The first Faculty Senate meeting of the year was called to order at 7:35 p.m. by Fr. David Burrell in rooms 210-214 of the Center for Continuing Education. A minute of silence was observed in memory of Fr. Leo Ward. Next all Senators introduced themselves. Attending for the first time was a representative from the student government, Bruce Lohman, Academic Chair. At future meetings Pat McCauley will serve as their representative to the senate. Burrell distributed copies of a report from the Subcommittee on the Quality of Undergraduate Life and drafts of a letter and questionnaire.

While the minutes of the April 9, 1984 meeting were approved, there were several changes in the Journal for May 2, 1984. Prof. Abraham Goetz was present at that meeting, and not absent and unexcused. Prof. David Dodge requested that his report on the Placement Office be amended to the following:

The success of the Notre Dame Placement Office in assisting Arts & Letters seniors is inexplicably bound up with the graduating seniors of the remaining colleges in the University. Despite sore shortages of personnel, funds, and work space, which reflect the priority assigned to the Placement Office by the Administration of the University, the Placement Office has done quite well given these resources. But decidedly there is room for improvement in assisting graduating students.

Prof. Irwin Press stated that the report he had given on the meeting of the sub-subcommittee of the Budget Priorities Committee was not just his report, but also that of Prof. Donald Barrett. Barrett confirmed that the report as given in the May 2 Journal was also his, and that the quotes attributed to Mr. Thomas Bull were correct. Press asked that the following amendment be approved:

Then Borelli gave the floor to representatives of the Senate (Barrett and Press) on the sub-subcommittee of the Budget Priorities Committee who proceeded to give their report on "... the most frustrating meeting we've ever been at."

After some discussion of the impact this report has had on campus, the senate approved the above changes to the May 2 Journal.

Burrell then gave the floor to Prof. Mario Borelli, past Faculty Senate Chair, to report on the summer's activities. In order to continue discussion on health insurance benefits, Borelli attempted to arrange a meeting with Bull. Unfortunately he had called just two days after the May 2 Journal report was released in the Notre Dame Report, and Bull declined to meet with the Executive Committee. Borelli then expressed the opinion that the Faculty Senate Journal was charitable in reporting Bull's opinions.
Borelli then reported that the review of the Faculty Manual was complete, and that about 90% of the senate's recommendations had been included. It is the feeling of the Provost that the changes should first be discussed in the Academic Council, and then come to the senate. While he did not see this as a problem, Borelli asked for the sense of the senate on this matter as he was not at liberty to discuss the revisions without the approval of the Academic Council's Executive Committee. He felt the revisions would be discussed at the next meeting of the Academic Council. Prof. Phillip Helman asked if it was Borelli's expectation that the Academic Council would both discuss and pass the revisions. Several other senators wondered when the agenda of the Academic Council would be made public. Prof. Robert Lordi asked if the revisions would become law at this meeting, and he suggested that Burrell should try to bring the revisions to the senate for its approval as well. In the discussion which followed it was suggested that Burrell call a caucus of all faculty members of the Academic Council to discuss the revisions as soon as the agenda was available. All agreed that this should be done.

Borelli reminded the senate that Academic Council members that are elected do receive invitations and agenda to all senate meetings. He suggested that appointed faculty members of the Academic Council also receive them. The senate agreed to this.

Burrell then asked Prof. Teresa Phelps to give a report on the activities of the Student Affairs Committee. Phelps spoke of two topics which have been held over from last year: the Admissions Office report on the profile of the student body and the faculty's perceptions of the students, and the report on the Placement Office. Both reports might be completed for discussion at the October Faculty Senate meeting.

Barrett, as past chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, took up the topic of health insurance benefits. There are still no changes which he has been able to discover despite the fact that various bids have been received. The administration of the Blue Cross/Blue Shield plan does seem to be moving more smoothly now. There is a most promising development in that two health maintenance organizations are moving to South Bend, and the Personnel Office will look into them. Barrett spoke of a federal law which mandates that certain employers must offer HMO's as an option to their employees when it is available.

The last continuing concern was reported on by Prof. John Uhran. While Prof. Michael Crowe did finish the sabbatical leave policy report, the Executive Committee has decided to leave the proposal alone as it is currently tabled in the Academic Council. The spirit of sabbatical leaves will be incorporated into one of the proposed priorities for the senate this year: faculty renewal. Uhran also said that he hopes to have the report on distinguished professorships soon completed.

Then Burrell asked the senate if they would agree to setting a two-hour limit on meetings. The Executive Committee had suggested that breaks be dispensed with and that refreshments be available for anyone to help themselves to during the meetings. This was quickly agreed upon.
Turning the discussion to the draft of the letter he had had distributed, Burrell commented that he felt the senate had made gains with the administration rather than with other faculty members. "Our colleagues have not been as aware of the senate's work." He was particularly concerned with the new faculty, and for these reasons decided to frame the letter. As the Executive Committee had decided not to use the same committee structure as in previous years, but rather to have interested and concerned senators concentrate on three major priorities. They are: faculty development, junior faculty especially the criteria for renewal and expectations for tenure, and improvement in the learning environment through working with the students and other faculty members.

Prof. Jay Dolan asked for the rationale behind singling out junior faculty. Borelli responded by citing a case he knew of where even after the proper review had taken place a junior faculty member was still unaware of what criteria had been used and why she had not been granted renewal. Burrell felt that the senate could open a discussion on the criteria as they are expressed, or are not expressed in the Faculty Manual. This would be of assistance to junior faculty. Prof. Teresa Ghilarducci concurred with this saying that while the Provost seems to have a clear idea of how the criteria are applied, there seems to be a conflict within the various departments. Phelps expressed the opinion that the pattern of renewal follows no discernable pattern.

In the discussion which followed Prof. Donald Kommers stated that he felt the Provost had been clear in presenting the criteria for tenure. Other senators voiced the opinion that renewal was really the problem. The morality of renewal and subsequent denial of tenure was mentioned as a topic for further discussion.

Burrell suggested that the senate fora could offer the opportunity for department chairs and junior faculty to discuss renewal and tenure criteria. Kommers asked if we would be guided by the Princeton report on junior faculty which had been distributed to all senators. Burrell felt that it should be circulated to all faculty members. Press felt this would be a good opportunity to involve the department chairs as the criteria are not equally applied. Prof. Michael Francis wondered if any changes in renewal policies could go into the decennial revision of the Faculty Manual. Borelli did not think so.

Prof. James Bellis brought up the question of just how much the senior faculty were aware of the changes which have taken place. What exactly are the renewal and tenure rates? Faculty being interviewed should be able to look at the odds and know if they have a chance at Notre Dame. Borelli agreed that there should be an airing of the situation. The senate agreed that it was important for the junior faculty to know what is expected of them.

Burrell's second proposed priority of faculty development was easily agreed to by those present as it continued an important theme from last year.

In speaking to the third priority Phelps suggested that faculty members meet with Fr. David Tyson. Lohman spoke of his disappointment that the report of
the Subcommittee on the Quality of Undergraduate Life had not been widely circulated. Also he said student government wanted a stronger voice in improving the learning environment.

Dolan asked about the curriculum review report. Burrell answered that it would be discussed throughout the university this coming year.

Borelli made a motion that the letter, questionnaire, the report from the Subcommittee on the Quality of Undergraduate Life, and the senate's five-year report be mailed to all faculty. Goetz seconded it. Prof. Robert Vacca suggested that not everything be mailed together, but that the Princeton Report on junior faculty be included in a mailing.

Returning to the draft of the letter, Press suggested including compensation and other benefits in the sentence about continuing concerns of the senate. Several others disagreed with Burrell's wording describing his view of the relationship between the senate and the Academic Council, and he agreed to change this as recommended. Capt. John Rohrbough suggested that the reason for including the five-year report be brought out in the letter, and he moved the question to send out the letter as amended. All were in favor of the motion, and there were no abstentions.

Burrell asked everyone to sign up for a committee. He assigned the priority of junior faculty to the Faculty Affairs Committee, the priority of faculty renewal to the Administrative Affairs Committee, and the priority to improve the learning environment to the Student Affairs Committee. Continuing concerns would be assigned as needed with the question of health benefits going directly to the Administrative Affairs Committee.

Continuing with new business Prof. Sandra Harmatiuk noted that there was only one meeting scheduled for October, and that Fr. Hesburgh was traditionally invited to speak the same night as his address to the faculty. Burrell said he would contact Hesburgh. Kommers asked if this meeting was necessary, and several senators responded that it had been a good meeting in earlier years. It was suggested that perhaps having the meeting on October 9, the night after Hesburgh's address, on the currently scheduled date would be better for all concerned. Burrell said he would try to do this. In conjunction with this Prof. Jean Rosenberg brought to Burrell's attention the fact that the annual meeting with the Provost in January had also not been scheduled.

The topic of curriculum review was brought up again by Rohrbough. This is of special concern to the ROTC programs because they are not under the aegis of the college councils.

Press raised the question of parking problems which have been exacerbated by the opening of Decio. Borelli responded that it might behoove the senate to conduct a study of available space for the Security Office. Harmatiuk also mentioned that Security was very late in distributing stickers which might be why cars are not being ticketed.
Rosenberg mentioned the need to elect a Treasurer. Burrell suggested that the Executive Committee propose a few names for the next meeting. Until then he would serve as Treasurer.

He then mentioned that he had received a memo from Prof. Andre Goddu concerning the Early Childhood Development Center. Burrell will have a report on the ECDC at the next meeting. Apparently the University has not yet withdrawn its support.

There being no further new business, Burrell adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

Absent but not excused: Tomoaki Asano, microbiology; Francis Connolly, mathematics; Leo Despres, anthropology; Pamela Falkenberg, communication & theatre; Linda-Margaret Hunt, biology; Ray Powell, accounting.

