the past few years used two to three million dollars from unrestricted gifts and endowment income for what it considered high-priority projects.

Professor DeSantis moved that the Faculty Senate recommend the adoption of a straight level contribution of at least 10% to the faculty retirement plan by the University and that a delegation from the Senate be appointed by the Chairman to discuss this and Professor McLane's report with the President. This motion was carried by a voice vote, Professor Rodes casting the only dissenting vote.
Professor Pasto suggested that the Senate respond to the Priorities Report that appeared in the December, 1973 issue of Notre Dame Magazine. The Senate will return to this under new business at its next meeting.

At 8:35 P.M. Professor Haaser called for a ten-minute coffee break.

When the Senate reconvened, Professor Haaser suggested the Senate move to the last item on the agenda and Father Banas introduced Professor Vasta and asked him to make some introductory remarks on the question of a proposed code of faculty ethics. Ms. Cordelia Candelaria and Professor John Roos, who were also members of the Committee on Campus Honor appointed by Father James Burtchaell, were present. (The report of this committee appeared in Volume 3, No. 6, of Notre Dame Report.) Professor Vasta referred to a general apathy on campus towards honor and ethics as evidenced by the demise of the old student honor system and the lack of interest in returning to such a system. He stated that each group, faculty, students, and administration, must articulate its own standards before any consensus can be reached on this subject. He felt that the faculty should set the character for the University in this matter.

In the discussion which followed Professor Danehy pointed out that the Student Life Council has all three components of the Notre Dame community, students, faculty, and administration, represented on it and that the best course might be to let them discuss it with the encouragement of the Faculty Senate.

After several attempts by various Senators to find out specifically what was being sought, Professor Jones asked what was required over and above that already contained in the AAUP statement on faculty ethics.

Professor Vasta replied that the honor concept must go far beyond simple laws to cover specific violations or faculty malfeasance and should contain something peculiar to Notre Dame as such.

Since the discussion was becoming somewhat lengthy and diffuse by this time, Professor Haaser entertained a motion for adjournment which was carried by a voice vote at 9:40 P.M. The Senate will continue this discussion and return to the other two items on its agenda, two resolutions from the Committee on Administration and the committee reports, at its next meeting.
Those Faculty Senators absent from the present meeting without explanation are listed below.

Joseph Bobik (Philosophy)
James Daschbach (Aerospace)
Michael Francis (Government)
Stanley Hauerwas (Theology)
J. W. Hunt (Modern Languages)
Aidan Kavanagh (Theology)
John Kromkowski (Government)
Robert Leader (Art)
Mario Picconi (Management)
William Rickhoff (Physics)
Thomas Smith (Chem. Eng.)
Morris Wagner (Microbiology)
James Ward (History)
Thomas Werge (English)

Professor McLane's report and recommendations on the University's contribution to the faculty retirement fund follows.

Respectfully submitted,

James T. Cushing
Secretary
Faculty Senate
Professor Haaser called the meeting to order at 7:40 P.M. and Father Charles Weiher, C.S.C. opened the meeting with a prayer.

Twenty-eight members were in attendance.

The minutes of the January 23, 1974 meeting, which will appear in Notre Dame Report, were approved without amendments by a voice vote.

Since there were no committee reports, the Senate moved to the second item on its agenda, two resolutions from the Committee on Administration. These resolutions had been distributed at the previous Senate meeting and are contained in the minutes. The first resolution, with its preamble, was introduced by Professor Cushing. These follow.

According to Section II.2 of the present Bylaws of the Board of Trustees of the University of Notre Dame the President of the University can be elected only "from among the members of the Priests Society of the Congregation of Holy Cross, Indiana Province . . . ." Inasmuch as the office of president of a major university is an exceptionally demanding one, it appears unreasonable and unwise to limit so severely the body of candidates eligible for this position. Certainly the best qualified person, be he or she religious or lay, should be recruited as president of this institution. This in no way need be counter to the proclaimed Catholic character of Notre Dame.

Therefore, the Committee on the Administration of the University recommends that the Faculty Senate adopt the following resolution and forward it to the Board of Trustees for its consideration.

"Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Notre Dame encourages the Board of Trustees to consider petitioning the Fellows of the University to change Section II.2 of the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees so that any qualified person may be nominated for election to the office of President of the University."

Professor Cushing moved this resolution be adopted and Professor Robinson seconded it. In the discussion which followed Professors Rodes, Lyon, Weiher, and Banas spoke against the resolution for various reasons, among
them being the futility of the exercise, preserving the Catholic character of the University, and the need to maintain contact with our past traditions. Professors Robinson, Roos, and Winicur, among others, supported the resolution citing the need to guarantee a sufficiently large pool of applicants from which to draw and the fact that the character of the institution need not change should a lay President be appointed. The resolution was passed by a show of hands with fifteen for, ten against, and one abstention. (This total of twenty-six votes is consistent with the number of Senators present since Professor Haaser as Chairman of the meeting does not vote and one Senator who arrived late was not present when this vote was taken.)

Professor Tihen then read the following preamble and resolution.

PREAMBULE: If an individual is once granted employment, and is then subsequently refused continuance of that employment, simple justice and fair play would seem to require that the person be provided with some explanation of the reasons for this refusal. This principle applies under any circumstances of employment, whether the person be an industrial worker, a corporate executive, a household employee, or in any other position, including that of membership on the faculty of an educational institution. It also applies whether the discontinuance of employment is brought about by actual dismissal or, equally effectively, by a refusal on the part of the employer to renew a contract of employment.

