The Faculty Senate meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by the chairman, Prof. Robert Vacca. The meeting began early due to several schedule conflicts. Prof. Michael Crowe offered the opening prayer. Vacca then introduced several newly elected members of the senate and noted several members who were re-elected.

The first order of business was the election of officers for 1982-83. The executive committee had obtained consent of one candidate for each office. These were nominated by Vacca and seconded by Dr. Phillip Helman: for chairman, Prof. Vaughn McKim; for vice-chairman, Prof. Mario Borelli; for secretary, Dr. Sandra Harmatiuk; for treasurer, Prof. Peri Arnold; for chairman of the Committee on Faculty Affairs, Prof. Donald Barrett; for chairman of the Committee on the Administration of the University, Prof. Michael Crowe; and for chairwoman of the Committee on Student Affairs, Prof. Carson Daly. The senate then took a short break to discuss nominations informally. The chairman asked for additional nominations. There being no further nominations, the nominees were elected by acclamation.

The senate expressed its thanks to Vacca for his job well done as chairman the past two years.

The minutes for meetings of March 10 and April 15 were approved without change.

Prof. Ellen Weaver gave the treasurer's report. The total budgeted for the year was $3,500, of which $2,028 had been paid out with an expected $1,100 bill yet to be received from the Center for Continuing Education for meeting space. The budget for 1982-83 will be increased to $3,800.

Vacca gave the chairman's report, first noting that he had yet to receive an answer from the administration in reply to his letter asking for clarification as to why the Faculty Children's Tuition Grant had not been extended to all categories of regular faculty. However, this topic is on the agenda of the Academic and Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. Other topics to be discussed at that meeting include hiring policy as it pertains to the Catholic character of Notre Dame, student life at Notre Dame, and the spectrum of academic freedom grievances not covered by Academic Manual procedures.

Vacca also reported on the Academic Council meeting of April 19 and the senate proposal for grievance procedure in the case of removal of a professor from a course in progress. Some comments on the proposal were very favorable, these being made by faculty members of the council. They were followed by several unfavorable comments, chiefly by administration members of the council. There seemed to be three main objections, one that the deans might be prevented from seeking advice from advisors of their choice, second that the statement lacked a code of conduct for the professor as a rationale for removal, third that
there was no provision covering removal in cases of urgency. In the end the
motion was tabled with a committee to be appointed to study the matter and
propose a substitute next fall.

Crowe reflected that the senate proposal had been quite mild, compared to
what some had wished, in deference to anticipated Academic Council reaction.
The wording of the proposal had even been made in conjunction with the execu­
tive committee of the council. He suggested that the senate must seek the
best strategy to achieve the goal of the proposal. Vacca pointed out that
the chairman of the senate is to be on the Academic Council committee and
should make every effort to see that there is more than token faculty repre­
sentation on that committee. Several suggestions were made as to the desirable
make-up of the committee including the senate's ad hoc committee that gathered
facts on the case of Prof. Shapiro. It was also suggested that the administra­
tion is rather sensitive over the Shapiro matter and that the senate should
continue to separate that case from any proposed action. One member of the
senate ad hoc committee said that he did not want to be on the council's
committee, as the handling of the case and of the senate proposal, which he
deemed very fair, left him depressed.

Once again there were several requests that the facts of the case be discussed
in view of the need for informed actions by the senate. It was again held to
be unproductive to spread allegations and contrary to the agreed confidentiality
of the ad hoc committee's discussions with several administrators and Shapiro.

Several courses of action that the Senate could take next fall were discussed.
One, that the whole senate should be able to study the revised proposal before
council action, seemed possible as there is to be a senate member of that
committee. Ways to involve the whole faculty might include a faculty forum,
a poll of faculty sentiment, a general meeting of the faculty or a referendum.

The suggested code of faculty conduct was perceived by some as being only a
device to lever someone out. It did, however, raise the question of the proper
responsibilities and conduct of students, parents and administrators in such
cases.

Vacca mentioned that several faculty members of the Academic Council had sug­
gested that the faculty members are less informed on matters brought before
the council than are the administrators. This is in large part due to lack
of prior discussion. The senate might explore the possibility of organizing
a caucus of elected members.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Those absent but not excused: Rudolph Bottei, chemistry; Paul Conway, finance
and business economics; Fred Dallmayr, government and international studies;
Douglas Kmiec, law; James Tabor, theology; Thomas Theis, civil engineering;
Joseph Tihen, biology; Stephen Worland, economics.

Respectfully submitted,

W. Phillip Helman, Secretary
The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. in Room 202 of the Center for Continuing Education by the chairman, Prof. Vaughn McKim. Prof. James Tabor offered the opening prayer. McKim then called for any additions or corrections of the Journal for May 4. Prof. Paul Conway noted that his name appeared on the list of those absent but not excused in error since he was present at that meeting. Hearing no other additions or corrections, McKim stated that the minutes would stand approved.

McKim requested that any Senator who holds concurrent membership on any University Committee list such membership on the attendance sheet. Since the Faculty Senate is an elected body, McKim noted that the Executive Committee had agreed to append to the Journal an additional list of those absent but excused.

McKim called the attention of the senators to a number of enclosures which were sent along with the agenda for this meeting. Among those enclosures was a copy of the Bylaws of the senate which McKim stated he felt would be instructive for all members of the senate to review. Some discussion of the attendance requirement as stated in the Bylaws ensued. The meeting schedule for the coming year was also included.

The next meeting of the senate will be on October 4. This is the meeting which traditionally follows Father Hesburgh's address to the faculty. This meeting affords members of the senate an opportunity to talk about substantive matters with the President. McKim urged faculty members to think carefully about issues which could be raised at that meeting.

The regular business meeting for October is tentatively scheduled for October 12. McKim noted that this meeting would take place if there were sufficient business to warrant such a meeting. Perhaps, efforts should be concentrated instead on the work of the Standing Committees to generate serious proposals for consideration. Further information on the October 12 meeting will be sent along with the reminder for Father Hesburgh's meeting.

In addition to a copy of the Bylaws and the meeting schedule, senators should also have received a list of standing committee assignments. Members who had not returned the form sent out in June were assigned to a committee using a number of criteria. Any senator who would strongly prefer to serve on a committee other than that to which s/he was assigned, was asked to let the chairman know. McKim noted that Prof. Robert Wegs had agreed to substitute for Michael Crowe as acting chairman of the Committee for Administration while Crowe is in London.

Regarding the status of membership, McKim pointed out that the body is presently short nine people. Presently, the senate is waiting the appointment by the four College Councils of their ex officio members. The senate must also replace several members. McKim noted that Karl Kronstein of the College of Science
replaces Father James Shilts who died very suddenly last month. Two members of the senate are presently on academic leave this year, Alex Hahn of Mathematics and Douglas Kmiec of the Law School. McKim has inquired of the Dean's regarding replacements for them as well. Two members are not here because they are in London, Crowe and Prof. Michael Francis. McKim also noted that during the summer he was informed that Prof. Rufus Rauch was leaving South Bend. He has been replaced by Prof. James Danehy. Finally, McKim noted that he received a note from Prof. Nancy Carter resigning from the senate because of other commitments this year. Despite these empty positions at the beginning of the year, McKim stated that he felt this was a strong senate, one capable of making genuine contributions to the ongoing work and life of the university.

Following these announcements McKim requested that each senator informally introduce himself/herself for the benefit of new members.

McKim prefaced the chairman's report by a statement pledging to uphold the traditions established by previous chairmen.

McKim indicated that he perceives three broad ranges of issues that the senate should keep in mind this year. The first, and perhaps of most immediate concern, is the continued activity of engaging in research on specific issues, with the aim of formulating well thought out proposals for presentation to the Academic Council and the Administration. One of the things the senate has proven itself capable of doing effectively is to formulate solutions to single-issue problems in such a way as to present them to the Administration in a favorable light. However, McKim also stressed that the senate must begin to think not only in terms of single-issue problems but in broader terms as well, gradually take some initiative in formulating proposals for the development of the University in various areas. One of the problems undermining the effectiveness of the senate has been that we are typically caught in a reactive mode. That is, a policy is promulgated after which the senate finds out about it, discusses it, reacts with a counterproposal, and so forth. It would certainly be preferable for the senate to begin taking some initiative in articulating broad policy proposals ourselves so that faculty viewpoints could be taken into account early in any decision-making process. McKim proposed that to accomplish this, the senate might well produce modest "white papers" or mini-PACE reports for discussion in the University Community and as input into the administrative decision-making process.

Finally, McKim stated that there is yet a further task, of perhaps more global significance, to which the senate must begin to address itself. Over the long run perhaps the most important thing we can begin to make a contribution to is the effort to find new and better ways to integrate faculty opinion more effectively into the decision-making processes of the university. The issue here is precisely the role of the faculty in University Governance. This is a complex and multifaceted problem on which intensive and extended reflection will be required. However, in the short run, there are a number of informal steps we might take to begin to raise the profile of faculty in the decision-making process. The Executive Committee has already held some preliminary discussions
to clarify their ideas on this matter, but any concrete proposals will be left to the Committee on Administration which is the proper place to begin discussion and formulation of such proposals.

Broadly speaking, McKim suggested that there are then a number of different levels of concern to which the senate must be sensitive: First, particular projects which require immediate attention; secondly, more disinterested examination of large-scale issues affecting University priorities and plans for future development of the institution; and finally, the attempt to deal with structural matters, that is, to enable faculty members at this university to play a somewhat more appropriate role in the context of governance.

Unlike last year at this time there are few specific projects already "in the pipeline" in fairly well-developed form, although a number of ideas are in process of development. Consequently, attention should be given at least early in the semester to more active collaboration and participation of members in the work of the standing committees.

By way of conclusion, McKim commented on some issues left over from last year. First, McKim reminded the senate of the election of Dr. Thomas Carney as Chairman of the Board of Trustees. McKim wrote to Carney congratulating him on his election and, at the same time, reminding him that "we are here." The response was very encouraging and indicated that channels of communication between the board and the senate were open.

Secondly, in a recent meeting with the Provost two issues were raised. McKim noted that a committee had not yet been appointed to study the question of removal of a faculty member from the classroom, as mandated by the Academic Council last spring. O'Meara indicated that the committee would be appointed shortly. McKim was assured that Prof. Robert Vacca would be a member of that committee; likewise, it was strongly suggested that there would be additional senate representation.

Also, in discussion with O'Meara, the question of the PACE report was raised. According to O'Meara, the penultimate draft of the document is now complete. Hopefully, copies will be ready for distribution to the senate toward the end of October with discussion likely to begin at the November meeting.

Some questions and comments were raised after the chairman's report regarding the status of the TCE's. Vacca requested that specific questions and concerns be directed to him within the next week as he is representing the senate on the University committee established to evaluate the new TCE format.

The meeting adjourned briefly for initial meetings of the standing committees.

The general meeting resumed with reports from the chairmen of the standing committees.
Wegs, acting chairman of the Committee on Administration reported that several issues were of interest to the committee. In general, of primary concern was the role of the senate in University governance. Secondly, some concern for the issue of distinguished professorships was indicated. Finally, some consideration was paid to the question of increasing senate influence on the basis of increased senate participation on key university committees. Some discussion followed regarding theoretical and practical approaches to these issues.

Among matters of concern to the Faculty Affairs Committee, according to the report of chairman Donald Barrett are preparation of the annual report on faculty compensation, organizing the Faculty Forum, an examination of fringe benefits (e.g. the question of dental benefits), the Faculty Committee in Control of Athletics, and course evaluation review. A more detailed report will be forthcoming at a later meeting.

Prof. Carson Daly reported that the Student Affairs Committee plans to consider the Admissions Survey concerning faculty perception of Notre Dame students, upgrading of the Bookstore, the investigation of an Honors program for exceptional students, the state of the liberal arts at Notre Dame and the question of the Honor System.

General discussion of these issues followed with some special concern indicated regarding the state of the Bookstore. The question of social space was raised. Daly, in response, indicated that the committee was waiting for the PACE report to proceed on this issue. Other issues raised for possible senate consideration were the question of incentives for early retirement, topics for upcoming Faculty Forums, faculty input into the reappointment review of the Provost, and faculty involvement in improvement of the Library.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m. A reception for senate members followed.

Those absent but not excused: Gary R. Burleson, microbiology; Fred Dallmayr, government and international studies, David L. Dodge, sociology; Eugene R. Marshalek, physics; and Stephen T. Worland, economics.

Those absent but excused: Vincent P. DeSantis, history; John W. Lucey, aerospace/mechanical engineering; and Lawrence Simon, philosophy.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra J. Harmatiuk
The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. in room 202 of the Center for Continuing Education by chairman Vaughn McKim. McKim then introduced Fr. Theodore Hesburgh for his annual discussion with the Faculty Senate.

The first question directed to Hesburgh was concerned with the notion of the Catholic image of the University particularly in view of the reaction of the present generation of students to the concept of a teaching magisterium. Many students, and parents as well, believe that there is a body of truth "out there" associated with the Church. These students want to know how that body of truth relates to what they are studying here. How can this notion be incorporated into any proposed curriculum reform?