Absent and excused: Peri Arnold, government & international studies; Subhash Basu, chemistry; Salvatore Bella, management; Harvey Bender, biology; James Danehy, emeritus; John Fitzgerald, emeritus; Philip Gleason, history; Andre Goddu, program of liberal studies, Matthew Miceli, C.S.C., theology; James Flanigan, art history & design.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean A. Rosenberg
Appendix to Minutes of Faculty Senate

The following items constitute the 1984 set of Senate proposals regarding Notre Dame Health Benefits. These proposals were derived from a detailed study by the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee of fourteen universities' benefit systems. The Senate discussed these proposals and offers them as possible additions, substitutions for the present Notre Dame plan. As always, these proposals are designed to reduce the costs of the present plan (can be substantial), as well as to make our health benefit system more effective and just for all members.

Towards an Effective Medical Benefits Program.

An effective program clearly has a number of characteristics: 1) it must provide adequate intensive and extensive health coverages for members, 2) it must contain costs to a manageable total premium, 3) it must spread the costs among members of different income levels and the university both fairly and efficiently, 4) administration of the program must be feasible and not too costly (8 percent of premium is too expensive and 2 percent is too cheap), 5) the program must be flexible to meet the present and future needs of members and the university.

The Notre Dame faculty Senate strongly recommends serious efforts to implement the following principles of benefit planning, which are designed to meet the above program characteristics. This survey and Senate discussions induce us to propose that:

1. the Benefits Plan contain alternative plan choices by the member:
   a) between a high-coverage and lower-coverage option (at high and lower cost—this is not just a choice of Single, Couple or Family coverage),
   b) between paying part of the premium (with the university paying the other part) as a higher or lower percent of salary, e.g. requiring all wishing high coverage to pay 2 or 3 percent of salary (regardless of salary level) and requiring those wishing lower coverage to pay 1 or 2 percent of salary; this equalizes the cost burden among members of different income levels;
   c) between plans offered by different companies, e.g. Blue Cross, Aetna, Prudential, and HMO (this introduces the principle of price competition, which does not exist where there is a single carrier);

2. the university take a more active organizational position supporting the Voluntary Incentive Program (VIP) in which physicians agree to charge only predetermined fees in a list of specified services (and not bill for more) in a given time-period, e.g. using the Indiana University referenced Series 1200 list, or/and the Memorial Hospital list; for the university to assume that members will persuade physicians to sign up in the VIP program all by themselves is quite absurd;

3. that the university should build in incentives for members to verify bills critically and carefully; if, for example, a member finds a bill to contain an item for a service/drug/item not actually rendered, then his/her bringing it to the attention of the university could result in the member being paid 10 percent of the savings;
4. the university actively pursue Preferred Provider Agreements with hospitals, clinics, physicians, pharmacies, etc.; eliciting the cooperation of other large employers to work together with the university in such agreements can reduce the medical inflation significantly; (PPP)

5. the university exercise leadership in the local community toward the development of a Health Maintenance Organization (HMO), to provide comprehensive coverage, with prepayment of premiums, possibly its own clinics or PPP programs; there is a federal advisory service on this, a national organization of HMOs, regional services in this direction, etc.; reductions of costs, sound services are vital;

6. the university provide for careful auditing of all medical service charges to the plan and to members; our consultants all agree that a trained clerk in Personnel would pay for his/her salary many times over by doing just this auditing; medical billing is so complex that errors are quite common; this person also can be assigned the task of getting accurate data (and valid data) on each member and the number and ages of dependents--similarly an aggressive effort to coordinate benefits (where, for example, a husband and wife work for different employers, which medical plan pays for illness, accident...); these cost savings can be substantial;

7. the university provide a "dental option," possibly similar to St. Mary's--this can be paid for mainly by adding to the member's part of the premium payment; the Los Angeles HMO (U. of So. California) admits that an "eye option" is expensive, so Notre Dame faculty are not pressing for this;

8. if it is proven that the plan requires increases in premium, above CPI, then the university and members can consider reduction in some benefits or coverages (such as payments for office visits to the physician), rather than increase payments of university and members;

9. the university provide a "wellness" program; by preventing one or more fifty or hundred thousand dollar illnesses (e.g. heart attacks, by-pass operations, Ct Scans, etc.) the member is not only given good service, but there is reduction of important costs to the plan; the BC/BS 5-year experiment on such a program showed that the plan saved $2 for every $1 spent; an example: hiring an LPN parttime, to take blood pressures of members/dependents and basic medical histories (to alert members to the need to take preventive measures, exercise, diets, less risks, etc.) --also, a one-day-a-month physician to examine more thoroughly those members referred by the LPN screening--a concerted health education program (flyers, meetings, etc.);

10. there should be a representative committee (of members and university) to review and make recommendations on the entire program performance each year; medical fringe benefits are part of the contract with the hiring of each member and thus members should be consulted in considering important changes;

11. with the availability of computers the introduction of "flexees" (see Educational Testing Service paragraph, toward end of Part III above) becomes a feasible and legitimate way of handling medical and other benefit choices.

Donald N. Barrett
Committee on Faculty Affairs
The Faculty Senate
Fr. David Burrell called the Faculty Senate meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. in room 202 of the Center for Continuing Education. Fr. Matthew Miceli led the senate in the opening prayer.

The first order of business was the approval of the minutes of the September 10, 1984 meeting. Prof. Mario Borelli moved for their approval, and Prof. Donald Barrett seconded this action. Prof. Philip Gleason asked for a clarification on the change in Prof. David Dodge's report on the Placement Office. Then Burrell reported that he had spoken with the Provost about the use of quotations in the minutes when the confidentiality could be a factor. They agreed that quotations from other meetings would not be reported. The minutes were then unanimously approved.

Burrell then reported that Prof. Karla Goold had agreed to take Prof. James Daschbach's place on the Traffic Violations Board. He then requested that the senators present nominate two senators to fill two vacancies on the Judicial Review Board. There was discussion as to who could be nominated as Prof. Jean Rosenberg reminded Burrell that these positions were open to all faculty. In the interests of time it was agreed that the election would be restricted to senators only, and ballots would be counted at the meeting's end.

Then Burrell thanked Barrett for the work which he had done on medical benefits. Progress has been made with the sub-subcommittee of the Budget Priorities Committee. Barrett presented a set of proposals which had been developed out of his work the previous year:

1. There should be a University Medical Benefits Committee.
2. The university should provide a "wellness" program for members.
3. The university should ask two or three companies to offer plans for choices.
4. The university should welcome the formation/entrance of HMO's in our community.

Borelli made a motion to thank Barrett for his work and to accept the proposals. Capt. John Rohrbough seconded the motion. Prof. Phillip Helman suggested the clarification that the proposed committee be composed of faculty, staff, and administrators. Prof. Robert Vacca wondered if the Faculty Committee for University Libraries had served as a prototype for the committee. The committee's functions as described seemed to specify Mr. Thomas Bull's duties. Burrell commented that Bull has been put in the position of making policy rather than of transmitting it. While it was clear to Vacca why faculty constitute the library committee, he questioned the faculty's expertise with regard to health benefits. Prof. Harvey Bender commented that he felt there would be an analogous competency. Prof. Irwin Press suggested the third proposal be changed to "... offer varied plans for choices." Vacca suggested
the fourth proposal read "... support the formation ... " The motion was unanimously passed with the few suggested changes. (See Appendix)

Burrell reported that the Faculty Affairs Committee had met and were planning for a on the junior faculty's perceptions of the reappointment process. Also that some responses to the questionnaire had been received.

After a short break Fr. Theodore Hesburgh was introduced by Burrell. Borelli opened the discussion commenting that while Hesburgh had spoken earlier in the day about the need for quality in graduate education, there was a need to improve undergraduate education. This would be an expensive proposition which the senate had addressed two years before in Prof. Vaughn McKim's report on financial aid. Hesburgh said that Fr. Edmund Joyce had studied the matter for the Board of Trustees, and they had mandated a tripling of the amount spent for undergraduate aid by tripling the current endowment of $35 million for that purpose. Rohrbough commented that the senate had wanted a certain amount identified as scholarship monies rather than as financial aid. Hesburgh responded that the Trustees and the Administration felt it was better to help those who needed financial aid, but that the Administration was exploring ways to get money for scholarships.

Barrett asked why the University was reluctant to establish distinguished professorships rather than endowed chairs. As Hesburgh was unfamiliar with this senate proposal, he asked Barrett to forward information on it to him.

Next Vacca and Hesburgh discussed the PACE Report with its statements about the growth of the university and Hesburgh's earlier comments. Hesburgh said: "Graduate development should help undergraduate development by 1987." However, he wanted to keep total enrollment below 10,000 because when that figure is exceeded, according to the Carnegie Commission on Education, the University becomes a different kind of school. He would hate to lose the feeling of family which Notre Dame is noted for. He expressed the challenging idea that if one wanted to expand, then one could start another university in the 500-600 acres on the other side of the lake where there is more room.

Prof. Katharina Blackstead asked Hesburgh for a status report on the administration's decision-making process with regard to the University Libraries' proposed automated system. Hesburgh commented that the proposed system had been vetted by the Assistant Provost for Computing, and the company was somewhat underfinanced. The committee responsible for the decision has gone back to the drawing board. He suggested that the Provost be consulted as to what and when a decision will be made.

Burrell spoke next on faculty development saying it was a more useful rubric than sabbatical. If there was to be overseas expansion of graduate studies, it could serve as a catalyst for some imaginative faculty development. Hesburgh responded that he didn't believe in entitlement. However, he did feel that leave time did not have to be used only on research. "I'd like people to be very imaginative. I can't remember anyone ever being turned down for money. If you have the support of the chair of the department, you'll probably get it."
Prof. Teresa Phelps questioned Hesburgh about the fact that while the University has been trying to attract good, young scholars, especially women, Notre Dame is withdrawing its support of the Early Childhood Development Center. Hesburgh replied that he did not feel it was the University's job to support ECDC, although it was important to have childcare facilities for graduate students who can receive some support for this. Faculty people can provide their own as they would in other places.