Under the provisions of the current Academic Manual, it is possible for the University of Notre Dame to refuse to renew the contract of an untenured faculty member for unspecified reasons. One would hope, and expect, that renewal would never be denied on any purely arbitrary or capricious basis. Regardless of hopes and expectations, we believe that the Academic Manual should contain provisions excluding even the possibility that this would occur. Further, the principle of justice mentioned above demands that a faculty member whose contract is not renewed be provided with some explanation of the reasons for nonrenewal if he or she so desires. The Academic Manual should make provision for supplying such an explanation.

The Faculty Senate therefore adopts the following resolution, and instructs the Secretary of the Senate to send copies of this resolution, including the preamble, to all members of the Academic Council:
RESOLVED: In accordance with Article V of the Academic Manual of the University of Notre Dame, the Faculty Senate hereby proposes to the Academic Council that Article III, Section 4, Subsection (a) of the Academic Manual be amended as follows:

1) Insert a new paragraph, immediately following the first paragraph, to read: "The procedure for reappointment is the same as for appointment. When a Departmental Committee recommends against the reappointment of an untenured faculty member, and that negative recommendation is approved by the President, then the Chairman of the Department shall convey orally to the faculty member in question the reasons of the Committee for making a negative recommendation. If a positive recommendation for reappointment made by a Departmental Committee is not approved by the President, reasons for the disapproval shall be submitted to the Chairman of the Department through the Dean. The Chairman of the Department conveys these reasons to the faculty member in question upon his or her request."

2) Delete from the present second paragraph, which will now become the third paragraph, the first sentence, namely: "The procedure for reappointment is the same as for appointment."

Professor Cushing seconded the resolution.

In the discussion which followed Professor Fiorenza proposed an amendment, seconded by Professor Goulet, that Professor Tihen's new paragraph to be inserted in the Academic Manual end with the sentence "These reasons shall be given in writing upon the request of the faculty member involved." The ensuing discussion was a lengthy one. Professor Lyon spoke several times pointing out that the abstract principles of simple justice and fair play, to which Professor Tihen referred in his preamble and to which few would take exception, would be transformed by force of the resolution itself into specific legal justice to be decided by litigation in court. He also suggested that a faculty member who was given a terminal contract might simply be told that the University felt it could do better in today's job market. Professor Cushing offered the opinion that this could be a valid reason for a departmental appointments and promotions committee, which is assumed qualified to pass on a candidate's professional competence, but not for the Administration unless it could produce external supportive evidence for such a contention. Several Senators, among them Professors Gleason and Roos, felt that if reasons were required to be given, then
the various departmental committees would conduct their meetings in such a fashion that they could justify their decisions. Professor De Santis insisted that his long experience on such committees convinced him that it is not possible to know the reasons for which people vote the way they do. Professor Lamanna expressed doubt that it would in fact be possible to obtain the real reasons for which a faculty member was terminated if the Administration did not wish to give it. Professor Jones, after a rather incisive analysis of the various classes of circumstances which result in an ultimately negative recommendation regarding promotion and tenure, suggested that it would probably be unwise to submit the proposal to the Academic Council again this year without substantial supportive evidence for the need for this requirement, since the Council had defeated such a motion in its consideration of the Academic Manual last year. Both Professor Jones and Professor De Santis pointed out that it is invariably difficult to get faculty members to make public the details surrounding the termination of a contract. Professor Cushing asked whether a committee of the Senate might petition the various departmental appointments and promotions committees for statistical information on how often the Administration has overturned positive recommendations without supplying these committees with sufficient reasons. Professor Pleasants moved that the motion be returned to an ad hoc committee, to be appointed by Professor Haaser, for the purpose of gathering such supportive evidence before presentation to the Academic Council. This was seconded and passed by a show of hands, there being sixteen votes in favor of it.

Professor Rodes asked that this committee return a proposal which would include a recommendation for the systematic annual evaluation of untenured faculty members by the appointments and promotions committees in each department and that the results of these considerations be discussed with the faculty members concerned.

At 8:55 P.M. the Senate recessed for a ten-minute coffee break.

When the third item on the agenda arose, further discussion on a code of faculty ethics, Professor De Santis moved that this item be tabled. Professor Cushing seconded this and the motion carried unanimously.

The last item on the agenda was discussion of the Report of the Committee on University Priorities which appeared in the December 1973 issue of Notre Dame Magazine. In order that the Senate can forward its comments on this Report to Father Hesburgh before the spring meeting of the Board of Trustees, the three standing committees of the Senate will consider the document and report their recommendations to the Senate at its next regularly scheduled meeting on Wednesday, March 20, 1974.
In regard to Professor McLane's report on the Step-Rate Retirement Plan at Notre Dame, Professor De Santis quoted part of a letter from Father Burtchaell to the effect that the University plans to lay more emphasis on salaries rather than on increased fringe benefits in the immediate future.

Professor Haaser will report at the next meeting on a plan to insure that one third of the faculty senate seats are filled with newly elected members each year as required by the Academic Manual.

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 P.M.

Those Faculty Senators absent from the present meeting without explanation are listed below.