In response, Hesburgh stated that, for him, the magisterium was a shorthand for what the Church teaches which, when you really get down to it, means the Nicene Creed. Hesburgh registered some concern regarding the use of the term since so many people tend to use it for their own purposes. It can refer to what every bishop in the world thinks about what he's teaching. This can get pretty sticky given the conflicts between liberal/conservative bishops, etc. Hesburgh stated that for himself he felt more comfortable with the Nicene Creed as what the Church teaches. When you try to get too detailed about what the Church teaches it causes problems in a lot of very practical matters. Essentially, Hesburgh stated that he felt the term "magisterium" was overworked for the purposes of those wishing to impose a kind of orthodoxy on people, and may not be all that important.

Hesburgh was also questioned regarding student life on campus. What, in his opinion, are the most serious problems affecting student life here, and what solutions are possible?

In response, Hesburgh stated that the main problem a student ought to have is getting a good education. He expressed the hope that the years a student spends here would be maturing years and that a person would get some concept of what his or her life was about as well as what goals are worth seeking. Hesburgh stated that, in general, he believed the University to be a good place to grow up. Most of the students here face the same problems we experienced when we were young--problems of identity, morality, forming character, etc. Many students face a problem of how to relate to each other; men often face the problem of relating to women. All these are normal problems facing the 17-20 age group. Hesburgh indicated his worry that students might get too narrow an education, that they might learn to do something well but not to be someone. Hesburgh stated that he hoped students would get a sense of beauty while here as well as a sense of utility. If there were one thing he would want students to carry away from their four years here, it would be a sense of curiosity because, if they get that, they can go on and learn for the rest of their lives. The worst thing that could happen to a student here is to think he or she is acquiring cut and dried answers, simplistic answers, to complicated problems.
Hesburgh stated that he hoped students would leave here with a few doubts about the "real" answers to some very complicated questions.

Hesburgh was then asked about the role of the faculty in University governance, a question which is presently being discussed in the Faculty Forums. One concern expressed was the role of the Faculty Senate which is presently strictly advisory with no decision-making function or power.

Hesburgh began his response by referring to the historical evolution of the senate. The original idea was that there should be some place for the faculty to get together and take on any question involving the University and have a rational discussion of it. As years went by a mechanism was created by which things could go directly from the senate to the Academic Council for legislation. Hesburgh stated that there were probably a thousand ways to organize governance. There is no way to say absolutely that one system is perfect while another is not. Hesburgh further stated that he felt faculty governance could be "a pain" for individual faculty members if it were to involve them in complicated details of administrative work. But Hesburgh admitted that there would probably always be people advocating total faculty governance. He further went on to state that he believed that the senate has become very responsible in discussing issues as the years have gone on. He also said that his guess would be that there might always be some tensions between the senate as a purely deliberative body and the Academic Council as a legislative one. But he also expressed the belief that things are far better now in this regard than they had been in the past.

Following this question, a question was raised regarding the PACE report. When the penultimate draft is made available to the trustees, faculty, and community at large, will some process be established by which the opinion of the community, as a whole, could be made known? Hesburgh was asked how he envisaged that process.

In response, Hesburgh stated that everyone in the University should have "a fair crack" at PACE once it is available. There has, as yet been no definite plan put forth by which the process would take place. Hesburgh continued by comparing the process to that of the COUP document which went to about 80,000 people before it was printed in its final form. This would most likely be the fate of PACE as well.

As a follow-up question, it was pointed out that it was important for these discussions to filter back to the main building. As part of the process, would it be possible to convene joint meetings of the senate and the Academic Council to review PACE?

Hesburgh stated that this was surely a possibility. But precisely how the community's reactions to the PACE document should be structured has not yet been determined.

Hesburgh was then asked to expand upon a point made in his address to the faculty earlier in the day regarding the developing situation in which more and more
faculty are remaining longer, or even pursuing their entire careers, in the same institution; there is less mobility than previously. This creates an ever-increasing need for opportunities for faculty renewal. How best might that renewal be achieved?

In replying, Hesburgh pointed out that the standard procedure was the faculty leave policy. He expressed some reservations about the productivity of such leaves. However, he also indicated concern about the danger we all face of getting into ruts. Ways need to be found to "keep people alive" by doing different things, teaching different courses, getting into new fields, etc.

Hesburgh was then asked if there were any University study comparing leave policy, support for attending conferences, etc. with our peer institutions.

Hesburgh stated that most likely there was such a study, although he didn't have a specific document in mind. His principal concern with our present leave policy is that he is not sure that all faculty who receive leaves use them as wisely and productively as they should.

Pursuing this question further, it was pointed out that a tension seemed to exist here. On the one hand, there is concern with the productive use of leaves for research, and, on the other hand, the need, not necessarily to complete a piece of research but for renewal, to gain new perspectives, etc. If one perceived it important to have leaves for both reasons, then the product or output is going to look pretty different in the two cases. The present system is almost completely research oriented. Is any other format possible, especially in view of the present requirement to seek external funding in applying for a leave?

Hesburgh indicated that at least a few leaves have been granted in the past for "retooling." He also suggested that possibilities do exist at grant agencies outside the university to fund faculty with very wide ranging interests. In conclusion, Hesburgh acknowledged that it would be a terrible thing to let a faculty member who has ceased learning and growing just go to seed and not do anything about it. A leave that brings a person back to life is the best investment in the world because that person is going to be touching hundreds of lives.

A question was then asked in regard to the problem of 'impacted faculty,' whether the administration was considering the possibilities of encouraging early retirement in order to open up new faculty positions especially for women and minorities.

Hesburgh indicated that the problem was indeed under continual review and agreed that early retirement was the only apparent answer to the problem, but that it would be extremely expensive to pursue as a regular policy. The net new jobs in education in the sixties was 25%; in the seventies, 20%. Presently, the net new jobs in education is zero. This trend will continue into the nineties. The only openings now are when people die, retire, or move on to something else.
A question was raised regarding a research contract held by a faculty member in the College of Engineering with the Department of Defense concerning the effects of nuclear weapon explosions.

In response, Hesburgh indicated that given his knowledge of the type of research being done he perceived no inherent moral problem in accepting the grant.

Fr. Hesburgh was also asked about his retirement. Since his replacement must be a C.S.C. priest of the Indiana province, is this not too narrow or limiting a base? Many can understand, why it must be a C.S.C. priest, but why limit the search to the Indiana province?

In responding, Hesburgh indicated that it was likely the pool could be increased. The only serious consideration is the appointment of a C.S.C. priest. It was the Board of Trustees that made the stipulation, not the order. If a viable candidate were available from another province there would, most likely, be no problem in appointing him.

Hesburgh was also questioned regarding the relationship of technology and the humanities. Most people agree that students in the technological areas should have exposure to the humanities. Additionally, shouldn't humanists also have exposure to technology?

Hesburgh agreed that the problem cut both ways. Essentially, someone should stand up and ask the curriculum question: What should you have as a humanist that you don't get from humanistic studies and vice versa for the technological areas? Everyone in the humanities should know something about technology, especially computers—what they can and can't do, etc. As a measure of minimal competence, the humanist should be able to read intelligently the Time-Life series on science. The basic question for students in the technological areas should be what is the greatest humanistic exposure—books to be read, things to be discussed, philosophy and theology to be mastered in some context—for these students. It is as irresponsible to permit students in science and engineering to take just anything in the humanities as it is to permit students in the humanities to get by without a stiff math and science course. What we really should be asking ourselves is what kind of intellectual experience should a student have and how can we bring it about?

The question was raised regarding the potential conflict between this ideal and the pressure put on faculty by students' concerns about jobs.

In response, Hesburgh stated that, granted students often come with the notion that the main purpose of a college education is to provide them skills to enter a profession, but it is our responsibility to challenge this idea. We must ask them what it is they ought to expect from their education.

Another question raised was whether the University was considering the possibility of a five-year engineering degree incorporating a stronger liberal arts curriculum, particularly in view of likely government funding through ROTC.
Hesburgh pointed out that such a program already exists. If funding made it possible to increase the number of students involved, so much the better.

Another question was then raised about curricular reform. Interdisciplinary teaching can be exciting for faculty and students but raises problems with respect to faculty research, especially in view of the increasing need of faculty members to be visible in specific research areas.

In responding, Hesburgh stated he saw no reason why the encouragement of innovative approaches to teaching should be antithetical to an emphasis on research. It is, in fact, possible for the best people to do both. In responding to the question of curricular reform, Hesburgh stated he wanted a lot of new questions posed and a lot of assumptions challenged as soon as the dust from PACE begins to settle.

A question was then raised regarding how well the University's job placement program is serving students in the humanities, particularly in the area of informing students on how to market their skills.

In responding, Hesburgh agreed that it was important to teach students how to market themselves.

Hesburgh was then asked to comment on the situation in many fields of graduate study in which our brightest students are not going on to graduate school, and more and more foreign students are being admitted to our own graduate programs. The latter is having an increasingly serious affect on our undergraduates who are being taught more frequently by students, some of whom are unfamiliar with our customs and educational system, as well as not very proficient in English.

Hesburgh stated that we must find ways to make it more attractive for our own good students to continue their education rather than go directly into the job market. Given the fact that fewer students are going into graduate school, we must accept foreign graduate students as teachers in spite of the drawbacks.

Hesburgh was then asked whether there were any plans to encourage "older students" at Notre Dame.

In response, Hesburgh agreed that many schools had increasing numbers of these students. However, he indicated that Notre Dame had no plans to encourage increasing enrollments from this group.

As a final question, Hesburgh was asked to summarize the status of the many building projects on campus.

The University is presently spending 1-1/2 million dollars to renovate the Old Chemistry building for the Art department. When completed, the next step will be to tear down the old Field House and put another park or mall in its place. Washington Hall is being renovated to make it more serviceable for
classroom space and movies. The old WNDU building is to become the Center for Community Service. Hopefully, the building will be ready by December. Already completed is the new WNDU building. The old Engineering building is also undergoing extensive renovation. The old Senior Bar has been torn down and replaced with a new building. The new Faculty Office building will also be started soon. There is room near that site for a new classroom building when and if money becomes available.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Those absent but not excused: Gary Burleson, microbiology; Wendy Carlton, sociology; Fred Dallmayr, government, William Slowey, accountancy.

Those absent but excused: Peri Arnold, government; Nancy D'Antuono, modern languages; Thomas Theis, civil engineering; John Yoder, theology.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra J. Harmatiuk
The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. in room 202 of the Center for Continuing Education. The opening prayer was offered by Prof. John Yoder.

Proceeding to the first agenda item, Prof. Vaughn McKim, chairman, asked for any corrections or additions to the minutes of the September 8 meeting. Hearing no corrections or additions, the minutes were approved.

McKim then proceeded to the Chairman's Report. McKim began by bringing the senate up to date on the membership. The following people have been appointed or elected to the senate since the last meeting: Thomas R. Swartz, Economics (ex. off.); Barry Keating, Finance and Business Economics (ex. off.); William C. Streider, Chemical Engineering (ex. off.); Gerald B. Arnold, Physics, and Teresa Phelps, Law School.

Two items of correspondence were mentioned by McKim. The first had to do with the question of extending the new tuition benefit plan for faculty children attending college at schools other than Notre Dame to non-teaching and research faculty, a proposal endorsed by the senate last year. University Provost, Dr. Timothy O'Meara sent a letter to Bob Vacca, at that time senate chairman, indicating that a study would be undertaken by Tom Mason to decide whether it would be financially feasible to extend that benefit. If the senate had any further ideas to offer, they were to be sent to Mason. McKim then referred to a recent letter which he had written to Mason supporting the extension of the new benefit. In the letter he pointed out that extending the new plan would benefit roughly 17% of our total faculty (those to whom the plan is not presently available), with an addition to the student pool receiving such benefits of only about 8-13 children per year. The resultant cost increase was projected to be approximately 2-3% of the total tuition budget to which the University already is committed.

McKim noted that he also had sent a note to O'Meara expressing appreciation on behalf of the senate for the recent increases the administration has announced in long-term disability coverage and in minimum retirement benefits for faculty.

As a point of information, McKim also called attention to the recently finalized "friendship" agreement which Notre Dame has established with the University of Innsbruck (Austria) for purposes of mutual academic enrichment. The agreement envisages an exchange program on all levels--undergraduate, graduate, and faculty--between Notre Dame and Innsbruck. The program presents a number of interesting possibilities. Faculty wishing additional information were encouraged to contact Sr. John Miriam.

The Faculty Forums this semester have been very successful. McKim noted that a transcript of the second Forum on the topic of governance at Notre Dame would be distributed to all faculty in the near future to stimulate discussion of this important topic.
Updating information on the PACE report, McKim noted that copies were to be made available to members of the Board of Trustees at their November meeting. McKim further hoped that copies would be made available to senate members in time for there to be some discussion of the report at the December meeting.

Prof. Vacca gave a report on the committee which is reviewing the validity of the new TCE forms. According to Vacca, the initial hypotheses that class size, student motivation, and method of administration would affect the results of an instructor's TCE ratings have not been confirmed. As part of the study, the committee is tapping into the Kansas State University Center studying faculty evaluation nationwide to evaluate the diagnostic value of the Notre Dame TCE instrument relative to alternative instruments. The findings of this Committee will be published in Notre Dame Report.