Next, Prof. Robert Lordi inquired about plans for a new student center. Hesburgh described various changes he'd like to institute in LaFortune and the surrounding area, including a war memorial. There are at least thirty spots on campus for satellite social centers which are being developed at minimal expense.

Rohrbough asked Hesburgh if he was aware of the fact that if the proposed change in the curricula were approved without amendment by the Academic Council then the ROTC would lose six hours of degree accredited courses allotted to engineering curricula. Hesburgh stated that he was unaware of this, and promised to look into the matter. He then spoke of the contributions which the three ROTC programs have made to Notre Dame both monetarily and in the quality of students.

Returning to the notion of satellite centers Miceli asked if they would be new buildings or remodeled areas. Hesburgh felt that remodeling would recover much social space in the dorms.

Prof. Subhash Basu remarked that senior faculty members at Notre Dame are in need of better research facilities, and that this was not mentioned in the PACE Report. According to Hesburgh these funds must come from and through the deans.

As there is a national shortage of new faculty in the fields of business and engineering, Vacca asked Hesburgh if there was any discussion on the national level of why so many were staying in the humanities. Hesburgh thought such a discussion would be worthwhile even through retreading into engineering would be more difficult for liberal arts students than into business. He told of the problems the Harvard Business School had finding someone to teach ethics.

Phelps remarked that there was a great deal of resistance to interdisciplinary studies even though outside directions were pointing that way. Hesburgh didn't know why this was, as many areas in the social sciences are cognate in their methodology. He asked if the senate would discuss this matter. Burrell responded that it would probably require procedures to cover each involved department's interests. Agreeing that problems of tenure and support were departmental, Hesburgh suggested the problematical approach such as study groups focusing on the environment or the nuclear threat best leads to interdisciplinary studies.

Then Burrell asked how one could urge universities to look at the ethical, moral problems of today's world. Hesburgh answered that interdisciplinary studies will aid in this process. At Notre Dame the Kellogg Institute will influence the social sciences. The University has to find its strengths and build upon them... "We must be more conscious of what we have in the way of assets."
Changing the subject, Barrett commented that the focus of this year's senate was faculty development. He asked if the administration had considered the problem of young faculty with regard to tenure expectations. Hesburgh commented that there has been much thinking about the problem. The irretractable problem is that there is restricted room for growth with young faculty because of the sizable percentage of tenured faculty. Some of this came from the growth in student enrollment. Barrett asked if any thought had been given to tenure track vs. nontenure track. Hesburgh replied that it made people nervous to talk about it. Other schools have gotten around the problem with visiting professorships. Notre Dame has tried to keep some good people through maneuvering various appointments. Barrett suggested the use of adjunct professorships. Hesburgh replied that Notre Dame did have some good adjunct professors, but that the deans and department chairmen were generally not in favor of adjuncts.

Mr. Douglas Wurth questioned the wisdom of remodelling LaFortune as opposed to building a new student center. Hesburgh reminded the student government representative that students had been involved in the planning. He proposed to utilize the money available to remodel now so that the students would have better social space now rather than having to wait until the money was raised to build a new building.

At this point Burrell thanked Hesburgh for coming, and adjourned the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

Absent but not excused: Peri Arnold, government & int'l. studies; Tomoaki Asano, microbiology; Salvatore Bella, management; Joseph Blenkinsopp, theology; Paul Conway, finance & business economics; Leo Despres, anthropology; David Dodge, sociology; Jay Dolan, history; Michael Francis, government & int'l. studies; Teresa Ghiarducci, economics; David Kirkner, civil engineering; Donald Kommers, government & law; John Lucey, aerospace/mech. engineering; William Slowey, accounting.

Absent and excused: James Bells, anthropology; Rudolph Bottet, chemistry; Linda-Margaret Hunt, biology; John Uhran, Jr., electrical engineering; Robert Williamson, Jr., accounting.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean A. Rosenberg
APPENDIX

PROPOSAL/MOTION REGARDING MEDICAL BENEFITS. October 9, 1984

Preamble: In the 1983-84 academic year the Faculty Senate conducted and reported on a study of medical benefit programs at 13 other universities. Careful analysis of these plans led to 11 different proposals. Also, the Senate put a great deal of effort in urging administration to seek "bids" from 10 or more companies, including Blue Cross/Blue Shield. This was our major proposal to reduce the 30 to 35% increase in premiums, as charged by this, the only company ever approached by Notre Dame in the last thirty years.

Results from last year's efforts: 1) the university sought bids from 7/8 companies and obtained bids from 5; each company gave two bids, one on the current medical benefits coverages, and the other on the coverages of the "old plan" which was effective prior to September 1, 1983 and for which Faculty paid nothing; one of the five companies gave bid about 6 percent lower than the bid of Blue Cross/Shield (i.e. over $200,000 less on a $3,000,000 premium); this 6 percent was defined as not lower enough and no plan change at Notre Dame has occurred; BC/BS still handles our medical benefits, although its current 1984-85 premium is considerably less than its 1983-84 premium; 2) administration of the current BC/BS program has improved appreciably, due to the skilled efforts of Paul Rentschler in Personnel Department; however, many Faculty and Staff are not clear on available benefits and thus are not using them, e.g. re pharmaceuticals.

Proposal: that the Faculty Senate specify its support for a limited few changes in the present medical benefits program.

Senate representatives can be more effective if they concentrate on three or four specifics, rather than the 11 contained in the spring 1984 Benefits Report.

I. There should be a University Medical Benefits Committee.
The Committee's functions would include: a) reviewing the operations and performance of the program at least once a year; b) top priority of study should be given to the program's service to members and to costs to members and the university; c) specific recommendations to administration decision-makers should be made to improve the program; d) a written report to all members should be made by the Committee at least once a year; e) Committee should be made up of elected/representative members of the different faculties, staff and administration.

II. The university should provide a "wellness" program for members.
Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Indiana provided just such a program for its employees and after years of operation concluded that it saved their health program $2 for every $1 spent. Example: hiring a Licensed Practical Nurse to do blood pressure and heart checks and medical histories of members--referring some members "at risk" to more thorough examination by a physician who gives one day a month to this (with prescriptions...)--a concerted health education program.

III. The university should ask two or three companies to offer different plans for choices by members. Where there is price and service competition, it is recognized that members benefit. Taking the two/three lowest bids among the five obtained, spring, 1984, this would help define what companies should be invited.

IV. The university should actively encourage the formation/entrance of HMOs into our community. Health Maintenance Organizations (HMOs) are guided by federal law (19 to hold down costs, to provide for effective medical care, to arrange for prepayment of premiums, etc. Kaiser Permanente is an HMO operating very successfully in Connecticut, Cleveland, through California, and many other places. There are today thousands of HMOs in the U.S. Three are trying to enter the St. Joseph County area. Notre Dame does not reply to their inquiries. Note: by federal law, once an HMO is established in the community, large employers must offer it to members who contract for a medical benefits plan.

Donald N. Barrett
Sociology - Faculty Senate
The Faculty Senate meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. in room 202 of the Center for Continuing Education by Fr. David Burrell, who then led the senate in the opening prayer.

Prof. Mario Borelli moved that the minutes of the October 8, 1984 meeting be approved. Prof. Joseph Blenkinsopp seconded. There were two changes in the listing of absences. The minutes were then approved.

Burrell thanked the senate with a special word of thanks to Borelli for the work done on the revision of the Faculty Manual. He congratulated Blenkinsopp for his appointment to the O'Hara Chair in Theology. Then he commended Prof. Thomas Bergin for his work on the faculty seminars, and Mr. William Hickey, Jr. for arranging lunches in Decio Commons. He also announced that there would be a mailing of the senate's five year report soon.

After thanking Prof. Donald Barrett, Borelli, and Mr. Paul Rentschler for their work on health benefits, Burrell turned the meeting over to Barrett for a status report. Barrett urged all faculty to talk to the representatives from Blue Cross/Blue Shield and Maxicare as the senate had strongly urged last year that there be choices in health benefits. He reported that the choices were made available so suddenly because Maxicare had finally been able to get their offer together while the Flex Plan was the result of the hard work of the Personnel Dept. He hoped that the faculty would recognize the fact that the University is paying a substantial amount of money per month to the plans for each faculty member. Regardless of the choice of plans the University's contribution will be the same, i.e. over $150 per month, per faculty member. Also Barrett urged that the faculty help reduce costs by asking physicians to join the VIP Program, i.e. promising not to bill more than the usual and customary charge per service. He read a letter Mr. Rentschler had written to the president of Blue Shield following up on the senate's request for a list of VIP physicians.

Barrett then reported on several possible future plans: dental coverage funded fully by members, a wellness program to identify high risk members so that preventative care could be given thus reducing costs, and another HMO offered by Michigan Blue Cross/Blue Shield HMO. At this point Barrett offered the following three motions:

A. Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate send an appreciative Thank You to Fr. Hesburgh, Fr. Joyce, Prof. O'Meara, Mr. Mason and all others who worked on the new medical benefits plan.

B. Be it resolved that the Senate elect a Faculty Benefits Committee to encourage faculty input into benefit planning, to study and make proposals on the University benefits packages.

C. Be it resolved that the Senate make a formal request of Administration for a copy of the annual report on the operations and financing of the Medical Benefits Plan which was effective September 1, 1983 to August 31, 1984.
The first was seconded by Capt. John Rohrbough, the second by Borelli, and the third by Prof. Katharina Blackstead. All were unanimously passed. Burrell suggested that anyone interested in serving on the Faculty Benefits Committee contact him or Prof. Jean Rosenberg.

Turning to committee reports Burrell gave the floor to Prof. Teresa Phelps, chair of the Student Affairs Committee. She reported that thanks to Prof. David Dodge the report on the Placement Office would be ready for discussion at the senate's December meeting. She welcomed any ideas from the senate with regard to the relationship between academic and student life. This has been a topic of discussion with Fr. David Tyson and Fr. Edward Malloy. Mr. Patrick McCauley, academic chairperson of the Student Council, said they hoped to come up with ideas to improve intellectual life on campus as this was the responsibility of faculty, students, and administration.