Joseph Bobik (Philosophy)  Paul McLane (English)
James Daschbach (Aerospace)  William Rickhoff (Physics)
J. W. Hunt (Modern Languages)  Julian Samora (Sociology)
Aidan Kavanagh (Theology)  Thomas Smith (Chemical Engineering)
John Kromkowski (Government)  Morris Wagner (Microbiology)
Robert Leader (Art)  James Ward (History)
Don Linger (Civil Engineering)  

Respectfully submitted,

James T. Cushing
Secretary
The Faculty Senate
Professor Haaser called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. and Reverend Leonard Banas, C.S.C., opened the meeting with a prayer.

Thirty-four members were in attendance.

Professor Pleasants moved that the minutes of the February 6, 1974 meeting, which appeared in Notre Dame Report No. 12, be accepted. Professor Tihen seconded the motion and it was passed by a voice vote with no dissent.

Professor Haaser announced that the Reverend Aidan Kavanagh, O.S.B., had resigned from the Faculty Senate.

Since the Faculty Senate had been reduced in size as a result of the adoption of the new Academic Manual in 1973, an imbalance has resulted in the number of Senators who would have to be elected in coming years (22 in 1974, 17 in 1975, 7 in 1976). In order to conform to the requirement that one third of the Senate seats be open for election each year, Professor Haaser announced that for the 1974 and 1975 elections the various Colleges in the University will elect some Senators to two-year terms and others to three-year terms. Thereafter all Senate terms would be the usual three-year ones with fifteen or sixteen seats to be filled each year.

Next the Faculty Senate Delegation on the Retirement Plan, consisting of Professors Cushing, Haaser, McLane, and Tihen, reported on its meeting with Fathers Hesburgh, Burtchaell, Brown, Wilson, and Dr. Gordon on February 24, 1974. A brief written statement of the sense of the meeting was distributed to Senate members and is appended to the minutes of this meeting.

Professor Rodes moved that the Senate accept this report with thanks to the delegation, express its continued concern, and append it to the minutes. Professor Cushing seconded this motion.

In the lengthy and animated discussion which followed Professor Lamanna expressed the hope that something could actually be done to improve the total compensation picture for the faculty, rather than simply expressing concern. Professor Anthony felt that the faculty did not really carry much weight with the Administration in this matter. Professor Tihen suggested that the Senate endorse faculty representation on a Budget Review Committee, as proposed in the Priorities Report. Such representation would allow access to facts on which to make an intelligent decision based on financial data. Professor Goulet stated that the faculty should set forth its goals and that
it was then the responsibility of the Administration either to meet these requirements or to counter, with specific facts, these arguments for more compensation. Professor Conway emphasized that faculty salaries in the University budget must be taken as a fixed operating cost, not as an item which is coped with as best as possible after other priorities have been decided upon and met. Professor Bellis argued that the Administration should explain in detail why the Faculty must live with yearly increases on the order of 4%. Professor Daschbach then made an impassioned plea that Senate members realize the escalating costs of operating the University and the problems of coping with them. He expressed no sympathy for the prospect of collective bargaining as a solution. Several members responded that such general and unspecific pleas would not serve to counter faculty demands.

The question was then called on Professor Rodes' proposal and his motion was passed by a voice vote with no dissents registered.

It was moved by Professor Pleasants and seconded by Professor Danehy that the written report of the Senate Delegation meeting with the Administration (appended to the present minutes) be sent immediately to every faculty member. This motion was passed without dissent.

At 8:40 P.M. a recess was called and the Senate reconvened at 8:55 P.M.

Professor Lamanna moved that the Senate attach to the report to be circulated a statement of concern about the present allocation priorities and ask faculty members to sign and return it so that the results could be compiled as a signed petition and published. This was seconded by Professor Danehy. Professor Anthony asked why more of the unrestricted gifts, could not be used for improved faculty compensation. After much discussion by several Senators, Professors Lamanna and Danehy withdrew their resolution in favor of one proposed by Professor Bellis and seconded by Professor Cushing that the Executive Committee draft such a statement and present it at the next Senate meeting for a vote of approval before it is sent to the faculty at large. This was passed without dissent.

Professor Haaser then made a short report of a recent meeting between Professors Haaser, Danehy, Lamanna, Robinson, and Rodes of the Faculty Senate and Professors Heller (University of Kansas) and Wiley (University of Wisconsin at Parkside) of the North Central Association of Schools and Colleges. Apparently these Committee members had been given an overly bright picture of the faculty's compensation status and also believed the faculty had access to important information on tenure and reappointment decisions, prior to their discussion with these representatives from the Senate.
At Professor Tihen's suggestion the Senate agreed to postpone, until a special meeting around April 16, a consideration of the Priorities Report.

Professor Haase then turned the chairmanship of the meeting over to Professor Danehy so that he, Professor Haase, could propose a change in the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate. This proposal, which will be circulated to Senate members the required ten days before the next meeting at which a vote will be taken, would allow elected members of the Academic Council to attend Faculty Senate meetings with speaking (but not voting) privileges. Its purpose is to inform the Academic Council more effectively of the sense of the Senate's feelings on important questions which are finally sent to the Council for its consideration. The Senate approved that this item appear on the agenda of its next meeting.

Professor Haase then resumed the chair and entertained a motion for adjournment at 9:30 P.M.

Those Faculty Senators absent from the present meeting without explanation are listed below.