A report was also given on the Ad hoc Committee of the Academic Council to study faculty grievances formed as a result of the Council's discussion of Senate proposals stemming from the Shapiro case. Members of the committee, appointed by the Provost, are Francis Castellino (chairman), Walter Nicgorski, Lee Tavis, Kwang-tzu Yang, Edward Malloy, Donald Barrett and Robert Vacca. The committee is looking broadly at the need for formal procedures in the case of removal of a faculty member from a class, the scope of such procedures, and the method of bringing such procedures into being. Barrett indicated a general satisfaction with the way in which the Committee was proceeding.

The next order of business was the reports from chairmen of the standing committees. Carson Daly gave the report from the Committee for Student Affairs. No progress has yet been made by the Admissions Office in collating the data from last spring's survey of faculty opinions about Notre Dame undergraduates. Student needs brought up in recent meetings of the CLC for consideration are student social space, lack of use of the Judicial Board, and lack of use of the Senior Bar for other students.

The committee is also concerned with the student Financial Aid question and the need to devise more creative ways of utilizing such aid. With regard to the study of the operations of the Bookstore, Daly pointed out that space is a major consideration. The Bookstore presently has 30,000 sq. ft. and needs 50,000. The problem of high costs being incurred to return unused texts from book orders for courses is a complex one because the need to rely on the Registrar for information on enrollment conflicts with the need for early ordering of texts for use in the spring semester. Two other areas of concern mentioned were the Honor Code which is presently in limbo and the question of an Honors Program. With regard to the second, Daly indicated that the committee was awaiting the publication of the PACE report.

Prof. Barrett then gave the report from the Committee for Faculty Affairs. Barrett pointed out that the next scheduled session for the Faculty Forum was December 2. He called for suggestions on topics. The Compensation report is moving ahead, and should be ready for presentation to the senate in December. Among items which will need further consideration are the likely effects on
Notre Dame of the new law regarding retirement and the recent very rapid increases in the cost of fringe benefits. Barrett also indicated that questions of athletics program policies affecting student athletes need to be looked into.

Prof. Crowe gave the report for the Committee on Administration. Three sub-committees have been formed to deal with key issues: Faculty Governance (Chair: Francis); distinguished service professorships and endowed chairs (Chair: Uhran), and faculty support and renewal (Chair: Crowe).

A brief recess followed the Standing Committee Reports.

Following the recess, an open-ended discussion ensued on ways in which the senate might more effectively represent faculty opinion in the context of university governance. Among the issues discussed were the need to enhance relationships between the senate and Academic Council (especially its thirty-two elected faculty members), and ways to improve channels of communication between the senate and the Administration and Board of Trustees. It was noted that the mandated 10 year review and revision of the Faculty Manual would have to take place soon, and that this would provide a significant occasion for rethinking our present structures of governance.

Following this discussion, representatives of student government made a presentation expressing their concerns about the inadequacy of student social space, based on a study of facilities available at peer institutions.

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Absent but not excused: Gerald Arnold, physics; Gary Burleson, microbiology; Fred Dallmayr, government; Bernard Doering, modern languages; William Eagan, management; Barry Keating, business; Thomas Kosel, metallurgy; Julian Pleasants, theology; William Slowey, accountancy; Eric Smithburn, law; William Streider, chemical engineering; Stephen T. Worland, economics.

Absent but excused: Subhash Basu, chemistry; Jay P. Dolan, history; Eugene Marshalek, physics; Terry Phelps, law; Niels Rasmussen, theology; Capt. John Rohrbough, ROTC; Jean Rosenberg, library.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra J. Harmatiuk
The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. in Room 202 of the Continuing Education Center by the chairman, Prof. Vaughn McKim. An opening prayer was offered by Prof. Neils Rasmussen.

The first order of business was the approval of the minutes for the October 4 and November 8 meetings.

McKim began the Chairman's Report by informing the membership about two meetings he recently attended representing the Senate. The Academic Council met for the first time this fall on December 1. It elected an executive committee and took up two items of business. The executive committee of the Council this year will be comprised of the following elected members in addition to the Provost and Associate Provost who are ex officio members: Profs. Jim Burtschaell (Theology), John Derwent (Mathematics), Neil Delaney (Philosophy), Tex Dutile (Law), Sonia Gernes (English), Lee Tavis (Finance), Roger Schmitz (Engineering), and a student representative. The Council approved the discontinuance of the general undergraduate major in Engineering Science at the request of that College. The program was held to have outlived its usefulness and no longer meets new accreditation standards. A discussion also was held of a proposal to change the language in the Faculty Handbook pertaining to the normal retirement age for faculty, moving the age for retirement from 65 to 70 to reflect recent changes in Federal law. As a result of the discussion the motion was tabled temporarily, and Dean David Link (Law) was asked to prepare a report detailing the ramifications of the new law and the ways in which other colleges and universities are responding to this matter. It was emphasized, however, that the University intends to comply fully with the law. Faculty approaching 65 will no longer be subject to mandatory retirement at that age.

The fall meeting of the Academic and Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees (which includes a number of faculty as elected members) was held on November 11 in conjunction with the general Trustees' meeting on campus. This was the first meeting of the Committee under the leadership of Dr. Martha Peterson, former president of Beloit College, the newly elected Trustee chairperson of this Committee. A new departure, designed to enable Trustee members to get a better sense of university operations and faculty attitudes, was a series of morning visitations to various academic units in the University. Each Trustee accompanied by a faculty member of the Committee visited one of the following departments: Chemistry, Economics, English, Chemical Engineering and the Business School. Various departments handled the sessions differently. Overall, however, both Trustees and faculty were extremely pleased with the outcome, feeling that fresh and informative exchanges of views had resulted in every case. Such visitations are likely to become a regular feature of fall meetings of the Committee in the future. The afternoon meeting was devoted to mutual debriefing on the morning visits and planning for future meetings. The next meeting in May will likely be devoted to a discussion of the "Catholic character" issue and to a careful review of PACE.
Finally, McKim noted that some positive steps were to be taken in the months ahead to increase communication and the flow of information between the senate and the Academic Council. First, McKim noted that he would begin sending copies of the minutes of each senate meeting to elected members of the Council as soon as they are approved. Secondly, McKim stated that he plans to extend an invitation to all faculty members on the Council to attend the January 18 meeting of the senate. This meeting, which is the traditional meeting with the Provost, will meet in rooms 210-212 of the CCE instead of room 202. Finally, a joint meeting is being planned later this spring for interested members of the senate and the Academic Council to explore informally ways in which the Council and senate might be able to work together more cooperatively and effectively in the area of governance.

McKim then called on Mario Borelli to give a report on classroom space problems at the University. Borelli met with Leo Corbaci, Dean of Administration, before Thanksgiving to discuss the issue. He expressed his appreciation to Corbaci for his frankness and cooperation. Some problems in the assignment of classroom space seem to arise from a lack of coordination between the Registrar who assigns the rooms, Corbaci's office, and the faculty. The executive committee will look further into this matter. Space problems appear to be particularly acute in two ranges of courses. 921 out of 1393 courses are in the 1-30 student range. This range makes up 66% of the demand. However, there are 51 classrooms on campus primarily designed to accommodate that number of students, roughly half the number needed. At the other end of the scale, there are two regular classrooms available to accommodate 16 classes in the range of 150-399 students. Corbaci's office is undertaking a time study of classroom use by times of day on the hypothesis that a partial solution to the space problem would be to teach more 8:00 and 4:30 classes. But it is still fairly obvious that a new classroom building is needed, though there is no indication that such a building will materialize in the immediate future. Administration studies are being conducted regarding the suitability of various kinds of new classroom facilities. Although Fr. Hesburgh will have the final word about the design of such a building, Borelli pointed out the importance of our submitting ideas to the Administration regarding facilities we as teaching faculty would deem essential in any new classroom building.

The first of the Standing Committee reports was given by Carson Daly. Reporting on the activities of the Committee on Student Affairs, Daly reported that a study of the Bookstore is still in progress.

In reporting on recent Campus Life Council meetings, which she attends representing the senate, Daly mentioned three issues that were presently of concern to students. First, the question of section parties; second, the suggestion that park benches be placed in scenic areas on campus; and third, the desire expressed by the students that Cable TV be installed in the dorms.

Daly also reported that her committee has been writing to other schools for ideas on curriculum reform. They have also had some meetings with the Deans on the same issue.
In reporting on the work of the University Committee on Financial Aid on which she serves, Daly indicated that serious concern was being voiced about how to deal with the Federal Budget cuts in aid for college students, and the need to establish clearer priorities in the distribution of available funds. It was moved and seconded that the Executive Committee engage in a fact-finding study of the financial aid situation for undergraduates and report back to the Senate its findings and any appropriate recommendations. In this connection the Committee was urged to meet at the earliest possible opportunity with appropriate parties from the Admissions and Financial Aid Offices. The motion was unanimously passed.

Prof. Donald Barrett then proceeded to present the new Compensation Report prepared for the Committee on Faculty Affairs. Barrett stressed three resolutions which he would like to see presented to the Administration in conjunction with the release of the Report. First, that now is the time for Notre Dame to invest in faculty salaries to bring all professorial ranks to an AAUP rank 1 rating. Secondly, that Notre Dame commit itself to give a minimum cost of living raise to all faculty members. Further, when such an increase is not possible to give public explanation of the reasons. Finally, that an ad hoc Faculty Fringe Benefit Committee be appointed (half by the provost, half by the senate) to reassess fringes and make recommendations.

In the ensuing discussion several points were made and some questions raised. It was pointed out that there may already be two committees, i.e., Budget Priorities Committee and Provost's Committee, looking into the question of fringes. Questions raised from the floor included the issue of equality of salaries for men and women at the same rank with comparable experience at Notre Dame. Barrett indicated that he knew of no evidence indicating serious disparities. Also raised were questions regarding the possibility of the university sponsoring supplementary or alternative pension plans in addition to those available through TIAA-CREF.

Given the scope of the questions raised regarding the compensation report and the appended resolutions, and the need for full discussion of the PACE report, it was suggested that an additional meeting might need to be scheduled for January since the regular meeting would be devoted to the question/answer session with O'Meara.

A brief recess was called at 9:15. The meeting resumed with a short report by Prof. Michael Crowe for the Committee on Administration. The committee is presently preparing a letter to be sent to peer institutions to gain information about what programs and resources they presently devote to the support of faculty research and faculty renewal. A draft of the letter was distributed to the members. Crowe asked that each senator read the draft to determine if all relevant areas of concern were covered adequately.

The remainder of the meeting was devoted to a preliminary discussion of PACE. It was strongly recommended that the senate develop a substantive set of responses
to the issues raised in PACE to be incorporated in a formal document which can be submitted to the Administration and the Board of Trustees.

Questions were voiced about a number of issues including the ways in which the PACE Report deals with the Catholic character of the university, the adequacy of present governance structures, and concerns related to the quality of undergraduate student life. Prof. James Danehy registered special concern about the adequacy and appropriateness of PACE's presentation of the Catholic character issue inasmuch as this issue sets the tone of the Report and will receive the most publicity. Given the complexity of this issue, a separate committee was formed to study it. Members of the committee include Mario Borelli, mathematics; James Danehy, emeritus; Bernard Doering, modern languages; Karl Kronstein, mathematics; Jim Tabor, theology; and Donald Barrett, sociology. The task of developing an initial formulation of reactions to the three main sections of the PACE Report was assigned to the Senate's three standing committees.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Those absent but not excused: Subhash Basu, chemistry; Gary Burleson, microbiology; Fred Dalimayr, government; David Dodge, sociology; Barry Keating, business; Julian Pleasants, microbiology.

Those absent but excused: Rudolph Bottei, chemistry; Michael Katona, civil engineering; John Lucey, aerospace; Terry Phelps, law; William Slowey, accountancy; James Tabor, theology; Thomas L. Theis, civil engineering.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra J. Harmatiuk
Highlights and Recommendations

As in the case of some previous Compensation Reports it is tempting to conclude with an expression of frustration. Notre Dame is still number "2", again... and again, despite the official high-priority given some years ago by Fr. Hesburgh to the achievement of "1" AAUP compensation ratings for all faculty ranks. The Cassandra perspective mentioned at the beginning of this Report appears to be quite accurate and soundly based, thus far. However there is some ground for optimism as well. Historically unprecedented inflation rates were finally responded to at Notre Dame with unprecedented increases in faculty compensation in 1981-82 (and presumably in 1982-83 as well). This is good news indeed. But the fact remains that the best of the Peer Universities and Private, Independent Category I universities as a whole made even greater strides forward in dollar and percentage increases last year in salary and compensation. 1981-82 brought very little change in Notre Dame's relative ranking in the compensation of its faculty. Yet even in this respect there is reason for some guarded optimism. In the Provost's recently released PACE Report there is an explicit recommendation that the "University achieve a number one AAUP rating in each of the professorial ranks by 1985" (p. 32). A specific date has finally been attached to a long standing commitment of the administration. Section III of this Report makes clear that the University possesses the resources to achieve this goal, but very substantial increases in faculty compensation must continue to be budgeted over the next two years to put this goal within reach.

In concluding its discussion of this Report, the Faculty Senate passed unanimously the following resolutions which it strongly urges the University administration to adopt:

1. "Be it resolved that now is the appropriate time for Notre Dame to invest in faculty salaries and compensation so as to achieve a rank "1" AAUP rating in all professorial ranks no later than 1985."

2. "Be it resolved that Notre Dame commit itself to giving annual salary increases to all faculty which at a minimum match increases in the cost-of-living. When in the judgement of the administration this cannot be done, that a public explanation of the reasons be given."