In a corollary report Burrell stated that he would bring up before the Board of Trustees Committee on Faculty Affairs the senate's report on student aid as it has not had adequate response.

Prof. Robert Vacca reported on the progress of the Faculty Affairs Committee with regard to the senate's second priority: renewal of faculty appointments and junior faculty. Comments will be solicited from all 31 department chairs in order to arrive at college-wide statements concerning the ability to discern tenurability at the time of reappointment as well as possible differences between departments and/or colleges in applying criteria. There will be two faculty fora for junior faculty to express their candid opinions of the reappointment and tenure process. All ideas will be collated with a report ready for the March meeting.

Prof. Paul Conway expressed the opinion that quite a bit had evolved from one meeting of the committee. Burrell and Vacca commented that the Provost's October 31, 1984, letter to the faculty also seemed to be a response to the senate's interest in reappointment and junior faculty. Blenkinsopp asked if the denominational matter had been brought up. Burrell responded that the Provost subscribes to looking at this at the time of hire, and not at any other time. Prof. Alex Hahn pointed out the Provost's reaffirmation that candidates must have potential or "... the proper trajectory for tenure." Prof. Robert Lordi asked if the criteria for reappointment were published in the Faculty Manual. Vacca said that this was one of the questions being asked of department chairs.

Burrell expressed the opinion that reappointment was also a problem for senior faculty who must either make or assist in making reappointment decisions. Borelli said that the Executive Committee of the Academic Council was also very concerned with this matter.

Burrell then gave the floor to Prof. John Uhran. He reported that out of one meeting of the Administrative Affairs Committee concerning the topic of faculty development had come several ideas and he hoped that small groups would begin working on them soon. A report on university chairs would soon be out for the senate, and it would point out some innovative ways to honor deserving faculty. The use of the Library as a teaching/research tool and the faculty's relationship to the Library hopefully would be discussed with Mr. Robert Miller.
up the topic of faculty honors, Lordi asked about awards for research as Fr. Theodore Hesburgh gives awards for teaching and service. Uhran responded that a larger number might be considered. Phelps felt that the entire topic of general leave policies and grants needed examination.

Hahn asked Uhran to elaborate on the discussion of endowed chairs. He replied that it should be part of a larger perspective. Burrell commented that the North Central Accreditation Committee had also been concerned with this issue. He had noted that the University's Undergraduate Bulletin had identified by name photos of endowed chair professors. He had written the Provost, and Sr. John Miriam responded that the publication would in the future identify any professor's picture. He cited this as an example of the regard the University had for endowed chairs and of the need to work on the idea of university chairs as their complement. He mentioned that the faculty members of the Academic and Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees would be caucus to discuss faculty renewal, university chairs, and funding for them as this was a more comprehensive way to build up the University.

Prof. James Bellis asked what Notre Dame was doing to produce chairs for professors for itself rather than for other universities. Burrell mentioned Princeton's idea of preceptorships, and Prof. John Fitzgerald noted that previously the University had a similar process. Blenkinsopp reminded the senate that endowments would be needed to finance these ideas. Vacca remembered that the Provost had said that the fund raisers were against preceptorships because it is easier to raise money for endowed chairs.

Barrett reminded the senate that Fr. Hesburgh didn't seem to know about the idea of university chairs, but that he was interested if it didn't cost too much. Uhran described several examples of low cost university chairs such as a research chair with a stipend under $10,000, extra travel allowance which could be awarded for a fixed time or for life, distinguished service professorships. Prof. Perl Arnold stated that there is a morale problem for those faculty members who won't reach full professorships as there will be more levels to which one can't obtain. Uhran responded that these university chairs and distinguished service professorships could easily be awarded assistant and associate professors. Burrell suggested they could be awarded to outstanding teachers.

At this point Prof. Irwin Press suggested that the senate look at the criteria for those who would be promoted to full professor from associate because he felt that university chairs would be adding just another social class and not contributing to collegiality. Burrell countered that this could be a project for next year's senate. He then closed this discussion by saying that unfortunately no one wants to project the dollar amounts which would be necessary to implement this project.

Burrell next brought up the subject of the Faculty Manual revision. The senate's role in providing candidates for various elections has been taken over by an elections committee. The senate may nominate candidates directly for committees "... except as otherwise provided."
Reporting on the afternoon's Academic Council meeting Burrell said that the criteria for tenure and for promotion to associate professor were discussed. Notable achievement in scholarship through publication or service relevant to scholarship would be required. Examples of this are speeches to conventions which would be published in proceedings rather than just scholarly articles. This will now be considered as directly relating to scholarship/research.

Under new business Borelli outlined the problem of deductibles with regard to the health benefits. It is all a matter of timing for the family plans because coinsurance does not begin until two deductibles have been expended. As the two new plans do cost more Borelli felt that the senate should push for having the extra costs treated as salary reductions rather than deductions for the purposes of taxes.

Barrett then reminded the senate of the Faculty Benefits Committee it had just approved and the fact that this idea is something they could bring to Mr. Rentschler. Prof. Andre Goddu and Prof. James Danehy both confirmed the fact that salary reductions were legal. Burrell suggested that Barrett chair the committee which could monitor the benefit plans. Prof. Robert Williamson and Prof. Francis Connolly responded to Burrell's call for volunteers to serve on the committee. Burrell said he would draft a letter to the faculty and staff about the committee's formation.

Barrett brought up the question of retired faculty living in the South Bend area wondering if there were some ideas for constructive projects they could carry out for the University. He felt there was a potential for academic contributions which they could make perhaps to freshman seminars. FitzGerald mentioned that he does currently teach. Prof. Teresa Ghiarducci suggested that there should be some monetary backing for this work. Prof. Linda-Margaret Hunt felt individuals could contribute to improving student-faculty interactions and the intellectual climate on campus. However, Danehy was opposed to the idea and felt much more discussion was needed.

There being no more new business Prof. David Dodge moved that the meeting be adjourned. Uhran seconded this, and the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Absent but not excused: Tomoaki Asano, microbiology; Salvatore Bella, management; Philip Gleason, history; Donald Kammers, government & law; William McGlinn, physics.

Absent and excused: Jay Dolan, history; James Flanigan, C.S.C., art history & design; Michael Francis, government & int'l. studies; Sandra Harmatiuk, freshman year of studies; Eugene Henry, electrical engineering; James Powell, graduate admissions.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean A. Rosenberg
The Faculty Senate meeting was called to order by the chairman, Fr. David Burrell at 7:35 p.m. in room 202 of the Center for Continuing Education. He asked for a moment of silent prayer for a former student who had just died.

After several corrections in the minutes of November 7, 1984, Prof. Mario Borelli moved the minutes be accepted as amended. Prof. Katharina Blackstead seconded, and the minutes were unanimously approved as amended.

The second order of business was the election of Treasurer. Burrell placed Capt. John Rohrbough's name in nomination. As there were no other nominations Borelli moved that they be closed. Rosenberg seconded, and the vote was unanimous. Burrell then reminded the senate the Provost would attend the next senate meeting to answer questions, and that the date had been changed to January 17, 1985.

Burrell then reported on the meeting of the Academic and Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. They had visited various departments, and had heard a historical report on health benefits by Mr. Thomas Mason. The changes in course requirements and ROTC requirements were discussed along with admissions policies. The North Central evaluation report's comments on faculty development were the topic of much discussion. Burrell said that: "The seed was planted for faculty development," as the senate's plans for faculty development were brought to the Committee's attention as well.

Prof. Robert Vacca gave a report on the activities of the Faculty Affairs Committee which has been scrutinizing the process of third year reappointment policies. Two faculty fora had been held for the junior faculty to express their views on the matter. Several committee members were interviewing the department chairs as well. A discussion of Vacca's findings to date followed.

Prof. David Dodge then presented his Report on the Placement Bureau Regarding Its Efforts on Behalf of the AL Students and the University Students in General (See Appendix). He regretted he was not able to obtain data from peer universities because there has as yet been no agreed upon standard for reporting placement data. However, the numbers of professional staff and student populations of our peers were contrasted in the report. Rohrbough commented on sources of funding at the other universities which might account for their larger staffs. Vacca asked Dodge if bettering Notre Dame's efforts in placement activities required more staff or more money. Dodge replied that both were needed as trained staff were required to handle the growing numbers of students seeking assistance, and money was needed to provide more computer programs, library materials, and adequate housing. He commented that the Placement Bureau appeared to have a low University priority.

Dodge then suggested that the Placement Bureau be commended for its accomplishments despite the adverse conditions under which it operates, and that his report be sent to Fr. David Tyson. Burrell thanked Dodge and moved that the senate
accept his report. Borelli expanded this motion to include sending the report to Tyson and a letter of commendation to Mrs. Kitty Arnold, the Bureau’s Director. This was seconded by Rohrbough, and unanimously passed.

Prof. John Uhran reported next on the work of the Administrative Affairs Committee with regard to an overall strategy to further faculty development. Growing out of earlier senate and committee discussions, endowed chairs, faculty renewal, and faculty honors were targeted as areas for concentration. As all of these involve funding, Burrell suggested that the senate move quickly because the Development Office is moving toward setting its goals. Uhran commented that the untenured faculty’s concerns as expressed in the Faculty Affairs Committee’s investigation fit in nicely with the renewal plans this committee was working on. He reported that Prof. James Powell was looking into library and equipment matters. Prof. James Bellis then led a discussion on faculty development.

The discussion turned to the senate’s proposal on sabbaticals which had been tabled by the Academic Council last year. Various methods of handling this matter were proposed resulting in an instruction to Burrell to inform the Executive Committee of the Academic Council that it could proceed without further concern regarding the tabled issue of faculty sabbatical leaves.

Prof. Paul Conway moved that the meeting be adjourned. Dodge seconded this, and the meeting was adjourned at 9:12 p.m.

Absent but not excused: Gerald Arnold, physics; Peri Arnold, government and international studies; Tomoaki Asano, microbiology; Subhash Basu, chemistry; Philip Gleason, history; Donald Kommers, government and law; Robert Lordi, English; John Lucey, aerospace/mechanical engineering.