Joseph Bobik (Philosophy)
Phillip Helman (Radiation Laboratory)
J. W. Hunt (Modern Languages)
John Kromkowski (Government)

Respectfully submitted,

James T. Cushing
Secretary
The Faculty Senate
APPENDIX

The Faculty Senate Journal
March 20, 1974

March 19, 1974

The following is the sense of the meeting between the Faculty Senate Retirement Plan Delegation consisting of:

James T. Cushing
Norman B. Haaser
Paul E. McLane
Joseph A. Tihen

with Fathers Hesburgh, Burtchaell, Brown, Wilson and Dr. Robert Gordon.

The Senate resolution of a straight-level 10% university contribution to retirement (which still would leave about 200 universities with better retirement plans than ours) would be equivalent to a 4% salary increase. Such an increase the University had already determined would be available for a salary increase alone -- even though the ND report on the Economic Status of the Faculty (by Professor Swartz for the AAUP) made clear that a 12% salary increase would be necessary for the faculty to have the "same after tax purchasing power that they had in 1971-72."

Every avenue of significant improvement in the faculty total compensation was closed. Everything had to give way to building up ND's endowment. A tuition increase that might take care of the Faculty's plight in terms of inflation and improved salary and retirement was ruled out because such an increase would produce the kind of a university at which the Faculty would not care to teach. The possibility of improving our retirement income through a few extra years of service after age 65 was ruled out because the whole trend is towards earlier retirement to help the many trained university teachers who are now unable to get university appointments. A suggestion was even made that the Faculty should vote on whether the 4% increase the University is willing to give should be allotted to salary or retirement improvement.

Fr. Hesburgh agreed that it would be a fair representation of the University financial priorities to state that the type of faculty compensation increases of the past few years, i.e. about 3-4%, would be essentially all that the Faculty could expect for the foreseeable future. Efforts are being made to obtain funds for additional endowed chairs. Fr. Hesburgh expects that over the long haul this would remove a number of higher salaried positions from the total cost of faculty compensation which must be taken from current operating funds.

All in all, the meeting offered little hope for the improvements necessary in salary and retirement if ND is to maintain a competitive and just position among our so-called "peer universities." ND's step-rate retirement plan that constantly deteriorates under the ever rising social security base should concern us all. Apparently the University will continue to pay a portion of their increases in Social Security Taxes by reducing their contribution to TIAA-CREF. But there is no dispute between various groups of the faculty. We are all in agreement that social justice and grim necessity demand that there be improvements in both salary and retirement--and that improvements in one should not be at the expense of the other.
The Faculty Senate
The Journal
April 17, 1974

Professor Haaser called the meeting to order at 7:35 P.M. and the Reverend Leonard Banas, C.S.C., opened the meeting with a prayer.

Twenty-eight members were in attendance.

After some minor modifications in wording suggested by Professors Cushing, Jones, and Robinson, two proposed changes in the Faculty Senate Bylaws, statements of which had been circulated to Senate members the required ten days prior to the meeting, were approved without dissent.

Article XIV of the Bylaws has been replaced by the following:

XIV. Elected members of the Academic Council may attend all meetings of the Senate and participate therein but shall have no right to vote, unless they are also members of the Senate. A notice of meeting by mail from the Secretary, including any known agenda, shall be sent to all elected members of the Academic Council. The Senate shall be in recess whenever assembled to be addressed by one who is neither a member of the Senate nor an elected member of the Academic Council.

Article XVI has been amended to read:

XVI. The terms of members who have completed their service shall expire on the fifteenth day of April in each year. Members who fail to attend at least two or half of the meetings in any one year of office, whichever is less, shall be removed from membership in the Senate. It shall be the responsibility of the Chairman of the Senate to advise the College Councils, or equivalent bodies, of the number of members needed to fill vacancies, including those vacancies which may occur at other times because of resignation or incapacity to serve. It is the sense of the Senate that annual elections be held in each college on a date as near to the first of April as possible.
It was then moved by Professor Winicur and seconded by Professor Danehy that the minutes of the March 20, 1974 meeting be accepted. This was approved with no dissents registered.

Professor Haaser then reported on a communication from Father Wilson concerning the parking situation in some of the lots designated for faculty use. At times some faculty members have been unable to find a space in their assigned lot. Professor Haaser referred this problem to the Faculty Affairs Committee for study.

Five Senate members have resigned. These are Professor Stanley Hauerwas (Theology), Professor John Kromkowski (Government), Professor Robert Leader (Art), Professor Julian Samora (Sociology), and Professor James Ward (History). This brings the current active Senate membership to a total of forty-three.

Professor Haaser read a letter from Father Hesburgh which stated that in his opinion the report of the Senate delegation on the retirement plan, published with the minutes of the March 20, 1974, meeting and sent to all Notre Dame faculty members, did not accurately represent all that was said at the meeting with the Administration. Father Hesburgh expressed hope that Father Burtchaell would produce a report from his point of view. In a subsequent telephone conversation Professor Haaser asked Father Burtchaell whether it would be possible for him to make his written comments available to the Senate for its April 17 meeting. No such report has yet been received.