3. "Be it resolved that whenever substantive changes in the composition of faculty fringe benefits are contemplated by the administration, the appropriate consultation be held with representative faculty bodies including the Faculty Senate."
The following resolutions have been discussed and approved by the Executive Committee for presentation to the entire Senate at its next meeting. If they are adopted by the Senate it is proposed that the following text be appended to the conclusion of the revised version of the Compensation Report to be distributed to the faculty and administration:

In concluding its discussion of this Report, the Faculty Senate, meeting on [date], (endorsed/unanimously endorsed) the following resolutions which it strongly urges the University administration to adopt.

1. "Be it resolved that now is the appropriate time for Notre Dame to increase its investment in faculty salaries so as to achieve a rank "I" AAUP rating in all professorial ranks no later than 1985."
   Rationale: 1983 Compensation Report, Section III.

2. "Be it resolved that Notre Dame commit itself to providing annual salary increases to faculty which on average minimally match increases in the cost-of-living. When, in the considered judgment of the administration this goal cannot be met, that an explanation of the reasons be provided to the faculty."
   Rationale: 1983 Compensation Report, Section IV.

3. "Be it resolved that whenever substantive changes in the composition of faculty fringe benefits are being given serious consideration by the University administration, that appropriate consultation be held with representative faculty bodies including the Faculty Senate."
   Rationale: 1983 Compensation Report, Section V.
The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. in room 210 of the Center for Continuing Education by the chairman, Prof. Vaughn McKim. McKim welcomed elected members of the Academic Council, all of whom had been invited to participate in this annual meeting with the Provost. He then proceeded to introduce Dr. Timothy O'Meara, who immediately opened the session by requesting questions from the floor.

Carson Daly asked O'Meara to summarize some of his ideas regarding the question of curriculum reform which was raised earlier by Father Hesburgh in his annual address to the faculty.

O'Meara responded by referring to the recommendations in the PACE report. He further stated that he believed that the specific issues to be addressed and the procedure to be followed in any curriculum reform study should be developed by the faculty. The points O'Meara views as most important are mentioned in the recommendations, essentially, that the Catholic Character of the University be represented in certain specific disciplines at least. Several letters which O'Meara has received regarding PACE have criticized the fact that the report did not specify more clearly how the Catholic character of the University was to be represented in the various functions of the University. But O'Meara suggested that it would have been presumptuous for the PACE Committee to propose a blueprint.

Prof. Michael Crowe asked O'Meara to explain the source of the data regarding the percent of Catholics on the Faculty reported in PACE (p. 53). A Faculty Senate survey conducted about two years ago came up with a different set of figures.

O'Meara responded by pointing out that problems exist in any survey depending upon who is counted. The number may differ depending on whether you are counting only Teaching and Research faculty or whether you are counting all regular faculty, e.g. visiting faculty, etc.

Crowe followed up this question by asking O'Meara what strategies he foresaw developing to deal with the growing emphasis on scholarship and research for those departments without graduate programs.

O'Meara responded by indicating that one strategy would be to hire people who indicate an interest in and commitment to research. Another strategy to encourage research would be to take a harder look at the question of appropriate teaching loads for those faculty who are, or ought to be, productive in research. Consideration must, of course, be given to those who were hired at a time when the expectations for scholarship and research were not as important as they are presently. Such people, however, should not provide the only role
models for their departments. Having a department strong in research when there is no graduate program, according to O'Meara, is possible in many fields. It is important to begin to de-emphasize the unfortunate American tradition of linking graduate training and research too closely.

Prof. Mario Borelli followed up this comment by asking O'Meara how one would attract faculty to a department that does not have a graduate program given that traditional coupling?

O'Meara responded that in a certain sense, the present employment prospects of new faculty here and elsewhere assist in that.

Prof. Donald Barrett then asked O'Meara to comment on the University's efforts to bring salaries for all faculty ranks up to AAUP Rank #1.

In responding, O'Meara first stated that he was concentrating on salaries at this time as a separate variable. He would not include compensation projections in his comments since there were a number of additional variables that would have to be taken into consideration. In looking at salaries, two "crystal balls" need to be consulted; i.e., this year's averages across the country, and the percent of increase other schools are likely to adopt next year. O'Meara indicated that he has taken all the schools in the AAUP Category #1 ranking, and has ordered them by salary in descending order. He has placed on that list our position in each of the last four years for each of the three professorial ranks and where we are now. This enables him to see how much we are progressing (i.e., moving up the list) each year. He has also tried to discover where some of the raise money given in the past used to vanish and has plugged those holes. Putting salary data for all faculty on the computer this year also has helped to rationalize things and to make possible a clearer understanding of what is happening in the budgeting process. O'Meara indicated the following hopes for this year: we are on the border of a #2 rating for professors; five or six steps into the #1 rating for Associates; and hopefully, a #1 rating this year for Assistants. He indicated that his guess was that raises would be good for next year; they will be very good compared with those likely to be offered in many parts of the country. Also in that regard, O'Meara pointed out that three years ago, a minimum was established for all regular faculty of $18,000; this year the minimum is $21,000; while for next year the minimum will be $23,000.

Barrett proceeded to question O'Meara regarding the rationale for picking the Associate rank first in the effort to bring salary levels up.

In responding, O'Meara stated that the Associates were chosen first because it was easiest to do. The next step would be the Assistants since that's where we have to attract new young people. These individuals will start with a higher base that will support good increases as their careers progress. Finally, the full professors must be dealt with. One thing that is helping with what has to be done in this regard is the Chairs. Regarding the hiring of instructors, O'Meara noted that the University does not hire instructors, per se. New
Assistant Professor appointments are conditional, reverting to Instructorships if the Ph.D. is not completed. O'Meara indicated that, in his opinion, such a situation could well call for a reduction in salary as well as rank.

Prof. Joseph Tihen then asked O'Meara to comment on how close the median salary figures at Notre Dame come to the published figures on mean salaries in various ranks.

O'Meara responded that he could figure that out but that it was not a statistic he carried around with him.

Capt. John Rohrbough then asked O'Meara to comment on how women have been doing at Notre Dame in relation to their male counterparts in salary, etc.

O'Meara responded that he believed there was no real discrepancy, that such differences as exist reflect "normal" differences in contribution, reputation and experience of faculty and are not based on gender. Barrett followed this up by pointing out that the data compiled for the Senate Compensation Report shows no significant salary difference between men and women at the Associate level; at the Assistant level, salary averages for women were somewhat lower, in part, to the increased number of women among the very recently hired.

O'Meara noted that one of the arguments against having a fixed salary minimum as high as we do is that you could bring in more faculty if you didn't use so much raise money to increase the minimum each year. But he stated that he felt strongly that if we are to take seriously what we are saying about the importance of liberal education at Notre Dame, people in the arts, humanities and social sciences must get a decent wage. Market conditions alone should not prevail.

O'Meara was then asked by Prof. Charles Wilbur about the future of university governance at Notre Dame in view of the fact that this topic was given so little emphasis in the PACE Report. Has any thought been given to a merging of the Academic Council and the Senate?

O'Meara responded that the question had come up before. One of the problems to consider is the present size of the Council, the tradition of representing all University constituencies in its membership. The effect of a merger could be to double the size of the body, a consequence which could be counterproductive.

In following up on this question, O'Meara was asked if any thought has been given to more effective ways of involving faculty in decisions affecting academic policy?

In responding, O'Meara referred to the bad times of the 70's with student problems, etc. There were tensions also among the faculty. One of the traditions that evolved from this unsettling period was the Academic Council as it is presently structured. One of O'Meara's hopes is to get the Council involved again in more academic matters.
An enormous amount of work will be coming up for the Council as a result of PACE. Curriculum revision and new external reviews of the quality of departments should be coordinated by the Council. The faculty has very real power at Notre Dame (e.g. in appointments and promotions decisions) as distinct from many other universities such as Princeton where the departments don't even get to see the external letters of recommendation in faculty promotion cases. At the departmental level faculty are properly concerned with the curriculum of the department and its quality.

Crowe then asked O'Meara to comment on the fact that although there have been real improvements in salaries for new faculty, for faculty holding endowed chairs, and for some Associates, the general sense or sentiment among the faculty is that these changes have not brought much benefit to many faculty who have been at Notre Dame for some time.

In responding, O'Meara agreed that there was an element of truth in what Crowe had to say. It is connected with the fact that the quality of the faculty is ascending. It is only to be expected that compensation levels will reflect this fact to some extent. But compensation differentials can only be implemented in an orderly and civilized manner with attention given to respecting the dignity and the feelings of all those affected. Service, loyalty and experience will continue to be recognized, but whether or not promotion occurs is another matter.

Dr. Phillip Helman then asked O'Meara to comment on how fringes, especially health benefits, would, in future, impact on salaries?

O'Meara responded that there was always a need to be sensitive to this issue. One reason is that over the long run, particular fringe benefit policies tend to take on a life of their own, i.e., once a policy is adopted things begin to happen that are beyond the University's immediate control. It's like entitlement programs. Regarding the question of health benefits, O'Meara stated that costs are becoming a serious problem. One solution would be to establish a deductible amount. Psychologically, adding a deductible to health benefits would act as a regular reminder of the cost of using the benefits. However, a high percentage of the total cost of health insurance benefits in any given year is generated by a small percentage of the faculty. This is an indication that one might not actually save a great deal with a deductible. No concrete decisions have yet been made, but alternative modes of funding will have to be considered.

O'Meara was asked by Prof. James Tabor to expand on the statements in PACE regarding the Catholic character of the University. It appears Tabor noted that at least four different notions of "Catholicity" are being discussed in the University community, each having a certain validity:

1. "Catholic" in a statistical sense, i.e., a denominational affiliation tag possessed by a certain number of individuals.
2. "Catholic" as emphasizing the magisterium, i.e., the official teachings of the Church.
3. "Catholic" in the sense of Fr. Hesburgh's statements emphasizing Judaeo-Christian values vs. secular values.

4. "Catholic" in the classical Nicene sense, i.e., the Creed, doctrines, beliefs accepted by all mainstream Christian traditions.

Did one or more of these conceptions play a prevailing role in the formulation of the statements in PACE?

O'Meara responded by stating first that a further alternative needed to be kept in mind, i.e., "Catholic" in a sense which must be continually rethought in light of the Church's changing experience and self-understanding. Enough freedom must be left for this more evolutionary notion in our discussions. O'Meara added that the Provost's office can only be aware of the denominational aspect. The deeper sense of what it means for Notre Dame to be Catholic must be worked out at the "grass roots" level in the community itself. If "all the boxes are filled in correctly" and the spirit is missing something is wrong. Conversely, if there were no baptized Catholics here, then even if "the spirit were right" Notre Dame would be distinctive but not a Catholic University. Finally, O'Meara stated that Catholic and non-Catholic faculty alike must be equal citizens in the University. Each of us can find our own way of subscribing to the ethos of the place.

Following up on this matter, Prof. Vacca requested O'Meara to clarify why the "Catholic character" issue figures so prominently in PACE. Why is there so much concern on the part of the administration about this issue at the present time?

In responding O'Meara pointed out that the concern for the Catholic character of the University is precisely because it is threatened. This concern is not new to the 80's but can be seen in the 60's and in the COUP report of the 70's. It is the expressed policy of the Board of Trustees that this be a Catholic University. Even if the concept of what it is to be a Catholic university is changing we must preserve whatever it is at a particular time in our history that makes us Catholic. This is something we could lose and therefore there is a concern.

Peri Arnold then followed this up by asking O'Meara to comment on the apparent discrepancies in the language of the report which seem to imply a definition of "literal Catholicism" which would freeze tradition and the concept of the evolution of that tradition.

In responding, O'Meara stated that ultimately it is what this community in its various constituencies says that will determine what it means for Notre Dame to be Catholic. We are concerned here with a process of growth just as the Church itself has grown.

Arnold then asked O'Meara to elaborate on the various means or "instrumentation" needed to achieve this end.
O'Meara responded that first of all, Catholic tradition should be instrumental in the change. If you abandon the concern for a Catholic presence among the faculty in hiring and promotion decisions, something will be lost that is needed to preserve an awareness of that tradition. Our future will grow out of the traditions of the people one brings in. Second, there must be concern for a strong emphasis on liturgies on campus. Third, the University should maintain a concern for moral questions, and this concern should be reflected in the curriculum. How, the "grass roots" must determine. The aim of the Report is not to solve these problems, nor to define a specific list of "Catholic" characteristics, but to spell out the priority of our concern about being Catholic.

Prof. Michael Francis then asked O'Meara to give some idea about what a non-Catholic department, e.g., a non-Catholic physics department would look like.

O'Meara responded that in respect to such disciplines as physics, mathematics, etc., the primary concern would be in terms of composition of the faculty, i.e., in terms of the character and personal beliefs of individual faculty members regardless of their field of professional expertise. The concept of continuity, of maintaining a tradition capable of spanning future generations, is a parameter that must be considered across the whole faculty of the University.

Prof. Barth Pollak then asked O'Meara to elaborate on the recommendation of PACE, calling for new external reviews over the next seven years of all academic departments in the University.