Absent and excused: Salvatore Bella, management; Leo Despres, anthropology; James Flanigan, C.S.C., art history & design; Michael Katona, civil engineering; Thomas Kosel, metallurgical engineering; Matthew Miceli, C.S.C., theology; Teresa Phelps, law; Irwin Press, anthropology; Robert Williamson, Jr., accounting.

Correction: Prof. Leo Despres has been on leave, therefore his absences for the meetings of September 10, October 8 and November 7 should have been listed as excused.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean A. Rosenberg
October 8, 1984

Re: Sub-Subcommittee Report on the Placement Bureau Regarding Its Efforts and Accomplishments in Behalf of the AL Students and the University Students in General.

Synopsis:

1. Despite limited data, sufficient patterns emerge for the Faculty Senate to take under advisement, draw conclusions and make recommendations.

2. Despite current limitations, the Placement Bureau is doing a surprisingly credible job but has a long way to go (which was the consensus of all those interviewed and contacted).

3. The fortunes of the graduating AL seniors are currently inextricably bonded with the fortunes of the remaining university graduating seniors.

4. Despite their unique and peculiar needs, the AL students are not being shortchanged by the Placement Bureau. All university graduating seniors are receiving too few opportunities because of a short-sighted low priority assignment to the Placement Bureau by the university. This makes it difficult for the Placement Bureau to carry out its charges.

5. The Placement Bureau sorely lacks adequate personnel, funds and facilities, and ranks low compared to other peer higher educational institutions.

6. If these limitations continue, not only will career counseling and placement needs continue to be short-changed, but also current achievements will probably slide in face of increasing needs of future graduating students.

7. Specific needs are: continued expansion of housing facilities; continued increase in professional career and placement staff; funds for computerizing records; funds for adequate library holdings; funds for program materials such as audio-visual supplies in the interview skills projects, etc.

Objectives: To examine and evaluate how the Graduating seniors of the College of Arts and Letters are faring on the job market at graduation. What role, comparable to the other colleges of the university, does the Placement Bureau play in the placement of the graduating seniors of the College of Arts and Letters?

Procedures: Interviews: Assistant Dean Robert Waddick of the College of Arts and Letters; Mrs. Kitty Arnold, Director of the Placement Bureau; Scott Dix, Diagnostician of Data for Placement Bureau.

Phone Calls: Several with the preceding as well as with Mr. Paul Reynolds, Professional Career Counselor and Mr. Charles McCollester, Director of the Dept. of Analytical Studies for the University.

Data Base: Each year Mr. McCollester conducts a survey of the graduating seniors. Questionnaires are handed out to the seniors when they pick up their tickets/passes for their graduation guests. The filling-out of the questionnaire and
returning it to the Dept. of Analytical Studies is done on a voluntary basis. The responses are then compiled and analyzed by Mr. McCollester and assistants. This data base is also used by others for their purposes and needs. All data and summaries regarding career plans, etc. of graduating seniors are derived from this data base.

Materials Secured:
1. A summary of the 1983 Graduating Seniors data base file from Mr. McCollester.
4. Placement Program activities for total University by College from Placement Bureau and Dean Waddick.

Cooperation: All parties contacted, interviewed, were most cooperative, answering any question directed to them without apparent hesitation or hedging. More data was provided than requested.

Data, Findings and Comments: There were discrepancies between the summaries received from each agency. Some of this may be accounted for by the items in the questionnaires which may be used or interpreted in different ways. Any cross-tabulations with these items further aggravates the problem. Additionally, some graduate students are included in the data. Since Dean Waddick was concerned with only undergraduates and requested a recompilation and analysis of the data base to suit his purposes, I will use his summaries and supplement them with other materials where appropriate.

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Work Careers*</th>
<th>Avg. Salary</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>155 (30)***</td>
<td>$16,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>272 (72)</td>
<td>18,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>191 (61)</td>
<td>23,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47 (18)</td>
<td>19,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>665 45</td>
<td>Avg.19,328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Figures derived from survey of 1983 university bachelor degree recipients (N=1657) with a response rate of 93.7% (N=1553). The January 1983 graduates (N=85) were not surveyed. If they were included in the no response category, the response rate would decrease to 89.1%. This has not been the past practice. In 1984, 1631 of 1783 bachelor degree recipients filled out the questionnaire, thus constituting a response rate of 91.5%, slightly lower than previous year. The January graduates (N=70) are not included in figures.
*Work Career Interests: These figures include only those students seeking employment at graduation. Other intents = Medical Schools, Dental Schools, MBA Programs, Graduate Schools, Law Schools, Military/Voluntary Service and residual category Undecided.

**Figures in parenthesis designate the number of work career intents who had secured employment at time of survey of those seeking employment (Work Careers).

***Percent of Respondent Sample of College.

Comments: The following consensus emerged from the interviews.

Although 1983 would probably be a "down year" for hiring nationally, the AL graduates placement (success rate) was surprising. This success rate was an increase from previous years (See Table 2). In 1984, with the economy recovering, employers sought more employees.

TABLE 2

Success Rate Previous Years by College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ.</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1983, while not attaining its previous high of 1979, AL success rates bounced back to its 1980 level despite the poor national economic picture. Moreover, this recovery was accomplished with an increasing number of AL graduates seeking employment at graduation. In 1982 there were 119 such students compared with 158 for 1983 and 155 for 1984.

In 1984 373 AL students registered with Placement Bureau for assistance in finding employment at graduation. This decided upswing in AL students should be kept in mind when considering the future needs of the Placement Bureau. The AL graduates appear to constitute a unique, peculiar challenge to the Placement Office since they are not job-oriented until late in their college careers.

Cautions Concerning Tables 1 and 2: As noted earlier, the over-all response rates to the 1983 (93.7%) and 1984 (91.5%) surveys were excellent. However, there are three factors that influence these response rates:

1. The deadline for cutoff of returns of questionnaires is in late April. This may tend to portray a conservative picture of success rates in some areas. Undoubtedly, many graduates receive job offers in May and June, and during the summer.
TABLE 3

Responsible Rate by College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>#Students Responding 1983</th>
<th>#Students Responding 1984</th>
<th>Response Rate 1983</th>
<th>Response Rate 1984</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>537 (596)*</td>
<td>575 (629)*</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>91.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>378 (397)</td>
<td>431 (477)</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>90.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG</td>
<td>379 (403)</td>
<td>345 (393)</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>87.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>259 (261)</td>
<td>280 (283)</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
<td>98.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1553 (1657)</td>
<td>1631 (1782)</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>91.53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No. in parenthesis indicates total number of students graduating with bachelor degrees.

2. Self-Employed: Dean Waddick was able to determine that 39 of the AL graduating seniors in 1983 designated that they would be self-employed. If we assumed that these do not constitute valid entries engaged in pursuit of Work Careers and omitted them, then the success rate for AL would drop to 34.4%. Important factors to weigh in this matter are how many graduates of the other colleges of the university are to be self-employed? Do certain majors in the AL attract more so than the other colleges, students who intend to be self-employed. This type of second-guessing may be fruitless unless they lead to possible means of substantiation.

Whether or not the upper Figure of 51% or 34.4% (for 1983) is used for calculating the success rates of work careers for AL graduating seniors, the significant fact still remains that one-half or more of this group do not have jobs at graduation. The situation is even more exasperating for AL women in the job market for their success rate is usually lower than that of the males.

Of all those interviewed and contacted, there was a unanimity that, although the AL student is not matriculating specifically for a job, nonetheless their undergraduate career could and should be viewed as one of career preparation as well as personal growth. Therefore, it appears that the AL graduate, perhaps even more than graduates from the other colleges, need to know paths (means and ways) to successful job hunting. Both Dean Waddick and the Placement Bureau are operating on this assumption and have established a vigorous program to attempt to compensate for and remedy this need. While strong inroads have been accomplished under present conditions, a lot remains to be done.

Past and Future Trends
On re-examining Table 1, if the major role that accounting students play is correct in creating the success rate percent for the BA college, and this is taken into account, then it appears that a significant and critical number
of students from each college at graduation remain on the job market. In 1984, 45.4% of BA graduating males and 52.9% of BA graduating females opted for work careers. Moreover, it appears that this is a trend that has gained momentum over the past eight years. The number of bachelor degree students for the total University who opt for work careers at graduation has risen from 32% in 1975 to a plateau of approximately 46% the past 9 years. (1980-46.8%; 1981-46.5%; 1982-46.9%; 1983-45.0% and 1984-45.3%.)

If this increasing percentage of university students who are opting for work careers at graduation is to continue in its current pattern, and this appears to be the case for all other intents at graduation have remained stationary or noticeably declined over the past 6 years. The university should be appraised of these facts and a higher university priority should be given to the Placement Bureau needs to enhance its resources for meeting these increasing demands.

The Placement Bureau:

1. Role in Placement of Students: Given the increasing needs (the increase in those students opting for Work Careers at graduation) of the students, what methods have been most successful in securing jobs? There are several methods available and Table 4 portrays some of these means and their success rates for 1983 and 1984.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th># with Jobs</th>
<th>% of all Graduating Using Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placement Bureau</td>
<td>241 265</td>
<td>43.6% 52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resume Mailing</td>
<td>96 115</td>
<td>17.4% 22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Contact</td>
<td>18 5</td>
<td>3.3% 1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact-Friend</td>
<td>38 21</td>
<td>6.9% 4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>37 14</td>
<td>6.7% 2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Employment</td>
<td>73 50</td>
<td>13.2% 9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>49 33</td>
<td>8.9% 6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>552 503</td>
<td>100.0% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 clearly demonstrates the major role that the Placement Bureau performs in assisting students in finding jobs. This role is not only of the utmost importance for AL graduates, but for all graduates seeking employment at the bachelor degree, regardless of College (although the AL graduates may constitute a public requiring unique services and aid from the Placement Bureau). While it is not a hiring agency, the Placement Bureau is far and away the primary avenue and source to which students turn for assistance in securing jobs. Moreover, which Table 4 does not show, the Placement Bureau performs other critical roles in assisting students in career preparation, construction of resumes, etc. These activities and services have been seriously curtailed because of present conditions affecting the Placement Bureau.
In summary, using Dean Waddick's materials, the AL graduates do not appear to be getting "the short end" of the Placement Bureau efforts. Indeed, Dean Waddick appears to be receiving enthusiastic consideration and assistance from the Placement Bureau. Mr. Paul Reynolds has a special interest in the AL graduating students and their unique predicament and is co-sponsor with Dean Waddick of the AL Business Society which has its own extensive year program in assisting graduating AL students, in addition to that offered by the Placement Bureau. Dean Waddick personally feels that the Placement Bureau is providing him and the AL graduates with as much assistance as it can. He feels, under the circumstances, that the AL Business Society and the Placement Bureau are producing remarkable results, but there is a long way to go because over 50% of those in the AL seeking employment and careers at graduation are jobless. This matter is more acute for females than males for females successfully finding employment at graduation is slightly below 40%.