During the discussion which followed Professor Daschbach stated that the attitude of the Senate should be one of conciliation and compromise toward the
Administration rather than one which will widen any breach on this issue. Professor De Santis responded that it is apparently the Administration who seeks to widen the breach since it has not specified what it feels are the inaccuracies in the Senate's report. The responsibility now rests with the Administration to state their disagreements in writing. Professor Daschbach responded that "an informed source close to the Administration" had said that the figure of a 4% increase in faculty salary or compensation was inaccurate; that it would be 6% for salary in 1974-75. Also, according to this source the statement that the first priority is building the endowment is an oversimplification. Professor Winicur pointed out that the faculty should not allow its attention to be diverted from the main issue by squabbling with the Administration over the 4% vs. a 6% figure. The simple fact is that compensation increases have been far too low over the past few years and are projected to be roughly the same for the immediate future. Inflation alone last year was around 10%. It was the consensus of the Senate that it should proceed with its business in this matter as planned until the Administration makes a specific, written response to the Senate report.

Professor Danehy suggested that the Senate move on to a consideration of a Faculty Senate statement on salaries and retirement prepared by the executive committee. Professor Winicur seconded the motion. (This statement is appended to the minutes of the present meeting.) Professor Jones pointed out that the question of salary or compensation increases and a reordering of the financial priorities of the University are not necessarily equivalent propositions. For instance, it would be possible to increase faculty compensation by further
decreasing faculty size, mainly at the expense of the untenured faculty. He felt that this would be a very undesirable procedure, as compared, say, to using more of the unrestricted gifts and endowment income for this purpose.

Professor Lloyd asked that the Senate allow the Administration more time to respond to our delegation's report. Professors Robinson, Winicur, McLane, and Wagner expressed the opinion that the Administration had had time to respond if they had felt it sufficiently important and that we should move forward now.

A lengthy debate followed involving, among others, Professors Tihen, Lamanna, Daschbach, Cushing, Haaser, and Winicur about whether or not a signature should be required by those faculty members who responded and about where the results should be published. Several felt that some form of publicity was essential if any positive effects were to be produced. Professor Dugan asked if the purpose was simply to survey the faculty. Professor Conway felt a survey should be taken first and then more done later. Professor Jones asked what the purpose of requiring a signature was and stated that anonymity should be guaranteed in any case. Professor Winicur felt that a signature on the envelope returning the questionnaire would serve that purpose. Professors Robinson and Lamanna believed the statement would have more force if signed.

Finally Professor Robinson introduced a friendly amendment to Professors Danehy and Winicur's original motion. The motion was then that the Senate adopt the statement as its position and send a statement of this position to the faculty asking for support, the signature format being left to another motion. The results were to be sent to the President and to be published in Notre Dame Report. Professor Cushing then called the question on the amended
motion. Since there were thirteen votes for and eight against calling the question, the required two-thirds majority did not exist (as pointed out by Professor Daschbach) so that debate continued on the motion.

At 9:15 P.M. Professor Haaser called a short recess for coffee and the Senate reconvened at 9:25 P.M.

Shortly after discussion began again, Professor Daschbach called the question which was approved. The motion as amended by Professor Robinson was then passed by a nineteen to three majority. Professor Conway moved, and Professor Davis seconded, that a signature be required on the envelope returning the statement if the statement were to be counted. Confidentiality of the signatures would be insured. This motion carried by a twelve to nine majority.

Professor Haaser reminded the Senate that it had to make nominations to the Student Life Council. A committee was appointed to bring its recommendations to the Senate at its next meeting which is scheduled for Tuesday, April 23, at 7:30 P.M. Also at that meeting the Senate will discuss the Priorities Report.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 P.M.

Those Faculty Senators absent from the present meeting without explanation are listed below:

Joseph Bobik (Philosophy)                Julian Pleasants (Microbiology)
W. J. Gajda (Electrical Engineering)     John Roos (Government)
J. W. Hunt (Modern Languages)            Thomas Werge (English)
Don Linger (Civil Engineering)           

Respectfully submitted,

James T. Cushing
Secretary
The Faculty Senate
Faculty Senate Statement on Salaries and Retirement

The national prestige and academic distinction we all desire and strive for cannot be achieved or maintained unless we make serious efforts to improve Notre Dame's competitive position in faculty salaries and retirement benefits. The economic position of the faculty has been allowed to deteriorate gradually over the last six years to the point where a 12% increase in salary would be required to give us the purchasing power we had in 1971-72 and this would still leave us far behind the salaries of most of our peer universities. As Father Burtchaell has pointed out (ND Report No. 5, p. 120), in comparison with these universities, Notre Dame, in average compensation for 1972-73, ranked in the 40-50% decile. The retirement picture is even more depressing. The ever-rising social security base (from $6600 to $13,200 in the last seven years) seriously impairs Notre Dame's step rate retirement plan, a plan now inferior to that of all but one college or university in the State of Indiana.

In view of the above facts, we of the faculty question the decision to give top priority to building the University endowment fund and attracting outstanding scholars to the University through the establishment of endowed chairs. Important and valuable as these two goals may be, it would be unwise and self-defeating to pursue them if they can be achieved only through the involuntary sacrifices of the general faculty.

We, therefore, urge that the administration reorder its priorities in order to avoid further deterioration of both the economic position and the morale of the faculty. We feel that social justice and the best interests of the University, require at the very least:
a) acceptance of the Faculty Senate proposal to increase the University contribution to TIAA to a straight level 10%, (even such a contribution would leave more than 175 universities with better plans); and

b) provision of salary raises sufficient to meet the cost of living increases of the last two years (that is, about 12%) and reflect the increased faculty productivity brought about by fewer faculty, more students, and heavier teaching loads.
The Faculty Senate
The Journal
April 23, 1974

Professor Haaser called the meeting to order at 7:40 P.M. and the
Reverend Leonard Banas, C.S.C., opened the meeting with a prayer.