In responding O'Meara pointed out that the Graduate Council conducted reviews of the graduate programs over a period of several years (1974-1979). The question arises as to why such evaluations should be undertaken for the graduate sector only? Just as the Graduate Council should know where the programs under its jurisdiction are going, the Academic Council should be responsible for assessing the overall academic strengths and weaknesses of the University. The question also arises as to what to do with the information once you have it. There must be more constructive and concrete follow-up, e.g., in reviews of departments and in future allocations of resources (though always within reason).

Capt. Rohrbough then asked O'Meara to address the need to do something about the disreputable study atmosphere in the halls which, in his opinion, seriously affect the academic work of many undergraduates, especially freshmen and sophomores.

O'Meara agreed that problems did exist in the halls. One of the reasons for the construction of the college library was to provide a quiet study place for students. This, too, has presented problems. Any change in the present situation, O'Meara stated, must grow out of a sense of community in the hall. There must be basic discipline, but it should not be evident as discipline. We cannot return to the type of discipline we had here thirty years ago. The quality of life in the dorms must be elevated through elevating the ethos and the spirit of the halls.
Prof. Vaughn McKim suggested that one way of constructively responding to these problems would be to give some serious thought to modifying the present "stay hall" system to allow students, especially freshmen, to find their own way of "being" on this campus without instantly being exposed to stereotyped role-models. Much could be said for allowing people of like-minded character to find their own place to live together.

O'Meara was also asked about what the University planned to do regarding graduate enrollment in light of the many reports of overproduction in certain fields, e.g. law.

In responding, O'Meara pointed out that "natural forces" usually have a way of correcting such situations so that active intervention is unnecessary.

Several questions were asked of O'Meara regarding possibilities of decline in enrollment and the increasing financial pressures on undergraduates who do enroll.

O'Meara responded that although there has been a slight decline in applications there had been no significant decline in quality. Additionally, O'Meara indicated that the financial situation with regard to student aid is looking better.

In responding to questions regarding student/faculty ratios and the impact of class size on faculty members' time to do research, O'Meara indicated that the whole issue of equitable and proper teaching loads is not one that can be easily resolved. Presently the method of getting to the problem is an "inexact science." But efforts are being made to find out where serious discrepancies may be occurring.

In a final question, O'Meara was asked to comment on the role of Institutes and Centers in the future of the University.

O'Meara responded that many of our present programs of this nature are facing serious funding problems. Aside from funding, O'Meara indicated concern that in some cases, the role these programs have played in contributing to the larger educational endeavors of the University has been disappointing. New initiatives in this area are not likely to be undertaken in the immediate future.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Absent but not excused: Gary R. Burleson, microbiology; Paul F. Conway, finance; Fred Dallmayr, government; Nancy D'Antuono, modern languages; David Dodge, sociology; Barry Keating, finance; Lawrence Simon, philosophy; William Slowey, accountancy; Stephen T. Worland, economics.

Absent but excused: Rudolph Bottei, chemistry; James P. Danehy, emeritus; Vincent P. DeSantis, history; Michael G. Katona, civil engineering; John Yoder, theology; Jay Dolan, history; Niels Rasmussen, theology.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra J. Harmatiuk
The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. in room 202 of the Center for Continuing Education by the chairman, Vaughn McKim. The opening prayer was offered by Prof. Carson Daly. McKim then called for any additions or corrections of the Journal for December 8. Hearing none, McKim stated that the minutes would stand approved.

The next order of business was the chairman's report. McKim first extended a welcome to any Academic Council members present. He then summarized the work of the Executive Committee since December. McKim first mentioned his meeting with the Provost before the January meeting. Most of the topics discussed were ones subsequently brought up in the open meeting. O'Meara emphasized the point made in the Compensation Report that there is a growing concern about the cost of fringes, especially medical benefits. McKim also met informally with the Associate Provost to discuss the work of the senate and to share with him some of our priorities and concerns.

McKim further stated that as senate chairman he has been invited to attend a meeting of the Holy Cross Higher Education Committee which has been created by the Indiana Province to examine the role of Holy Cross priests in the context of Notre Dame. McKim also has had some correspondence with Isabel Charles, the Assistant Provost, with regard to solving a "modest problem" in connection with the visibility of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. Next year, Notre Dame Report #4 will list the members of all Trustee committees.

The principal concerns of the Executive Committee in the past few weeks have been:

1. the question of undergraduate financial aid,
2. proposals to accompany the compensation report,
3. the present financial problems of the Early Childhood Development Center which serves the Notre Dame and St. Mary's communities,
4. formulation of responses to PACE.

McKim summarized by stating the hope that, during the next two meetings, we will have some substantive documents to consider including a series of proposals in reaction to PACE, especially in regard to the question of the Catholic Character issue.

McKim then commented on the Faculty Forum held earlier in the day on Athletics and Academics which was very revealing and informative. Another Faculty Forum is planned for later this spring. Tom Carney the newly elected Chairman of the Board of Trustees will be invited to meet with the Faculty at that time. McKim then called for any questions or comments from the floor.
McKim next turned the floor over to Prof. Robert Vacca who presented a report from the Executive Committee on the Early Childhood Development Center (ECDC) which is presently confronted by financial difficulties ($4500 deficit this year). (See appendix.) The principal proposal set forth in Vacca's report was that the University take steps to help the program meet its short term deficit. Among the arguments favoring this proposal are: 1) the value of the program to the Notre Dame community, 2) the fact that the family-centered policies of the Center are in keeping with the University's emphasis on the Catholic character of Notre Dame, 3) its principle of providing professional wages to its employees deserves our support. In the discussion that followed several arguments were presented in support of the proposal: 1) the program is attractive to new faculty, and especially to married faculty, women, 2) the intangible value of the program in its support of families undergoing emotional crisis or professional stress to which no arithmetic dollar figure can be attached. After considerable discussion, it was moved that the senate recommend to the administration the two proposals for action contained in items #6 and #7 of Vacca's report.

The first recommendation is that the University administration make an additional cash contribution to the ECDC this spring to enable it to meet its expenses for the remainder of the present academic year.

The second recommendation is that the administration enter into negotiations with the ECDC Board and St. Mary's College officials to develop a viable and mutually agreeable plan for the continued operation of the Center in future years. As part of such a plan the Senate urges:

(a) That ECDC make every effort to operate the Center at full enrollment capacity. In the past there has been insufficient publicity about the services offered by the Center within the University community.

(b) That a policy of offering specific subsidies to faculty/staff/administration families from either Notre Dame or St. Mary's be discontinued. However "full-cost" tuition rates should not be set at a rate more than 10% higher than that for proprietary schools in the area offering comparable services.

(c) That student families continue to be offered services at a discounted rate, and that scholarships be available to families demonstrating unusual need.

(d) That Notre Dame continue to provide financial support to the Center to cover operational costs which cannot be met through the adoption of recommendations (a)-(c), up to a predetermined dollar amount subject to annual renegotiation.

The motion in favor of the proposals carried with no dissenting votes.
The next order of business consisted of reports from the Standing Committees. Prof. Carson Daly presented the report of the Committee on Student Affairs. The first point raised was a concern on the part of the student government to gain support in its efforts to make cable television available in the dorms. After some preliminary discussion, it was moved by Captain John Rohrbaugh that the senate not support the student union's petition for cable television in the dorms. The motion was seconded, and after further discussion, the question was called. The results of the vote were 14 for, 15 against, 3 abstentions. Because of lack of clarity about what the students are actually proposing, and the inconclusive outcome of the vote, it was recommended that the issue be set aside until a more concrete proposal was forthcoming from student government. Daly ended her report by indicating that the Admissions office survey of faculty perceptions of undergraduates would be available at the next meeting.

Prof. Don Barrett then presented the report of the Faculty Affairs Committee. He first made reference to some of the questions raised in the Faculty Forum on Athletics: 1) the justification for Freshmen playing varsity sports, 2) the role of Notre Dame as a moral leader (in recruitment, etc.) and 3) concern about athletics and scholarship. Barrett also mentioned that Tom Carney has been invited to appear at the next Faculty Forum scheduled for March 24. Some questions were raised regarding the scheduling of the Faculty Forums so that more people could attend.

Barrett then called attention to the new one page addendum to the Compensation Report containing three resolutions which the Executive Committee will recommend that the senate adopt. Discussion of the resolutions would be taken up later in the meeting.

Prof. Michael Crowe then gave the report of the Committee on Administration. Crowe called on Prof. John Uhran to give a report on the work of his subcommittee looking into the idea of establishing "distinguished service" Chairs at the University. One matter being considered is the precise nature of such a chair, i.e., how "service type" chairs should be funded and allocated. Some difficulties have been encountered in seeking information about how other universities utilize this type of chair. Uhran asked for any suggestions from the floor which would help in getting information. Among the schools suggested as having such chairs were Chicago, Minnesota, and the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor.

Crowe then mentioned that the letter which his committee drafted requesting information on how other peer institutions seek to facilitate faculty renewal and support faculty research has been sent out. Returns have been requested by March 1.

Crowe also mentioned that McKim had asked him to draft a letter of appreciation to Jim Frick who is resigning his position as Vice President of Public Relations, Alumni Affairs and Development. The letter will be prepared for the next meeting and circulated to enable each member who wishes to affix his/her signature. If anyone had any suggestions for the letter, such suggestions would be welcomed.
Following this report, a short break was taken. The meeting resumed at 8:50.

McKim called attention first to a sheet prepared by Don Barrett with some leading questions regarding PACE. Anyone with specific reactions to items to which the Senate ought to be sensitive was requested to pass them on to Don.

The next order of business was a discussion of recommendations to be attached to the Faculty Compensation Report.

A motion was made to accept the first resolution:

"Be it resolved that now is the time for Notre Dame to increase its investment in faculty salaries and compensation so as to achieve a rank "1" AAUP rating in all professorial ranks no later than 1985."

In the discussion which followed, it was suggested that the resolution be reworded to make more explicit the fact that it represents an endorsement of the PACE recommendation on faculty salaries. This suggestion was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Barrett was then asked why the target date was changed to 1985 when the original report suggested 1983-84. In responding, it was indicated that the change was made to achieve consensus support from the Executive Committee. McKim also pointed out that since the budget for '83-'84 has already been set, it was more realistic to set '85 as the target date. After some further discussion, the question was called. However it became clear that it would be necessary to clarify whether the senate was being asked to vote on the resolution as worded or whether we were considering acceptance of the proposal with the friendly amendment endorsing PACE. A straw vote was taken on whether to accept the wording as is, or with the friendly amendment. The straw vote indicated a strong preference for the resolution as amended. A vote was then taken on the resolution with the understanding that its final wording would include an endorsement of the PACE proposal. The resolution was adopted without dissenting vote.

Discussion then proceeded to the second resolution:

"Be it resolved that Notre Dame commit itself to providing salary increases to all faculty which, on average, minimally match increases in the cost-of-living. When, in the considered judgement of the administration, this goal cannot be met in a given year, that an explanation of the reasons be provided to the faculty."

After some discussion the wording of the resolution was changed by a friendly amendment to substitute the phrase "at least" for the phrase "minimally."

A question was also raised by Prof. James Danehy regarding the second sentence of the resolution which he considered vitiated the first sentence. It was then
moved and seconded that the second sentence be deleted. After some discussion a vote was taken. This motion was defeated and the resolution with the friendly amendment was voted upon. The resolution carried with only one negative vote.

The next order of business was to consider resolution #3:

"Be it resolved that whenever substantive changes in the composition of faculty fringe benefits is being given serious consideration by the University administration, appropriate consultation be held with representative faculty bodies including the Faculty Senate."

After some discussion, the resolution was voted upon and carried unanimously.

The next order of business was a preliminary consideration of the senate Financial Aid Report prepared by McKim with help from the Executive Committee. The report covers a number of issues, principally, the question of the actual financial aid situation for Notre Dame undergraduates at present. Additionally, the report considers amounts of support likely to be available in the near future, and makes recommendations regarding ways of increasing this amount, e.g. through tuition surcharges and alumni contributions. The full report will be available to members before the next meeting at which time a full discussion will take place.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Absent but not excused: Subhash Basu, chemistry; James Bellis, sociology; Mario Borelli, mathematics; Gary Burleson, microbiology; Fred Dallmayr, government; Nancy D'Antuono, modern languages; Michael Katona, civil engineering; Barry Keating, economics; Eugene Marshalek, physics; Stephen Worland, economics.

Absent but excused: Peri Arnold, government; Wendy Carlton, sociology; Vincent DeSantis, history; Jay Dolan, history; John Lucey, aerospace engineering; Robert Wegs, history.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra J. Harmatiuk
The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. in room 202 of the Center for Continuing Education. Prof. Julian Pleasants offered the opening prayer.

The first order of business was approval of the minutes of the Senate meetings held January 18 and February 17. This was followed by the Chairman's report. Prof. Vaughn McKim presented the following information in his report:

1. In a meeting with the Provost, McKim conveyed to O'Meara the resolutions pertaining to faculty compensation which the senate adopted at its February meeting. O'Meara agreed to present the resolutions to the officers of the University.

2. McKim also presented to the Provost the senate Executive Committee's Report on the Notre Dame/St. Mary's Early Childhood Development Center. He explained to O'Meara the senate's concerns about the financial difficulties being experienced by the Center, and requested that the senate's recommendations pertaining to University funding for the ECDC be given prompt attention by the administration.