Up to a point, it can be stated that as the total university goes in success rates for work career intents so goes the AL graduates. If we turn to data other than Dean Waddick's figures, the situation of the AL students comparatively speaking, decidedly lessens in success rates. Either way, the need to work with students as early as possible in their undergraduate careers--perhaps as early as the beginning of the junior year--regarding their future career plans is one aspect that all parties contacted stressed in addition to sizeably improving the current success rates for all colleges.

The Placement Bureau and Its Needs:

A. Current Efforts and Personnel

1983: The personnel of the Placement Bureau consists of only 2.5 professionals -- Director Kitty Arnold; Mr. Paul Reynolds, and Ms. Joan McIntosh. Of the 10 universities compared (see Appendix C), the University of Notre Dame has the smallest professional staff while the size of the student population it serves is greater than or approximates 7 of the 9 remaining universities whose Career Counseling and Placement Professional Staff range from 3-9.5 persons. All those interviewed identified Northwestern University as the university most similar to Notre Dame in structure, college composition, graduate and undergraduate student population, etc., and its staff consists of 9.5 professionals compared to N.D.'s 2.5.

1984: One full staff member was hired over the summer. However, in light of the increasing numbers of persons to be serviced and expansion of types of programs to aid students, the addition of a one full staff member, though greatly and graciously appreciated, in the eyes of this observer represents a token gesture and a step back from honoring the priority that the career and placement bureau not only deserves, but requires.

In 1984 the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Michigan has at its disposal, for its services alone: 19 full time staff personnel and 5 full time clerical staff members. In 1984, 5,000 interviews took place for the College of Arts and Sciences. The Career and Placement Bureau here at the University of Notre Dame had over 10,000 interviews! Moreover, a perusal of the following sections on Group Presentations and Sponsored Events and Recent Innovations and Programs which designates a mind-boggling number of services and numbers, one really has to wonder how a professional staff of 2-1/2 (1983-84) and a short-supply of clerical workers could attempt to conduct its past program, let alone expand its horizon of services.
B. Current Funding:

All those interviewed agreed that the Placement Bureau operates on a sorely insufficient budget. This inadequacy of funds has prevented the hiring of needed personnel, working materials, etc.

Aside from personnel needs, there is a strong shortage of funds for program supplies; e.g. audio visual equipment (rent or buy) in the interviewing program; an underdeveloped reference library (IUSB and St. Mary's have larger career and placement libraries than does the University of Notre Dame). Another area of concern to the Career and Placement Center is the need to computerize its records and to develop systems to facilitate all aspects of its recruiting. The Placement office at N.D. is one of just a few of the Major universities in the Midwest without such a computer system; almost left to the old "darning needle and cart sorting" techniques. Such a state of affairs has serious drawbacks including the fact that the placement bureau, without a computerized record system, is currently precluded from participation in a joint employer-college program devised to provide employers with direct computer access via telephone to student vitae/resumes.

Another particular concern!

C. Housing of Bureau:

1983: All persons interviewed believed the facilities provided to the Placement Bureau to be inadequate, disadvantageous, and even counterproductive in some instances. The space provided for displaying employer materials, and everything else pertinent to students' interests regarding information about the various industries, sign-up sheets, etc. is a hallway 20' by 5' with a 3' shelf waist-high running along one wall. Approximately 15-20 students are usually in the hallway working at the shelf, examining materials along the wall above the shelf. One has to work through this small crowd to find the director's office. This is what greets each representative of each firm/industry as well as each student.

Also, the space allotted for conducting interviews is located on the Fourth Floor in the Administration Building (no elevator for representatives to use; next to Administrative Assistants who are working and typing) and a temporary setup on the 2nd floor of LaFortune Center. Interviewers frequently complain about the noise.

1984: A primary accomplishment of the past year involved the move to new facilities in the basement of Memorial Library during the summer months. Obtaining approval for the new location (as well as obtaining the additional financial resources to renovate and equip the new offices) required a substantial investment of staff time.

The current space now provides for 26 interview rooms and a conference/workshop-room (which was not available previously). The new location will be much more convenient for recruiters and the centralization of the interviewing space will aid greatly in monitoring the entire program.

While new facilities are decidedly a great improvement over previously existing quarters, with increasing new program activities and interviews, additional space is required. This will involve more renovation of adjacent space to the existing facilities.
D. Position in University Administrative Hierarchy:

1983: The official to whom the Director of the Bureau reported to and conveyed the needs and situations of the Bureau was by training, not versed enough in the profession of career placement and career counseling to appreciate and adequately represent the Placement Bureau. Indeed, it was and is believed by all contacted that the past and current representative has relatively no background in this area. The suggestion that the Director of the Placement Bureau report directly to the Provost of the University was presented as an alternative avenue to remedy the current situation.

1984: The new chain of command involves Director Arnold - Father Caffarelli (Ass't. Vice President for Student Services and Affairs, - Father Tyson (Vice President for Student Affairs). It is too early yet to assess the effect of this new arrangement and officers.

E. Opportunities for Implementing Future Plans and Objectives:

This has been the first year for Director Arnold, and it appears that she has many creative ideas concerning programmatic changes that would greatly enhance the effectiveness of meeting the needs of the work career intents of the graduating seniors. Indeed, it is imperative that some of these programs be implemented (consensus of those contacted) for the increasing numbers of graduating students opting for work careers is adding substantial increments/numbers each year. This is especially critical for the increasing numbers of AL students. The critical shortage in funding and personnel numbers will sorely curtail the Bureau's efforts despite its new leadership and creativity.

A strong note should emphasize a much neglected part of the Placement program in the past due to critical shortages of personnel. The title of the office or center is Placement and Career Services. The latter group of services has been previously small in the past because of the demands of the Placement Services. The need and potential of career services would involve more, if not at least equal time as the placement program. The results of the Discovery Program will be a symptom of those students seeking career counseling, yet is doubtful that the existing will have time to adequately meet the needs indicated. The Discovery Program, as well as the increases in numbers of interviews, total counseling contacts, etc. clearly indicates the need/demand for individualized career assistance without any significant publicity efforts for the existence of this need. Students seek help for career concerns for a host of variegated reasons and needs ranging from interview techniques, constructing dossiers/vitae, to career implications of a particular major. With the limited staff available the emphasis currently stressed in the Placement and Career Services is program is placed on large group events rather than individual assistance. This is not to say that Director Arnold and her staff like it this way and are not attempting to meet the individual career counseling needs. The Placement aspect is just so demanding and consumes so much of the staff's time and efforts. Thus, in summary the staff is placed in the extremely unfortunate position of having to "rob Peter to pay Paul" between career services and placement, and not with fully developed programs to play with, but relatively few cards to play with.
Issues and Concerns

1. Another particular concern for the effective functioning of the placement service is the need to develop an aggressive marketing strategy with employers who have not recruited Notre Dame students in the past. Because of its small professional staff and the large number of students requiring individualized attention, little has been done aside from a very large annual mass mailing to encourage new employers to interview here. This problem will be exacerbated by the increased enrollment in the MBA Program because those students use placement services in proportionally the largest numbers. The Placement Office will be proposing that additional resources be allocated for the 1985-86 fiscal year to support a new staff position which will be used to develop and implement an employer marketing effort.

F. Major Events of Group Presentations and Sponsored Events.
(Excerpted with minor deletions and editing from Mrs. Arnold's Annual Report.)

Career and Placement Services (Academic Year August-May 1984)

The following data provide strong support for the critical comments in the preceding sections.

I. Individual Counseling and Advising

| Total number of Counseling Contacts: 1087 |  |
| Counseling breakdown by College: |  |
| Arts and Letters: | 373 |
| Business Administration: | 272 |
| Engineering: | 156 |
| Science: | 51 |
| Alumni, all others: | 225 |

II. On-Campus Interviews

| Total number of employers: 429 |  |
| Total number of interviews held: 9855 | (1983-9622) 1984 figure does not include approximately 300 interviews conducted by IBM. |
| Total number of students registered: 1355 |  |

In keeping with the economic upturn, there was an increase in the total interviews during 1983-84 academic year. Increased due more to the increase in number of interviews by typical recruiting companies than new employers visiting the campus.

Group Presentations and Sponsored Events

A large number of students were served this past year through Career and Placement Services-sponsored workshops and programs. The estimated total audience for all of these events was 4,000 students. Because of the small number of professional staff members, a much stronger emphasis is placed on large group events than on individualized assistance.
The major events of the year were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Audience Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-6-83</td>
<td>Accountancy Placement Night</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-7-83</td>
<td>Engineering Placement Night</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-8-83</td>
<td>Finance, Marketing, and Management Placement Night</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-9-83</td>
<td>MBA Placement Seminar</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12-83</td>
<td>Arts and Letters Placement Night</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-13-83</td>
<td>Science Placement Night</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-13-83</td>
<td>Arts and Letters Career Day</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-10-83</td>
<td>MBA Mini-Forum</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-9-83</td>
<td>Career Orientation Day (co-sponsored with Student-Alumni Relations Group)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-26-84</td>
<td>Kirby Stanat Job Hunters Seminars</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-14-84</td>
<td>Government Career Day</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-29 to 4-18</td>
<td>Placement Orientation Sessions for Juniors</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to developing and sponsoring programs, Career and Placement Services office staff coordinated over sixty receptions sponsored by employers recruiting on the campus. All of the receptions featured a formal presentation on the company and the career opportunities the firm had to offer in addition to the informal socializing.