Twenty-four members were in attendance.

After some minor changes in wording, the minutes of the April 17, 1974,
meeting were accepted without dissent.

Professor Haaser urged that members of the Senate assume responsibility
for encouraging their colleagues on the faculty to return their ballots on
the Senate statement on salaries and retirement which is being sent out.
Tellers will be appointed to check the signed envelopes against the faculty
mailing list.

Professor Tihen, of the Senate Nomination Committee consisting of himself
and Professor Jones and Dugan, presented a list of candidates for the faculty
representatives to the Student Life Council and to the Faculty Affairs Commit-
tee of the Board of Trustees. Each nominee listed below has been contacted
in person or by phone and has agreed to have his name placed in nomination.
The only nomination made from the Senate floor was that of Professor William
Eagan of the College of Business by Professor Conway. The Senate approved
the following list of nominees for three seats to be filled on the Student Life
Council and two on the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.
This list will be sent by the Senate to all members of the faculty for a vote.
Student Life Council

David L. Appel, Marketing Department, College of Business
William Sexton, Department of Business Organization and Management, College of Business
Michael Francis, Government and International Studies, College of Arts & Letters
Walter Niogorski, General Program, College of Arts & Letters
Jeffrey Leake, Electrical Engineering Department, College of Engineering
William F. Eagan, Department of Business Organization & Management, College of Business

Faculty Affairs Committee of Board of Trustees

Albin Szewczyk, Aeronautical and Mechanical Engineering, Engineering College
Joseph Scott, Sociology Department and Director of Black Studies, College of Arts & Letters
Charles "Bud" Murdock, Law School
Edward Trubac, Department of Finance and Business Economics, College of Business
John J. Lyon, General Program, College of Arts & Letters
Jerome Novotny, Aeronautical and Mechanical Engineering, Engineering College
William McGlinn, Physics Department, College of Science

Professor Winicur then recalled that one of the arguments which had been given in support of the new calendar containing two short breaks each semester, rather than one long one, was that there would be more student absenteeism before and after a long break than before and after a short one. He reported that the total absenteeism for both the long and the short break this semester had been almost the same for his freshman class. He suggested that other faculty members might also keep records of this for use later when a discussion of the academic calendar comes up again.

The Senate then moved to its main item of business, consideration of a proposed amendment to the Report of the Committee on University Priorities
(published in the December 1973 issue of Notre Dame Magazine). This recommendation originated in the Faculty Senate Committee on the Administration and was drafted by Professor Rodes. It is appended to the minutes of this meeting.

Professor Lamanna, Chairman of the Committee on the Administration, reported that most of the committee discussion had centered on the Catholic character of Notre Dame and the recommendation of the COUP Report concerning the establishment of a Budget Review Committee representative of the whole University.

Professor Pleasants said that some appointments and promotion committees were concerned and uncertain about how to interpret and apply the criterion of hiring articulate believers. He wrote Father Burtchaell a letter on this point and received a reply indicating that the requirement of seeking out articulate believers was to be taken seriously and that the COUP Report intended such to be the case. Father Burtchaell felt that the old currents of selectivity are changing so that we must take active measures to insure the predominantly Catholic character of Notre Dame. The Provost would urge departments to prefer Catholics in hiring policies as they are now encouraged to do for blacks, for instance. Professor Pleasants expressed the opinion that the proposed changes to the COUP Report at least improved the statement of the attitude toward non-Catholics on the faculty.

Professor Cushing raised the question of precisely what is meant by the term Catholic in America today. What would be the test one would apply to a candidate to determine whether or not he is indeed a Catholic? With the apparent state of flux of the Church today what should be used as criteria? Professor Anthony felt we should mean a practicing Catholic; that is, one who
regularly attends Mass.

Professor Tihen stated that as long as we do not have to lower our professional and academic standards, the additional requirement that a candidate be a Catholic is not objectionable. Professor Lamanna said that it is not implied that a person would be penalized for a lack of belief and that a faculty consisting largely of articulate believers is a noble goal toward which the University would probably tend since people who share this goal will naturally gravitate to Notre Dame. Professor Conway expressed concern that the requirement "articulate believer" may have considerable negative influence on non-Catholic observers. Professor Danehy felt that all this discussion centered around the COUP Report did disservice to the ideal sought; that the more one tries to be specific in defining a committed Catholic, the more ludicrous it all appears. The question ought never have been raised by COUP. Professor McLane believed that people do not take such written statements too seriously and that if it pleases the Administration, they should be allowed to luxuriate in this rhetoric.

Professor Jones returned to the point that if we are to examine a candidate as an articulate believer as we examine his professional competence, then we must be specific about this. Professor Bellis pointed out that this emphasis on hiring Catholics could have a negative influence on Catholics outside the University since they might interpret this as a very narrow outlook. Professor Dugan emphasized the importance of the question of values with regard to scientific inquiries rather than a concern with religious beliefs alone.
At 8:35 P.M. Professor Haaser called a brief recess for coffee.