3. McKim then reported on a letter which he received from Tom Mason, university Vice President for Business Affairs, in response to a letter McKim sent to him in November regarding the question of extending the present tuition benefit for faculty children attending schools other than Notre Dame to non-T & R faculty. Mason has been conducting a study of the likely cost of extending this benefit. In doing a survey of administrators and higher level staff to whom the University feels an obligation to extend the benefit, if it is extended to non-T & R Faculty, Mason determined that the rate of usage among that group would be roughly comparable to that of non-T & R faculty as projected by the senate. Mason estimated the additional cost of extending the benefit to the two groups to be in the range of $31,000 to $51,000 next year. This, he argued, would represent a major budget item. In response, McKim has sent another letter to Mason suggesting that he may have overstated the impact on the budget of the new program by not taking into account the effect implementing the new benefit would have on usage of the far more expensive Notre Dame tuition benefits for which non-T & R faculty and administrator families are already eligible.

4. McKim then spoke of an item that had come up at the January meeting with the Provost regarding the rising cost of fringes, especially Blue Cross/Blue Shield. At that time, O'Meara indicated that no concrete steps had yet been taken to respond to this concern. There has, however, been a new development. The faculty subcommittee of the Budget Priorities Committee has been asked to investigate alternatives which would reduce University contributions to Blue Cross/Blue Shield. Subsequently, the Provost agreed that it would be appropriate to have the senate cooperate in this study. The Executive Committee has asked Profs. Donald Barrett and Peri Arnold to work with the faculty members of the Budget Priorities Committee on this
issue. The Budget Priorities subcommittee will make its own report to the Provost. The senate will be free to make recommendations independent of that committee. Among the options being considered are:

a) that University pay part of the cost (e.g. 80%), with the faculty picking up the rest.

b) that a deductible on usage be established as is presently the case with Major Medical Insurance.

c) that the University would increase its support at the level of inflation; the faculty would pick up any costs over that.

McKim pointed out that another fringe, i.e., retirement benefits would most likely be an important issue for the senate next year especially in light of the strong possibility that new unisex benefit tables may soon be put into effect by TIAA/CREF.

As a point of information, McKim informed the senate that it had come to his attention that the Budget Priorities Committee has two new faculty members, Fr. Ernan McMullin (Philosophy) has been replaced by Prof. Nathan Hatch (History) and Prof. Walter Miller (Physics) has been replaced by Prof. John Kozak (Chemistry). These are the first changes in the Committee's faculty membership since it was established in the early 1970s.

The next order of business was concerned with the letter drafted by Prof. Michael Crowe to be sent to Jim Frick on the occasion of his retirement. The letter was passed around for each member of the senate to sign.

McKim mentioned next that members of the senate would soon be receiving an invitation to an informal gathering with the elected members of the Academic Council. This meeting is intended to provide members of both bodies an opportunity to share views about how well their respective organizations presently are functioning, and how cooperative relations between the two bodies might be enhanced.

On a lighter note, McKim mentioned that this spring marked the fifteenth anniversary of the senate. He noted that it would be appropriate to celebrate the occasion in some fashion and requested "creative ideas" about what form such a celebration might take.

McKim then announced that Trustee chairman Tom Carney had declined the invitation of the senate to appear at the next Faculty Forum. McKim requested that any ideas for further Forum topics and speakers be sent on to Prof. Barrett.

McKim next mentioned a letter he had received from James Powell of the Center for Continuing Education regarding plans by the Center to institutionalize an annual program of faculty seminars on the model of this spring's Jung seminar. Powell has asked the senate if it wishes to cooperate in this matter. McKim encouraged senators to share with him any ideas for attractive seminar topics.
The senate then had some discussion of the length of the break between semesters which though originally a month long has gradually been cut back to barely three weeks this year. Among the arguments presented for going back to a full four week break were:

a) that professional society meetings are often scheduled during this time;

b) that it would give faculty more needed time to prepare grant proposals with spring deadlines and to catch up on research;

c) that it would save energy costs to have much of the university's physical plant shut down for another week or so during the cold winter months.

One objection made was that it would, perhaps, be more advantageous to have the extra time in May since four weeks was not really long enough to get anything accomplished. McKim called for a straw vote on the issue; there were 16 votes for and 3 against returning to the previous system. Another issue discussed was the possibility of returning to a post-Labor Day start with a shortened fall semester break. In the straw vote on this issue, there were 19 votes for and 4 against beginning after Labor Day. McKim indicated that he would convey the senate's views on this matter to Leo Corbaci, Dean of Administration.

McKim then announced that the April meeting would be held on Monday, April 18.

McKim then called to the attention of the members a sheet distributed earlier in the meeting regarding membership quotas on the senate. (See Appendix I.) McKim indicated that a recently completed study of the present distribution of Notre Dame faculty revealed that some changes were required in Senate membership quotas to ensure that all represented constituencies had equally proportional representation. Elections for senators this spring will be used to bring the membership into line with the newly established membership quotas.

McKim then moved on to another agenda item--a consideration of a formal set of procedures to govern the election of senate officers. (See Appendix II.) The new rules being proposed are intended to ensure strong senate leadership, while yet underscoring the democratic nature of this body. After some discussion, it was moved to accept the proposal with a friendly amendment to item #5; namely, that to be nominated from the floor a member should have given prior consent, and that a nomination and a second would be sufficient to place the nominee(s) on the ballot. It was then moved and seconded that the proposed election rules be adopted. The motion carried without dissenting vote.

McKim then called attention to the list of candidates for nomination to the Academic and Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees compiled from the senate survey of faculty conducted in January. The senate's task is to select a small group of official nominees from whom the faculty as a whole then elect representatives to the Committee. It was agreed that the ballot would be conducted in two stages during the remainder of the meeting.

The meeting recessed at 8:45. The meeting resumed at 9:00.
The first order of business after the break was the Standing Committee Reports. Barrett presented the report of the Faculty Affairs Committee. Among the points mentioned were:

1. The appointment of a Faculty Chaplain, a move recommended by the senate Faculty Affairs Committee, has received administration approval. The role of the Chaplain in the context of Campus Ministry has yet to be worked out in detail.

2. Reference was made to the Forum on Athletics and to the importance of our maintaining an ongoing interest in the role of athletics at Notre Dame.

3. The suggestion has been made that a senate "white paper" be prepared on retirement. Among the issues to be considered would be the new legal issues affecting mandatory retirement, and the adequacy of present retirement benefits. It will also be important to determine how new unisex life tables would affect future TIAA/CREF retirement benefits.

Crowe, reporting for the Committee on Administration, indicated that he had so far received answers from 7 of 9 Peer Institutions in response to his questionnaire regarding their leave policies and provisions for faculty development. A preliminary report on this data will be presented at the next meeting of the senate.

At this point in the meeting the results of the first ballot for the AFACBT were presented. Profs. Donald Barrett and William Eagan were selected as nominees on the first ballot by virtue of receiving far more votes than any other candidates. A second ballot was then made up to nominate four additional faculty members from the ten who received the next largest number of votes in the first round.

The next order of business was a discussion of the Financial Aid Report prepared by McKim. The report points out that the three-fold increase in scholarship endowment by 1990 recommended in PACE may not be sufficient to sustain an adequate scholarship policy. The University must begin to investigate other sources of scholarship support such as modest tuition surcharges and annual alumni contribution earmarked for direct scholarship support. After some discussion, it was moved and seconded that the senate approve the Report. The motion carried unanimously.

Attention then turned to three recommendations which had been approved by the Executive Committee for presentation to the senate in conjunction with the Report on Undergraduate Financial Aid:

1. To ensure the rapid growth in endowment needed to underwrite any significant improvement in undergraduate scholarship support,
the Faculty Senate urges the administration to adopt the recommendation of the PACE Report that endowment for undergraduate student aid be increased three-fold by 1990.

2. The Faculty Senate recommends that the administration respond to the pressing need to increase the number of University-supported scholarships now being awarded to undergraduates by adopting a 25% scholarship plan as official University policy to be implemented at the earliest date possible.

3. The Faculty Senate recommends to the administration that additional funds required to support an improved scholarship policy be sought from alumni through requests for annual gifts in support of scholarship aid, and from other miscellaneous sources of annual income including, if necessary, very modest annual tuition surcharges.

It was moved and seconded that these recommendations be endorsed by the senate for presentation to the University administration, and that they be appended to the final version of the Financial Aid Report when it is made public. Following a brief discussion the motion passed without dissenting vote.

Crowe then called on the senate to express its appreciation to McKim with a round of applause for the work he put into the report.

The next order of business was a report from Prof. Mario Borelli on behalf of the senate ad hoc committee formed to study the issue of the Catholic character of the University as it is portrayed in the PACE Report. The purpose of this committee is not to criticize PACE, but to formulate the range of faculty concerns which have arisen in regard to this issue. The committee requested comments and suggestions from the members before the April meeting.

McKim requested members to turn in their second round ballots for AFACBT nominations at the conclusion of the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 9:45.

Absent but not excused: Subhash Basu, chemistry; Rudolph Bottei, chemistry; Gary Burleson, microbiology; Wendy Carlton, sociology; Eugene Marshalek, physics; William Slowey, accountancy; Thomas Swartz, economics; James Tabor, theology; Thomas Theis, civil engineering.

Absent but excused: Gerald Arnold, physics; James Bellis, sociology; Fred Dallmayr, government; Carson Daly, English; Vincent DeSantis, history; David Dodge, sociology; Jay Dolan, history; Michael Francis, government; Theresa Phelps, law; Barth Pollak, mathematics; Niels Rasmussen, theology; George Sereiko, library; William Strieder, chemical engineering; John Uhran, electrical engineering; Robert Vacca, modern languages.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra J. Harmatiuk
APPENDIX I

Membership Quotas for the Faculty Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Effective Fall 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Letters</td>
<td>20 + 1 ex officio</td>
<td>19 + 1 ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>10 + 1 ex officio</td>
<td>9 + 1 ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4 + 1 ex officio</td>
<td>5 + 1 ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>6 + 1 ex officio</td>
<td>6 + 1 ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Specialists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>49 + 4 ex officio</strong></td>
<td><strong>49 + 4 ex officio</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II

Proposed Rules and Procedures to Govern the Election of Senate Officers

1. Nominations for Senate officers may be made by any member of the Senate, whether elected or ex-officio. The names of proposed nominees are to be submitted to the Chairman in writing on or before the date of the April Senate meeting.

2. A Nominating Committee will have the responsibility of presenting a slate of candidates to the membership for election at the May meeting of the Senate. The official slate of nominees will be listed along with the agenda for the May meeting in a mailing to be sent to all Senators at least one week prior to the date of election.

3. The Nominating Committee will consist of the members of the Senate Executive Committee and of a representative from each of the Senate's major constituencies not otherwise represented on the Committee. A Major Constituency is here defined as one having a membership quota of more than two (2) elected Senate representatives. The faculty Senators comprising each constituency from which a representative needs to be selected will caucus for the purpose of choosing their representative. The chairman will be notified of the names of such representatives no later than March 31.

4. The outgoing Senate chairman will serve as chairman of the Nominating Committee.

5. At the May meeting an opportunity will be provided to place in nomination for any Senate office the names of Senators not included on the Nominating Committee's slate of candidates. Such nominations will take the form of a motion requiring a second. Candidates for Senate office nominated from the floor must have given prior consent to serve, if elected to the position for which they are being nominated.

Adopted by the Faculty Senate, meeting on March 23, 1983.
The meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 7:35 p.m. in room 202 of the Center for Continuing Education by the chairman Prof. Vaughn McKim. Prof. Joseph Tihen offered the opening prayer.

The first order of business was approval of the minutes for the March 23 meeting.

McKim then proceeded to present the Chairman's Report. McKim indicated that he had received a written response from Dr. Timothy O'Meara regarding the three Senate resolutions which were presented to the administration in conjunction with the Compensation Report. O'Meara placed these matters before the officers of the University at the last meeting. Essentially, the response to the resolutions was that the officers "will continue to strive towards the objectives contained in Senate resolutions 1 and 2" (endorsement of PACE salary goals and minimum raises matching cost of living increases). But O'Meara emphasized that this is a high priority not a commitment. No explicit response was made in the letter to the Senate's third resolution (that the Senate be consulted before major changes in faculty fringe benefits are made), but the implication was that the administration would seek to be responsive to this concern.

McKim then called on Prof. Robert Vacca to report on progress regarding the Senate's recommendations to the administration on behalf of the Early Childhood Development Center. Vacca reported that Sr. John Miriam has been directed by the Provost to explore the situation of the Center with the St. Mary's College Administration and the Early Childhood Development Center Board. Vacca indicated that it now appeared likely that the University would make funds available to help resolve the short-term cash problem at the Center.

McKim reported that there has been no response from the University regarding the Senate's recommendation to extend the faculty tuition benefits for children going to schools other than Notre Dame to non-Teaching and Research Faculty.

McKim then mentioned that after consultation with the Executive Committee he had made the following recommendations to the provost:

1. That in future the Chairman of the Faculty Senate become an ex officio member of the Academic Council Executive Committee in order to increase coordination of effort between the Senate and the Council;

2. That beginning next fall, the Chairman of the Senate receive partial released time during the academic year in order to fulfill his duties as efficiently as possible;

3. That, in view of the Senate's fifteenth anniversary, some acknowledgement by the administration of the work of the Senate and its past Chairmen might be appropriate.
McKim then announced that the nominees for election to the Academic and Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees selected by vote at the last Senate meeting were: Profs. Donald Barrett (AL), David Burrell, C.S.C. (AL), Michael Crowe (AL), William Eagan (BA), James Kohn (EG), John Malone (BA) and Joseph Tihen (SC). He encouraged all senators to return their AFACBT ballots promptly as the newly elected members of the Committee will be invited to attend the May meeting of the group.