**Alumni Placement Activities**

- New alumni registrations: 145
- Total number of active alumni files as of June 30, 1984: 323
- Total number of dossiers mailed: 2196
- Total number of job vacancies received: 2544
- Total number of job referrals mailed: 1163

The programs offered to alumni include the duplication and forwarding of dossiers for those seeking work in educational institutions, a job vacancy referral service, and individual career counseling when it is feasible for the individual to visit the campus. The professional staff also participates in the annual Alumni Weekend and offers workshops and individual assistance.

This past year the Alumni Association, in response to the increasing demand for career services, authorized the development of a computerized job matching service for its members. This effort, which is to supplement the services offered by the Career and Placement Services office, has not as yet become operational due to delays in the completion of the program.

**Employer Relations**

Central to the success of a job placement program is an effective employer relations effort. This activity is comprised of disseminating information on the institution and its academic programs to the appropriate employers and in continuing to meet their diverse needs. In practical terms, it translates into devoting a tremendous amount of time to the employer community.
through individual meetings, extended telephone conversations, attendance at employer-sponsored receptions, dinners, and lunches, and trips to various employers' offices. Each of the over seven hundred individuals who visit the campus to conduct interviews must be welcomed upon their arrival and special requests of various kinds acted upon.

A strength of the Notre Dame Career and Placement Services office noted by many employers is the extra effort which is exerted by the staff to make their visit more pleasant and productive. While personalizing the interviewing experience for recruiters is time consuming, it does result in a more positive image of the institution as a whole by these firms.

G. Discovery

To be implemented during the 1984-85 academic year is the introduction of computer-assisted career guidance. In conjunction with Counseling and Psychological Services, this office will offer a software program designed to assist a student in self-assessment and provide extensive informational resources pertinent to career planning. The program entitled DISCOVER will be co-leased and is one of the first cooperative efforts pursued by these two services. This effort has grown out of a mutual recognition that each service should offer career services in order to reach a broader student base.

Concluding Remarks

In light of the preceding report it appears imperative that something must be done to alleviate the circumstances of the Placement Bureau. With an anticipated increasing number of university graduating students (especially in AL) opting for work careers and with the detailed limitations curtailing the effectiveness of the Placement Bureau, it would seem inevitable that the Bureau is going to be unable to continue on its current state of achieving remarkable results in the face of serious limitations, let alone make significant inroads on increasing demands and needs. Although the university is not intended to be an institution devoted to job preparation, it is in the business of career preparation in the broadest sense. Its assignment of the Placement Bureau to lower realms of its priorities is actually shortchanging the student, placing obstacles in the paths of the students rather than providing the students with the most optimum career opportunity structures within which to put into practice the very career guidelines it instills in them.

The following materials are appended for your examination and curiosity:

Appendix A. Professional Conferences attended by staff: 1983-84.

Appendix B. Careers Represented at a typical Arts and Letters Career Day.

Appendix C. Profession Staff services at peer institutions.

Appendix D. Salary Offerings to 1984 Graduating Seniors by Major and College.
Appendix A

Professional Conferences 1983-84

Midwest College Placement Association Fall Meeting: Dick Willemin
ACPA Executive Mid-Year Meeting: Kitty Arnold
Endicott Conference: Kitty Arnold
ACT Career Decision-Making/Advising Seminar: Joan McIntosh
American College Personnel Association: Kitty Arnold
Skylark Conference: Kitty Arnold
Indiana College Personnel Association: Kitty Arnold
Midwest College Placement Association: Paul Reynolds and Kitty Arnold
CAREERS TO BE REPRESENTED AT ARTS AND LETTERS CAREER DAY--1983

Thursday, October 13, 1983
12:00 noon - 4:00 p.m.

Advertising
Representatives of Ms. Debbie Meyer
Leo Burnett Company--Chicago, IL

Alternative (nontraditional) Careers
Ms. Joan McIntosh
University of Notre Dame

Banking
Mr. John Gerlitz
American National Bank and Trust Company--Chicago, IL

Communications (Radio and Television)
Ms. Sandra Bell
WGN Television--Chicago, IL

Computer Programming/Computer Systems Applications
Representative of Mr. Richard Gilbert
Indiana Bell--Indianapolis, IN

Federal Government
Ms. Ruby Holmes
Social Security Administration--South Bend, IN

Financial Services
Ms. Jeanne Yoa
Merrill Lynch and Company--New York, NY

Foreign Service
Mr. James D. Conley
Retired, Foreign Service Information Officer--South Bend, IN

Graduate, Law, and MBA Schools
Representative of Dr. Chau Le
University of Notre Dame
Mr. Robert Waddick
University of Notre Dame
Mr. Larry Ballinger
University of Notre Dame

Graphic Design
Ms. Ann Mercer - Mr. Paul Wieber
University of Notre Dame

Health Care Industry
Representative of Mr. Michael J. Ferry
St. Joseph Medical Center--South Bend, IN

Career and Placement Services, Room 213 Administration Building, (219) 239-5200
Appendix B

Hotel/Restaurant Management
Ms. Amy Holobyn
Marriott Hotel--South Bend, IN

Industrial Sales
Mr. John Grupe
Xerox Corporation--Schaumburg, IL

Insurance
Mr. Douglas W. Cochrane
Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company--South Bend, IN

Lay Ministry
Mr. Dan Chaney  Ms. Deven Hubert  Ms. Mary Ann LaPlante
Little Flower Church--South Bend, IN

Museum
Ms. Kathleen Stiso
Northern Indiana Historical Society--South Bend, IN

Newspaper Careers
Mr. James McLaughlin
South Bend Tribune--South Bend, IN

Paralegal Services
Ms. Mel Freeman - Ms. Janet Crull
Barnes and Thornburg--South Bend, IN

Performing Arts
Ms. Jill Stoever
Enchanted Hills Playhouse--Syracuse, IN

Personnel Management
Representative of Ms. Cindy Bieniek
General Motors Corporation--Detroit, MI

Politics
Mr. Wayne A. Kramer
Office of Congressman John Hiler--South Bend, IN

Public Relations
Representative of Mr. James Dominello
Juhl Advertising Agency--Elkhart, IN

Publishing
Mr. Richard Beran
Horton Publishing Company--Chicago, IL

Purchasing Management
Representatives of Mr. Gaylord Olson
Sundstrand Heat Transfer, Inc.--Dowagiac, MI

Religious Life
Brother David Baltrinic, C.S.C.
University of Notre Dame

Sr. Patricia McCabe, C.S.C.
St. Mary's College
Appendix B

Retail Industry
Ms. Mary Harren
Macy's--Kansas City, MO

Small Business Ownership
Mr. Mike Pilat
Small Business Administration--South Bend, IN
Mr. Nole Walters
Trinetics, Inc.--Mishawaka, IN
Mr. Frank Mulligan
South Bend Controls, Inc.--South Bend, IN

Social Services
Representative of Mr. Joseph Greci
United Way of St. Joseph County,
Inc.--South Bend, IN
Representative of Ms. Bonnie Bailey
Family and Children's Center--Mishawaka, IN

Teaching
Representative of Sr. Jeannine Jochman
Diocese of Ft. Wayne--South Bend, IN

Travel--Travel Agencies/Airlines
Ms. Carol Weissert
Edgerton's Travel Service, Inc.--South Bend, IN

Volunteer Services
Sr. Judith Ann Beattie, C.S.C.
University of Notre Dame
## Career Counseling and Placement Professional Staff

### -Peer Institutions-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Student Population</th>
<th>Professional Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td>6,914</td>
<td>5.0+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>31,038</td>
<td>14.0+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>5,404</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University (Evanston campus only)</td>
<td>6,824</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane</td>
<td>9,936</td>
<td>5.0+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>27,647</td>
<td>6.0+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt</td>
<td>8,911</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. All student population statistics are from the *Peterson's Annual Guide to Undergraduate Study '83*.

2. All figures exclude any Law School staff members. The statistics were derived from the *1983-84 Directory of Career Planning and Placement Offices*, published by the College Placement Council and from a telephone survey.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>MALE OFFERS</th>
<th>ANNUAL AVERAGE</th>
<th>FEMALE OFFERS</th>
<th>ANNUAL AVERAGE</th>
<th>TOTAL OFFERS</th>
<th>ANNUAL AVERAGE</th>
<th>LOW OFFER</th>
<th>HIGH OFFER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS &amp; LETTERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics BA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21,272</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.375</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20,987(40)</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>25,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23,280</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,280</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23,280</td>
<td>23,280</td>
<td>23,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Majors BA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20,403(11)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22,422(18)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21,656(29)</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>27,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp. Application</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20,330(4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25,707(5)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23,317(9)</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>27,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountancy</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>19,690(201)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>19,816(96)</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>19,845(297)</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20,939(26)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22,371(8)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21,867(34)</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20,800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20,036</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>23,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18,100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20,337(8)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19,476(13)</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>23,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25,990(22)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23,981(11)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25,321(33)</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>31,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA/JD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology BA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23,600</td>
<td>23,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27,720</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27,720</td>
<td>27,720</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry BA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>25,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics BA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22,554(7)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23,785</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23,210(15)</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics BA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32,240</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32,240</td>
<td>32,240</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D
## Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>MALE OFFERS</th>
<th>ANNUAL AVERAGE</th>
<th>FEMALE OFFERS</th>
<th>ANNUAL AVERAGE</th>
<th>TOTAL OFFERS</th>
<th>ANNUAL AVERAGE</th>
<th>LOW OFFER</th>
<th>HIGH OFFER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24,378</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25,985</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25,047</td>
<td>17,383</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25,360(26)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24,851(7)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25,252(33)</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>29,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25,300(2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24,150(4)</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>27,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>26,422(95)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27,689(8)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>26,520(103)</td>
<td>17,383</td>
<td>30,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metallurgical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26,100(1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26,100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26,100(1)</td>
<td>26,100</td>
<td>26,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,400(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29,400(1)</td>
<td>29,400</td>
<td>29,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metallurgical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: University of Notre Dame, Salary Survey as of 8/31/84.
Fr. David Burrell called the Faculty Senate meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. in room 210-214 of the Center for Continuing Education. Fr. Matthew Miceli gave the opening prayer. The meeting was then turned over to Prof. Timothy O'Meara, Provost of the University, who after a few brief remarks to put everyone at their ease, opened the question and answer session.