When the Senate reconvened Professor Cushing moved, and Professor Lamanna seconded, that the Senate accept the proposed change drafted by Professor Rodes. Mrs. Gleason moved the removal of "That the University have a faculty and a student affairs staff among whom committed Catholics predominate." from the proposed change. Professors Lamanna and Anthony expressed the belief that such key phrases could not be removed from the proposed addition if the changes were to be accepted by the Board of Trustees. Professor Pleasants said that the COUP Report would be essentially changed if this were deleted. The vote was eleven to seven against this deletion. Mrs. Gleason also moved that the proposed addition should place emphasis on attracting, rather than on appointing, people to Notre Dame's faculty and staff. This was agreed upon by a sixteen to four vote. The Senate then voted unanimously to support the proposed addition (to replace the italicized portion of page 13 of Notre Dame Magazine, December, 1973) to the COUP Report and forward it to Father Hesburgh for him to convey to the Board of Trustees at their spring meeting.

Professor Lamanna pointed out what he considered to be a serious shortcoming in the COUP Report: that faculty improvement, development, and salaries were not treated at length although many other, sometimes relatively minor, matters were discussed extensively. He then moved, and Professor Dugan seconded, that the Faculty Senate endorse the COUP recommendation that a Budget Review Committee, representative of the whole University, be established (cf. p. 17 of Notre Dame Magazine, December, 1973). This motion was passed without dissent.
Professor Jones urged that care be taken in formulating the specifics of any such recommendation to be placed before the Academic Council to insure that the faculty representatives to a Budget Review Committee be selected by the faculty as a whole and not appointed as was the COUP itself. Professor Dugan asked that a Senate committee be established for formulating specific recommendations for a Budget Review Committee. A straw vote of the Senators showed unanimous approval of these suggestions by Professors Jones and Dugan.

At 9:30 P.M. Professor Haaser entertained a motion for adjournment.

Those Faculty Senators absent from the present meeting without explanation are listed below:

Joseph Bobik (Philosophy)  Robert Rodes (Law School)
W. J. Gajda (Electrical Engineering)  John Roos (Government)
J. W. Hunt (Modern Languages)  Thomas Smith (Chemical Engineering)
Don Linger (Civil Engineering)

Respectfully submitted,

James T. Cushing
Secretary
The Faculty Senate
Proposed Addition to COUP

Recommendation on Catholic Character of the University

From: Committee on Administration

The Senate proposes that the recommendations of the Committee on University Priorities concerning the Catholic character of the University (of p. 13 of Notre Dame Magazine, December 1973), be modified as follows, in order:

1) to make more specific the intellectual commitment appropriate to a Catholic university, and the primary responsibility of the Catholic members of the community for its Catholic character;

2) to give specific reassurance to non-Catholics concerning tenure and promotion, and

3) to deal with the problems of student discipline that have affected the Christian life here.

The proposed amended language follows, with additions underlined:

That the University continue its traditional commitment to freedom of inquiry and thought. The Catholic university should be especially open to all truth and to every human insight, more, even, than other universities. Belief should widen our purview rather than restrict it, and we should cherish the humane achievement of justice, not only among our own, but also in a world too prone to forget the source and basis for justice.

That we strive to make the University a place where moral and religious questions are taken seriously—neither shunted aside as irrelevant nor passed off with cut and dried solutions. Everyone here should be actively encouraged to explore his own deepest convictions, and relate them to what he is learning or teaching here. We should recognize that the Catholic character of the University depends in the last analysis not on the exclusion of competing views, but on the firmness, wisdom, and devotion with which the Catholics here bear witness in dialogue to their own faith and its relevance to the questions with which they deal.

That the University have a faculty and a student affairs staff among whom committed Catholics predominate. If the University is to have a Catholic character, it is obvious that all who play a role in recruitment should exercise care to attract from among the most competent teachers,
scholars and scientists available those who are articulate believers; brilliant scholar-teachers who respect Christ in man and who are committed as He was to service and sacrifice. Also, they should be aware of the numerous scholars who, while not sharing either the Catholic tradition or the Christian faith, abide here because they lead lives of inquiry which include a sensitivity to and respect for the commitment to investigate the moral realm. Of such intellectual comrades who live in and by the spirit of Notre Dame and respect her heritage and tradition, we have much need. They add essential meaning to our striving to be Catholic. The University's invitation to a non-Catholic to join the faculty or staff is a recognition that his professional concerns are compatible with those of the University, and an understanding that his religious commitments or lack of them will not interfere with his acceptance, retention, or advancement at Notre Dame.

That the University continue to sustain an increasingly competent Department of Theology. Learning defies departmental borders, and every department impinges upon the inquiries of others. But our tradition makes the excellence of this one department singularly imperative.

That appointments to the faculty and staff continue to be offered by preference to competent members of the Congregation of Holy Cross, whose contribution to the University is a special guarantee of its Catholic character. In return, we hope that those who guide the studies of young members of the Congregation will give emphasis to the educational and pastoral needs of the University.

That discipline be administered in such a way as to maintain a moral and social environment appropriate to a Christian place, and at the same time to respect the dignity and privacy of the members of the community.
Professor Haaser called the meeting to order at 7:40 P.M. and Ms. Ellen Ryan opened the meeting with a prayer.

Thirty-one members were in attendance.

Professor Haaser then asked the Senate members, both returning and newly elected ones, to introduce themselves.

Professor Jones moved, and Professor Lyon seconded, that the minutes of the April 23, 1974 meeting be approved. This was passed by a voice vote without dissent.