The Executive Committee is presently soliciting nominations for senate officers for next year. In accordance with the new rules for nominating officers, Profs. Thomas Theis (EG) and Paul Conway (BA) have been selected to represent their colleges to assist the Executive Committee in preparing a slate of nominees for the election of new officers at the next senate meeting scheduled for May 4.

The question was raised regarding who could vote at the next meeting for the new officers since the Bylaws do not specify and precedent is not entirely clear. In a straw vote taken on the issue, 16 members voted not to allow outgoing senators to vote while 10 voted to allow them to vote. It was thus agreed that only continuing and new senators would be eligible to vote for new senate officers at the May meeting.

McKim then indicated that the Undergraduate Financial Aid Report which the senate considered at the last meeting was nearly ready for circulation. The hope was expressed that the Report could be made available to Trustees and to Alumni Advisory Board members before their upcoming meetings on campus.

There will be a meeting of the AFACBT on May 5. The trustee members of the Committee have asked to be briefed on the workings of the Academic Council, the Senate, and the past concerns of the AFACBT. McKim is presently preparing the information on the senate. The Committee also has a discussion of PACE on its agenda.

McKim then reminded Senators of the informal joint meeting of the senate and the elected members of the Academic Council to be held Thursday, April 21 at 4:15 in the University Club to share perceptions about the performance of the two bodies, and about ways for improving cooperative interaction.

The Senate Executive Committee has been invited to meet as a group with the Provost Review Committee. The senate has also been invited to submit comments to the Committee reviewing the Director of University Libraries.

The next order of business was the election of faculty representatives to the Campus Life Council, the Judicial Review Board, and the Board of Traffic and Parking Appeals. Faculty members nominated were those who expressed a willingness to serve in response to the senate's annual survey of the faculty in January. Some discussion was raised regarding the procedures for selecting members of the Judicial Review Board. The senate presently nominates twelve faculty members from whom six are chosen by the Student Government Board of
Commissioners and submitted to the President of the University for approval. It was moved and seconded that the senate nominate six rather than twelve people to the Judicial Review Board. In the discussion, it was pointed out that the procedures for selecting people to serve on the JRB are set forth in Du Lac (pp. 51-52). A change of the sort proposed would have the effect of further limiting the very small role students presently have in dealing with disciplinary matters. In voting on the motion, 7 voted in favor of the motion, 23 were opposed. The motion was defeated. Additional nominations were solicited from the members to bring the slate of nominees to 12. Ballots were then distributed for the Campus Life Council and Traffic Appeals Board elections.

Following this, a brief recess was taken. The meeting resumed at 8:55.

McKim first announced the results of the elections. The following faculty members were nominated by the senate as faculty representatives to the Judicial Review Board for the 1983-84 academic year:

- Michael Crowe (Arts and Letters)
- Michael Mond (Arts and Letters)
- Br. Frank Rotsaert, C.S.C. (Arts and Letters)
- Robert Vacca (Arts and Letters)
- William Eagan (Business Administration)
- James Daschbach (Engineering)
- Karl Kronstein (Science)
- Katharina Blackstead (Library)
- Stephen Hayes (Library)
- Joseph Huebner (Library)
- Patricia Janicki (Library)
- Jean Rosenberg (Library)

The senate elected Professor Jerry Marley to one of the two faculty positions on the Campus Life Council. The second position will go to the chairman of the senate's Student Affairs Committee ex officio. That person will be chosen at the May 4 senate meeting.

The senate elected Prof. Kenneth Lauer as faculty representative to the Board of Traffic and Parking Appeals, and Prof. William Eagan as the designated alternate.

McKim then called on Prof. Peri Arnold to report on meetings with the faculty subcommittee of the Budget Priorities Committee regarding faculty health benefit costs. Thus far, the joint Senate-BPC group has met only once and has just begun investigating a range of cost sharing alternatives.

The next order of business was reports of Standing Committees. Prof. Michael Crowe reported first for the Committee on Administration. Crowe stated that he has received material from seven of nine peer institutions in response to his questionnaire on Support for Faculty Research and Renewal. Crowe distributed a document which compiles the data received to date. The committee is presently
working to gather comparable data regarding the situation at Notre Dame. Crowe made an informal request for information from the senators present regarding the situation in their departments with respect to University supported leaves of absence.

Prof. Donald Barrett then reported for the Faculty Affairs Committee. The committee has no new business but is continuing preparations for its study on retirement benefits.

In the absence of Prof. Carson Daly McKim reported that the results of the Survey of Faculty Perceptions of Notre Dame Undergraduates being prepared by the Admissions office and the Committee on Student Affairs should be available at the next meeting.

McKim then stated that it would not be possible to take up the final item on the evening's agenda. The committee constituted by the Provost to formulate a grievance procedure for faculty covering cases other than promotion and tenure and a related statement of faculty ethics, has finished its work. Because the senate last spring initiated the proposal that led to the formation of this committee (on which two senators served--Barrett and Vacca), McKim asked the Provost to permit the senate to review and comment on the documents produced by the committee before they were submitted to the Academic Council for adoption. It was anticipated that they would be available for discussion at this meeting. However, O'Meara has decided that it would be inappropriate to release this material to the senate until the Executive Committee of the Academic Council agrees to this course of action. Unfortunately, there are no plans for the Executive Committee of the Council to meet again this year, despite the fact that there are several items of business waiting to be placed on the agenda of the Council. (In fact, the Council Executive Committee has met only once during the 1982-83 academic year.) As a result, the whole matter must be deferred until the fall.

A lengthy discussion followed during the course of which serious questions were raised about the present functioning and effectiveness of the Academic Council: it seems to meet only at the convenience of administrators; in recent years it has conducted almost no substantive business; the elected members of its Executive Committee appear to have little or no control over the Council agenda; committees responsible to the Council are regularly appointed by the Provost without prior consultation with or the approval of the Council membership, e.g. the Curriculum Revision Committee. Concerns were also expressed about how the senate could proceed with work that required Council cooperation or timely access to the Council agenda under the present circumstances.

On the basis of this discussion, Vacca moved that the following resolution be adopted by the senate:
Be it resolved:

1. that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee take steps to seek a meeting of the Academic Council early in the fall semester;

2. that the agenda of that meeting will include consideration of the recommendations of Dean Castellino's committee on faculty grievance procedures and professional ethics. It will also include a report and discussion of the work of the University Curriculum Committee;

3. that the senate chairman should strongly recommend to the provost that it is appropriate that the senate have an opportunity to discuss the Castellino committee report before the Academic Council takes action on it.

The motion was seconded and some discussion followed. A friendly amendment was suggested to change the first resolution to the effect that the senate strongly recommend to the Provost that such a meeting of the Academic Council be called. The friendly amendment was rejected. After some discussion, it was moved and seconded that the original motion be tabled until the May meeting. The motion to table passed.

McKim then asked if there were any other business to consider. Hearing none, the meeting was adjourned at 9:55.

Absent but not excused: James Bellis, sociology; Mario Borelli, mathematics; Gary Burleson, microbiology; Wendy Carlton, sociology; Fred Dallmayr, government; Nancy D'Antuono, modern languages; David Dodge, sociology; Michael Francis, government; Teresa Phelps, law; Niels Rasmussen, theology; Lawrence Simon, philosophy; William Slowey, accounting; Thomas Theis, civil engineering; Robert Wegs, history; Stephen Worland, economics; John Yoder, theology.

Absent but excused: Carson Daly, English; Vincent DeSantis, history; John Lucey, aerospace; Barth Pollak, mathematics; James Tabor, theology; Michael Francis, government.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra J. Harmatiuk
APPENDIX

Policy of Notre Dame and St. Mary's for Future Support of the Early Childhood Development Center

Saint Mary's College (SMC) and the University of Notre Dame (UND), after numerous discussions, have finalized their position concerning their future relationship to the Early Childhood Development Center (ECDC).

Let it be clearly stated at the outset that SMC and UND commend the quality developmental program offered by ECDC and are dedicated to its continuance and flourishing. It serves well the young children of faculty, administrators and staff of both institutions; it also provides an excellent educational practicum for students of both schools.

Still both SMC and UND are concerned about allocating funds over which they do not exercise direct control and which annually benefit only about 4% of UND's faculty and about 3% of SMC's. The percentages of staff and administrators benefiting from such investments are even less. Both institutions feel that benefits should apply more equitably. We plan therefore to redesign the targets and the amounts of our contributions. We plan a three-year transition period during which current level subsidies would be gradually reduced by June of 1986.

By July 1, 1983 Saint Mary's College will reach an arrangement with ECDC in order to compensate them for the educational practicum afforded to undergraduates. In addition SMC will establish a scholarship fund of $2,000 available to children of their faculty, staff and students.

Effective July 1, 1983 the University of Notre Dame will create an annual fund of $5,000 available as scholarship monies for the children of its eligible graduate students.

The $50,000 endowment secured through Father Hesburgh currently realizes an interest of 5% per annum. If the Board of Directors wishes to assume the ongoing responsibility for and risk of investing this endowment in an effort to realize earnings above 5%, both institutions agree to its being segregated for such investment.

So as to provide for a realistic and orderly transition from the present subsidization to a healthy independence on the part of ECDC, SMC and UND will reduce their contributions in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SMC Contribution</th>
<th>UND Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 83-84</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-85</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-86</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 7:35 p.m. in room 202 of the Center for Continuing Education by the chairman, Prof. Vaughn McKim. The opening prayer was offered by Sandra Harmatiuk.

McKim then introduced reelected and newly elected senators. He asked for approval of the minutes of the April meeting. Hearing no additions or corrections, the minutes were approved.

The next order of business was the Treasurer's report given by Prof. Peri Arnold. The report indicated that, as of March 31, $1,193 of the senate budget had been spent. There were some increases in the cost of duplicating materials. Although 33% of the budget is left, the Senate has not yet received the bill for use of the CCE.

In the chairman's report, McKim noted that in the campus-wide elections for new members to the Academic and Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, Rev. David Burrell and Prof. Michael Crowe were elected to three year terms.

McKim then reported on the agreement reached between Notre Dame and the Early Childhood Development Center. Notre Dame has made a cash payment of about $3500 to the Center to help meet its short-term income deficit. In addition, the Center will seek to increase enrollments by changing its Articles of Incorporation to enable staff at St. Joseph's Medical Center, WNDU and Holy Cross Junior College to enroll children in the Center's programs. St. Mary's will compensate the Center for the educational practicum afforded to its undergraduates, and Notre Dame will create a scholarship fund for children of its eligible graduate students. Other forms of direct financial subsidization by St. Mary's and Notre Dame will be phased out by 1986. The Board of ECDC believes the Center can become essentially self-funding by that time.

McKim noted that the actions taken by all parties involved seem to have met the concerns raised in the senate recommendations to the administration regarding ECDC adopted at the February meetings. He commended the University Officers for their prompt and forthright action on this matter. (A synopsis of the new ECDC support agreement is attached to these minutes as Appendix I.)

McKim then made a report on issues pending:

1. The decision on extension of expanded children's tuition benefit to non-T&R faculty will be forthcoming at the next meeting of the University officers.

2. A decision on the request that future chairmen of the senate be given released time during their tenure in office has been deferred by the Provost.

3. The request that the senate chairman be made an ex officio member of the Executive Committee of the Academic Council will be taken up by the Council in the fall.
4. Fr. Hesburgh has responded to the Financial Aid Report indicating that he has asked appropriate University Officers to study the issues raised in the Report and to give him their recommendations.

5. McKim also reported that he and Prof. Michael Crowe had presented the Senate's letter of appreciation to Jim Frick, and that a gracious note of thanks had been received in response. Additionally, the senate presented Harriet Flowers, secretary to the senate, with a bouquet and a cash gift on her birthday this spring in recognition of her many years of outstanding service to the senate.

6. Reporting on the informal joint meeting between the senate and elected members of the Academic Council held April 21st, McKim expressed disappointment with the limited turnout. In spite of this, the discussion among those present from both groups was profitable. The conversation was open and honest, and some probing concerns were voiced about the present operation of the Academic Council in particular.

7. McKim then referred to the five-year review of senate activities that he had prepared for the AFACBT meeting to be held later in the week, copies of which had been distributed to all senators. He noted that the report clearly shows that the senate has a strong record of ongoing activities and accomplishments to its credit in recent years. It was suggested that it would be appropriate to share this report with the faculty as a whole early next fall. With that point in mind, McKim solicited from the membership any pertinent comments, additions or corrections to the report they might have to offer.

8. In lieu of presenting a final chairman's report on the work of the senate this year, McKim asked that the summary of this year's activities from the Five-Year Report be made a part of the minutes of this meeting. (See Appendix II.) He did note that he was extremely pleased with how much the senate had accomplished during the last nine months, in view of the fact that no major projects had been "in the pipeline" when this year began. This will not be a problem next year, he noted, as there are a host of serious efforts underway that will require continuing attention from the senate. In concluding, McKim expressed his thanks to the membership for their continuing support and cooperation.

9. As a final note, McKim reported that the Executive Committee had concluded that there was little to be gained from attempting to draft a detailed senate response to the PACE Report. The consensus view was rather that the senate ought to articulate a positive statement of university priorities from the viewpoint of the faculty. He encouraged the senate to make this a high priority in the year ahead.

McKim then asked for the reports of the standing committees. Prof. Donald Barrett reported that the Faculty Affairs Committee is actively working on various issues relating to retirement. A report should be forthcoming in the fall.

McKim then asked Prof. Michael Crowe to report on the Committee for Administration. Crowe asked Prof. John Uhran to give a report on the work of the subcommittee which he chaired, the other members of which were Profs. Rudolph Bottei, Joseph
This subcommittee has been meeting during the semester to consider a proposal to establish a new category of professorships at the University. Such professorships could carry a title such as University Professor, Distinguished Professor, or Distinguished Service Professor and would be awarded to present Notre Dame faculty for such things as distinguished service, teaching, or research. Recently, it has been found that a number of peer institutions have such positions, though the conditions associated with them vary quite significantly. It is the desire of the committee to gather further data and to develop a model appropriate for Notre Dame. A formal proposal is planned for presentation early in the fall semester.

Prof. Carson Daly then reported on the Student Affairs Committee. Summarizing some of the highlights of the preliminary report of the joint Senate-Admissions Office survey of faculty perceptions of undergraduates, Daly pointed out that there had been a 60% return of the questionnaires distributed. The percentage of students taught by those responding which satisfied the faculty's concept of a "good student" was 50% (mean and median). In general, the survey indicated that faculty perceived Notre Dame students as too job oriented/goal oriented and too homogeneous. A final report on the survey will be released to all faculty in the fall.

The next order of business was a reconsideration of a motion tabled at the April meeting.

Be it resolved:

1. that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee take steps to seek a meeting of the Academic Council early in the fall semester;

2. that the agenda of that meeting will include consideration of the recommendations of Dean Castellino's committee on faculty grievance procedures and professional ethics. It will also include a report and discussion of the work of the University Curriculum Committee;

3. that the senate chairman should strongly recommend to the provost that it is appropriate that the senate have an opportunity to discuss the Castellino committee report before the Academic Council takes action on it.

There was some discussion of the motion. A friendly amendment was proposed to change the wording of item #2 in the motion to read "It will also seek to include a report ..." The motion was carried with the friendly amendment.

The next item on the agenda was the approval of two letters to be sent to Dr. Timothy O'Meara. The first letter raised concerns that have been voiced in the senate about the role played by a faculty member's religious preferences in renewal, tenure and appointment decisions. The issue has arisen this year because of PACE. Though there has been a general understanding among the faculty that the administration does not treat personal religious convictions as relevant in faculty renewal or advancement decisions, PACE does not explicitly reaffirm this policy in the context of its strong recommendation to increase the number of committed Catholics on the faculty. Is this a mere
oversight or a shift in policy? The senate requests clarification of this issue. After some discussion, the letter was unanimously approved with some modifications in language. (The text appears as Appendix III.)

The second letter to O'Meara concerned the work of the Curriculum Committee appointed by O'Meara. The letter expresses senate concern about the manner in which the committee was constituted and about the fact that the objectives and priorities of the committee remain unclear. The letter also recommends some actions to be undertaken by the Curriculum Committee. After a period of intense discussion, the senate voted unanimously to approve the substance of the letter with some minor revisions in its language. (The text as approved appears as Appendix IV.)

The next item of business was election of new officers for next year. The following slate of candidates for office was presented by the nominating committee:

Chairman: Mario Borelli (Sc)
Vice Chairman: John Uhran (Eg)
Treasurer: Michael Crowe (AL)
Secretary: Jean Rosenberg (Li)
Chairman Committee on Administration: John Yoder (AL)
Committee on Faculty Affairs: Donald Barrett (AL)
Committee on Student Affairs: Teresa Phelps (Law)

McKim opened the floor for additional nominations. Hearing none, it was moved and seconded that the slate proposed be elected by acclamation. The motion carried.

In view of the fact that McKim will be on leave next year, the Executive Committee has agreed that the previous past chairman (Prof. Robert Vacca) should fill the eighth position on the committee for the coming year.

Prof. Carson Daly then called on the senate to acknowledge McKim's efforts during his year as chairman.

McKim then turned the meeting over to the new chairman, Mario Borelli. Borelli made some brief remarks about his hopes for next year. Borelli then reminded senate members to indicate their committee preferences for next year.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m. A reception for new members followed.

Absent but not excused: James Bellis, sociology; Bernard Doering, modern languages.

Absent but excused: Vincent DeSantis, history; David Dodge, sociology; Jay Dolan, history; Thomas Kosel, engineering; Niels Rasmussen, theology; John Rohrbough, ROTC; Lawrence Simon, philosophy; Thomas Swartz, economics.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra J. Harmatiuk
APPENDIX I

Policy of Notre Dame and St. Mary's for Future Support of the Early Childhood Development Center

Saint Mary's College (SMC) and the University of Notre Dame (UND) after numerous discussions, have finalized their position concerning their future relationship to the Early Childhood Development Center (ECDC).

Let it be clearly stated at the outset that SMC and UND commend the quality developmental program offered by ECDC and are dedicated to its continuance and flourishing. It serves well the young children of faculty, administrators and staff of both institutions; it also provides an excellent educational practicum for students of both schools.

Still both SMC and UND are concerned about allocating funds over which they do not exercise direct control and which annually benefit only about 4% of UND's faculty and about 3% of SMC's. The percentages of staff and administrators benefiting from such investments are even less. Both institutions feel that benefits should apply more equitably. We plan therefore to redesign the targets and the amounts of our contributions. We plan a three-year transition period during which current level subsidies would be gradually reduced by June of 1986.

By July 1, 1983 Saint Mary's College will reach an arrangement with ECDC in order to compensate them for the educational practicum afforded to undergraduates. In addition SMC will establish a scholarship fund of $2,000 available to children of their faculty, staff and students.

Effective July 1, 1983 the University of Notre Dame will create an annual fund of $5,000 available as scholarship monies for the children of its eligible graduate students.

The $50,000 endowment secured through Father Hesburgh currently realizes an interest of 5% per annum. If the Board of Directors wishes to assume the ongoing responsibility for and risk of investing this endowment in an effort to realize earnings above 5%, both institutions agree to its being segregated for such investment.

So as to provide for a realistic and orderly transition from the present subsidization to a healthy independence on the part of ECDC, SMC and UND will reduce their contributions in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>SMC Contribution</th>
<th>UND Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83-84</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-85</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-86</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II
Activities of the Faculty Senate 1982-83

Investigations:

(a) Of classroom space problems and the need for a new classroom building.

(b) Of the bookstore, to explore ways in which it could provide more support for the academic mission of the university.

(c) Of the feasibility of establishing Distinguished Service Professorships at Notre Dame in a way that would complement the university's present emphasis on endowed chairs.

(d) Of ways of strengthening the role of faculty in university governance at Notre Dame, with emphasis on finding new ways to enhance cooperation and coordination between the Senate and Academic Council.

(e) Of the resources available at Notre Dame to support faculty research and faculty development and renewal projects. As part of this study a survey of sabbatical leave, teaching load and faculty development policies at peer universities has been undertaken.

(f) Of the financial difficulties currently being experienced by the Notre Dame/St. Mary's Early Childhood Development Center.

(g) Of the faculty's Blue Cross-Blue Shield health insurance coverage to explore faculty cost-sharing alternatives necessary to slow cost increases of this fringe benefit. (This study is being undertaken in collaboration with the faculty subcommittee of the Budget Priorities Committee.)

(h) Of financial aid resources available to undergraduates, and of policies and priorities governing the distribution of financial aid to Notre Dame students.

(i) Of the recommendations and priorities contained in the PACE Report, with special emphasis on the ways in which the Catholic character of Notre Dame is represented in the Report.

Actions:

(a) Proposed to the officers of the University that the following goals and principles be adopted with respect to faculty compensation: (i) that a rank one AAUP salary rating be achieved by 1985; that salary increases will not be less than the annual rate of inflation; that the Senate will be consulted whenever major changes in faculty fringe benefits are to be made. (Acknowledged as "high priorities" by the administration.)

(b) Recommended to the Provost that the administration provide sufficient financial support to the Early Childhood Development Center to ensure its continuing viability. (Proposals accepted.)
(c) Proposed to the administration that steps be taken to sharply increase the number of scholarships available to undergraduates and that specific new approaches be adopted to fund such scholarships. (Proposals are pending.)

(d) Recommended to the Academic Council through the Provost that consideration be given to making the Senate chairman an ex officio member of the Council Executive Committee to facilitate coordination of the work of the two bodies. (Pending.)

(e) Recommended informally to the Provost that a position of Faculty Chaplain be created within the program of Campus Ministry. (Pending.)

(f) Recommended to the Provost that language be incorporated in the PACE Report reaffirming that faculty members' personal religious convictions will not be a factor in tenure or promotion decisions affecting them. (Pending.)

(g) Recommended to the Provost as chairman of the University Curriculum Committee that steps be taken to ensure much broader faculty and student participation in the curriculum review process presently underway. (Pending.)

(h) Sponsored three Faculty Forums during the academic year.

Topics: "Faculty Participation in University Governance" "University Governance at Notre Dame" "Athletics at Notre Dame"

Consultations:

(a) The Senate Executive Committee met by invitation with the Provost Review Committee.

(b) The Senate sponsored an informal meeting of senators and elected members of the Academic Council to explore ways in which these bodies could be made to function more effectively.

(c) The Senate is cooperating with the professional staff of the Center for Continuing Education to plan and implement an ongoing series of faculty seminars to be sponsored by the Center.

Reports:

University Governance at Notre Dame: Analysis and Critique (A Faculty Forum Perspective, October, 1982).

Faculty Compensation at Notre Dame (February, 1983).

Undergraduate Financial Aid at Notre Dame: Problems and Prospects (March, 1983).
Dear Dr. O'Meara:

Ever since the COUP Report a decade ago first made the Catholic character of the faculty a policy issue at Notre Dame, it has been widely understood that only research, teaching, and service were relevant to a faculty member's prospects at the University once she or he had been invited to join the faculty. The fact that the PACE Report does not explicitly reaffirm this policy in the context of its renewed emphasis on the need to increase the number of committed Catholics on the faculty thus raises a potentially serious question.

In a document which so forcefully stresses the need for a greater Catholic presence on the faculty, we believe it vital to offer explicit reassurances to non-Catholic faculty members that their chances for retention, promotion and tenure will not be affected by their religious commitments.

We strongly urge, therefore, that the following statement be appended to recommendation five on page 24 of the PACE Report in its final version:

The University's invitation to a Catholic or non-Catholic to join the faculty is a recognition that that individual's concerns are compatible with those of the University, and is made with the understanding that the individual's personal religious commitments will not be a factor in his or her retention or advancement on the faculty at Notre Dame.
Dear Dr. O'Meara:

In your appearance at the January 18 meeting of the Senate you indicated, "that the specific issues to be addressed and the procedures to be followed in any curriculum reform study should be developed by the faculty." We strongly concur with this opinion and therefore feel compelled to express our reservations about the way in which the curriculum study recommended in PACE has been implemented thus far.

(i) We are concerned that the Curriculum Committee appears to have been appointed quite precipitously without prior consultation with the Deans of the Colleges or with representative faculty bodies to ensure that the membership of the Committee would be broadly representative and have the full confidence of the faculty. Since the Committee is charged with formulating recommendations to be submitted to the Academic Council, we believe that the very least the Council should have been consulted in the constitution of the Committee.

(ii) We are concerned that the objectives and priorities of the Curriculum Committee remain unclear to the faculty at large. For example, the first and primary objective mentioned in the PACE recommendation on curriculum review, i.e. "an investigation of the overall structure of the undergraduate curriculum," has received no mention in the announcements by which the faculty was notified of the formation of the Committee. Subsequent requests of departments to offer suggestions to the Curriculum Committee have been excessively vague and unspecific. Constructive contributions from the faculty will be possible only when a shared understanding of the sort of project in which we are engaged has been achieved.

In light of these concerns we strongly recommend that the University Curriculum Committee undertake the following actions:

(1) That the members of the Committee meet with the College Councils and appear before the Academic Council early in their deliberations (a) to sensitize themselves to faculty concerns and priorities, (b) to share with the faculty the Committee's preliminary assessment of the specific curricular issues that need to be addressed and (c) to explore the advisability of creating faculty task forces to aid in carrying out various aspects of the review.

(2) That the Committee devise ways to take into account student concerns and priorities on curricular matters through contact with the Student Government Cabinet and the undergraduate advisory councils in each of the Colleges.

(3) That as soon as possible following these consultations the Committee prepare a statement to be published in Notre Dame Report specifying as precisely as possible
(a) the various topics and issues the Committee has agreed to address,

(b) an account of the procedures the Committee proposes to follow in its investigations, with explicit reference to ways in which the various colleges and departments of the University will be asked to cooperate in various studies,

(c) a target date for making final recommendations to the Academic Council.

In sum, the Senate is specifically concerned that the faculty's primary responsibility for curriculum be clearly affirmed, and that a process involving the entire university community be established and promulgated.