Professor Conway, the Senate Treasurer, then presented his report for the year 1973-74 which is summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
<th>Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$ 61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicating</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td>253.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>170.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>475.00</td>
<td>315.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1300.00</td>
<td>$694.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professor Haaser then read a letter from Father Hesburgh thanking the Senate for its recommendations on the COUP Report and assuring us that these would be passed on to the Board of Trustees at its spring meeting.

Professor Haaser announced the preliminary results of the poll of the faculty, library, and research staff on the Senate statement on salaries and retirement. Just over 400 responses had been received to date from among the approximately 700 eligible voters polled. The replies were nine to one in support of the statement.
Professor Haaser called the meeting to order at 7:40 P.M. and Ms. Ellen Ryan opened the meeting with a prayer.

Thirty-one members were in attendance.

Professor Haaser then asked the Senate members, both returning and newly elected ones, to introduce themselves.

Professor Jones moved, and Professor Lyon seconded, that the minutes of the April 23, 1974 meeting be approved. This was passed by a voice vote without dissent.

Professor Conway, the Senate Treasurer, then presented his report for the year 1973-74 which is summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
<th>Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicating</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td>253.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>170.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>475.00</td>
<td>315.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1300.00</td>
<td>$694.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professor Haaser then read a letter from Father Hesburgh thanking the Senate for its recommendations on the COUP Report and assuring us that these would be passed on to the Board of Trustees at its spring meeting.

Professor Haaser announced the preliminary results of the poll of the faculty, library, and research staff on the Senate statement on salaries and retirement. Just over 400 responses had been received to date from among the approximately 700 eligible voters polled. The replies were nine to one in support of the statement.
Professor Press suggested that a second mailing be sent to those who had not yet responded. Professor Cushing moved, with the support of Professor Bellis' second, that balloting be terminated in about a week and that the final results of this poll be published as an appendix to the minutes of the present meeting. This was approved without dissent. Professor De Santis then moved, with Professor Danehy's second, that an interim report of the current results be sent at once to Father Hesburgh. This was unanimously approved.

Professor Haaser called for committee reports, of which there was just one, from the Committee on Faculty Affairs, presented by Professor Bellis. As a result of a Committee meeting at which Mr. Arthur Pears, Director of Campus Security, was present, the Committee recommended that lots A-2, B-1, east of the Memorial Library, and lots A-3, B-5, east of the Biology building, each be opened as one lot for both faculty and staff on a first-come first-served basis. This arrangement had never caused any difficulty in the past. The Senate approved this unanimously and instructed the Chairman to send a letter to this effect to Father Wilson.

The Senate then moved on to the election of officers. Professor Cushing moved that the Senate suspend its normal election procedures and hold the election by mail after the election of the College of Science representatives had been completed. Professor Winicur seconded this. A lengthy and somewhat confused discussion followed centered upon the parliamentary propriety of such a motion. The Senate upheld a ruling by the Chair on this point and then defeated the motion itself.
Professor Jones moved that the College of Science representatives still serving terms which expire in 1974 be allowed to participate in the election of officers. Professor Dugan seconded this. All approved the motion.

A short recess was called for a coffee break and the Senate reconvened at 8:45 P.M. to nominate and elect officers. Professors Conway, Cushing, De Santis, and Dugan were nominated for Chairman. On the first ballot none received a majority of the votes cast. There was a runoff between Professors Conway and Cushing. Professor Cushing was elected Chairman.

Professors Conway and Rodes were nominated for Vice Chairman. Professor Conway was elected. Professors Martin and Winicur were nominated for Secretary and Professor Martin elected. Professors Dugan and Goulet were nominated for Treasurer and Professor Goulet elected.

The three standing committees of the Senate then caucused to elect chairmen. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate for 1974-75 is the following:

James Cushing, Chairman
Paul Conway, Vice Chairman
Leslie Martin, Secretary
Robert Vasoli, Chairman, Committee on Administration
Dennis Dugan, Chairman, Committee on Faculty Affairs
Daniel Winicur, Chairman, Committee on Student Affairs

Professor Dugan then moved, with Professor De Santis' second, that the Faculty Senate direct its Executive Committee to send an expression of condolence and a suitable remembrance to the relatives of Professor Francis J. O'Malley and to those of Father Charles L. Doremus, C.S.C., who had just passed away.
Professor Haaser then turned the Chair over to Professor Cushing who announced that Professor De Santis had agreed to act as parliamentarian for the coming year. A motion was then entertained to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

James T. Cushing
Secretary
The Faculty Senate
Faculty Response to Senate Statement on Salaries and Retirement

Below are the results of the Faculty Senate poll of the faculty, library, and research staffs of the University regarding the Senate's statement on salaries and retirement: (The statement appears on page 319 of Notre Dame Report 16.) Of the 720 eligible voters polled, a total of 527 had responded as of the end of May.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Non-Support</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None indicated</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results show that 87% of the faculty responding supports the substance of the Senate Statement (i.e., by a margin of approximately nine to one).

The 527 votes received represent 73% of those polled. Six envelopes containing ballots were not signed and were therefore not counted since a signature on the envelope had been stated as a requirement. The remaining 521 envelopes were separated from the ballots before a tally was made. The names of the respondents were checked against a list of faculty, library, and research staff members. A total of 33 signatures could not be identified although the ballots were included in the results (30 support, 3 non-support). Eight people returned ballots in signed envelopes but indicated neither support nor lack of support. A record of those responding was kept so that no one could vote twice. Library and research staff members were grouped with faculty members of corresponding rank.