Prof. Harvey Bender asked for a review and update on the automation of the University Libraries. O'Meara stated that while the funding was in place, the decision to contract had been held up pending questions of financial viability of vendors, questions of compatibility with other information systems to handle the load when finally installed. O'Meara went on to describe the three systems he was interested in, and the enormous potential of Boolean search. Boolean search could, however, be relatively expensive in terms of CPU time. Prof. Katharina Blackstead reminded O'Meara that more than just the online catalog component of the library system had to be considered; that all components of an integrated system should be uniformly good so as not to drain scarce manpower resources from possible public service applications. O'Meara responded that one of the systems clearly had a superior architectural logic. However, when pressed by Blackstead and Prof. Jean Rosenberg, he declined to set a time by when the decision would be made.

Prof. Bill McDonald asked if the University's main frame was going to be updated. O'Meara said that there were no plans to do so—the work load on the present IBM 3033 will be the determining factor.

Prof. Mario Borelli inquired as to when a new Assistant Provost for Computing would be in place. O'Meara said the size of the University's commitment to computing was the question, and until it had been determined the position would not be filled. He did not think the University should make the kind of commitment that is being made by, for example, certain institutes of technology. Prof. James Powell asked him to explain further. O'Meara said that Notre Dame should not make large commitments of funds to the research and development of campus-wide computer technology. This does not seem appropriate to Notre Dame's priorities in education. But we do have to keep up-to-date as the developments occur.

Capt. John Rohrbough referred to an article in the South Bend Tribune which had noted that minority enrollment in the freshman class had dropped, and asked if the University was going to mount a local or national campaign to recruit high, or relatively high academically qualified minority students. O'Meara answered that the new Director of Admissions was taking a fresh look at the matter. He saw the problem as twofold: lack of financial aid for minority students, and lack of cultural identification with Notre Dame as a Catholic university not located in a large city. Rohrbough spoke of the difficulty the military was having in recruiting for Notre Dame as well. O'Meara said that the University would have to provide more financial aid to offset tuition which he predicted would continue to go up. He would rather see a strong University with strong faculty and programs and the necessary financial aid, than low tuition and a mediocre university.
Changing the subject to the religious character of the University, Borelli told O'Meara about the two faculty fora concerning the problems of reappointment and tenure which the senate had sponsored with junior faculty. While it has been stated that once one is hired religious commitment is no longer a factor, Borelli described the fact that the junior faculty perceive it to be an important factor, and that several have left because of it. Reaffirming the fact that many feel it is important for the University to be Catholic, Borelli asked how these perceptions could be overcome. The Provost said that while he had a problem with the way in which some of the questions were being phrased, he would not attempt to rephrase the questions but rather state what the situation actually is. He recognized that perception is important. But no less important is what is true. These are times of great anxiety for junior faculty, especially in the humanities, not just at Notre Dame but throughout academe. This is compounded by the fact that standards have been rising rapidly at Notre Dame. That is the source of the problem, not the question of religious affiliation. O'Meara said he had never seen religious affiliation play a role at the time of promotion.

Borelli asked how, if the perceptions were then false, they could be eliminated. O'Meara said that by publishing reports of what has been said on occasions such as this, an awareness of the actual situation is created.

Prof. Donald Barrett spoke of the senate's interest in the teaching aspect of faculty development. Apparently several winners of the Madden Award for Excellence in Teaching have left the University. Barrett asked what the faculty and the administration could do to assist faculty to become better teachers. O'Meara felt that the fundamental way to accomplish this was through promotion, salary and good tenure decisions. While there are many definitions as to what makes a good teacher, the Administration does seriously look at teaching abilities. O'Meara reported almost all those who received tenure in the last several years would be numbered among the University's best teachers. Salaries have risen as a reward as well. He stated that he would view favorably the use of leaves to improve or rehabilitate teaching expertise. However, he expressed the opinion that the senate's idea of named associate professorships was inconsistent because excellence should be rewarded instead with a promotion to professor.

Barrett responded asking what might be an administrative response to the problem. Burrell commented it had occurred to him that while the junior faculty were interested in teaching, all they really know about is research, not teaching. Also that there had to be developed a good definition of what teaching actually encompassed. O'Meara described the use of a possible teaching component being added to doctoral programs.

Prof. Leo Despres asked if it was possible that the departments were required to retain the wrong kinds of records: teacher/course evaluations which tend to be popularity contests rather than data on which teachers had really influenced their students. O'Meara said: "We've just jumped from the quantitative to the qualitative." He went on to say: "I'm of the opinion that the old system of TCE's was superior because you could easily read the columns of numbers." Prof. Robert Vacca commented that the TCE was changed because grades were skewed under the old system. O'Meara and several others agreed that the new teacher/course evaluations were difficult to read. Prof. Pamela Falkenberg told the senate about the faculty evaluation system used at the University of Iowa. Graduates
were asked to write their impressions of how faculty had influenced them. O'Meara mentioned that numerical evaluations generally had good correlations with peer evaluations. Vacca added that recent Notre Dame graduate students had been polled with the data going into the redesign of the new TCE's.

Then Vacca said he had not understood O'Meara's answer to Borelli concerning religious affiliation and tenure decisions. He asked if O'Meara would be willing to say in print what the COUP Report had said. O'Meara asked for a copy of the wording. Vacca said he would forward it to him. O'Meara added that he did not believe that COUP specifically addressed the question of religious affiliation at promotion but that he himself had done so. (See addendum)

Compensation became the next topic of discussion as Vacca asked the Provost if market-driven salaries in fields of study such as engineering are having an effect upon salaries in non-market driven areas, or in essence, was Notre Dame developing two salary tracks? O'Meara replied that there was no deliberate decision to develop a two tiered salary schedule although beginning Accounting Faculty for example do indeed start at much higher salaries than in most other disciplines. When average salaries in specific disciplines were compared with other universities, Notre Dame faculty are well paid, which is not to say that there are no discrepancies within departments. The fact that we will have a minimum salary of $26,000 next year for regular teaching-and-research faculty is itself a non-market-driven phenomenon.

Vacca then asked if there was a correlation between years of service and salaries with discrepancies between faculty hired as part of the "old" Notre Dame and faculty hired for the "new," research oriented Notre Dame, and/or research faculty and undergraduate teaching faculty. O'Meara responded that salaries depend upon what the individual's qualifications are rather than upon when that individual was hired. "Generally speaking the reward system is better at Notre Dame for an individual compared to what that individual would be getting elsewhere."

Borelli questioned the Provost about the amount of raises faculty could expect for the coming year. "Less than last year, but more than inflation" was his reply. He then went on to explain the salary levels for the professorial ranks for 1984/85 in detail: $48,000 for professors, $36,400 for associates, and $29,500 for assistants. Rohrbough asked if the salary distribution was bimodal because departmental chairs receive higher salaries.

Prof. Francis Connolly asked: "Regardless of what's in the COUP Report, is the issue of religious affiliation relevant beyond hiring?" O'Meara responded: "I have never seen it so, nor is there such a doctrine." Prof. Joseph Blenkinsopp expressed the opinion that attempts to continue the emphasis on religious affiliation beyond hiring would be difficult, but there is certainly the sense that the junior faculty feel this does indeed affect the outcome of their futures. He asked O'Meara why he would not make a direct statement on the issue. Borelli reinforced this by saying that just because the Provost had never seen religious affiliation as a factor in tenure, the perception did exist. He also attempted to persuade O'Meara to clarify the matter by expressing the views he had just shared with the senate in writing to all the faculty. O'Meara answered: "I
Mr. Douglas Wurth presented the students' impressions that the junior faculty is most concerned with research, not teaching, and also that more students are career oriented. He and others have wondered if Notre Dame was becoming a Midwest Ivy League school, rather than a place of learning which was truly catholic in nature. Teacher course evaluations do not tell the Administration what the students appreciate about their teachers, and class size is a real problem which prohibits quality teaching. He wondered what the Administration might do about these problems. O'Meara responded that the ideal is for the faculty to be strong in both teaching and research because there is a strong relationship between quality in both areas. As for class size, there are some kinds of courses which can support large enrollments and others that cannot. However, the University could have a somewhat better teaching load.

Despres asked if the model research/teaching criteria were applied to the endowed chairs. It appears that they have been given money to do research as well as higher salaries. O'Meara said that he'd like to have them teach more undergraduates including freshmen. Despres responded that many don't even see five or six graduate students yearly. Borelli added that the majority of junior faculty think that teaching does not count for as much as research. O'Meara replied that the faculty who have received tenure in the last several years are good teacher role models. Burrell added that it was important that departmental chairs encourage the senior faculty to teach introductory courses as it is very easy to grant them release time from teaching instead. He suggested a summer institute to encourage the growth of teaching skills in all faculty.

Changing the subject, Blackstead asked if there were any plans for future physical facilities. O'Meara said that a classroom building was his next priority.

Prof. Francis Connolly spoke next about study periods saying that paradoxically the one day study period before exams comes just when students are most attuned to learning. He asked if O'Meara saw this as a difficulty. Rohrbough commented that next year's schedule provides a weekend study period. O'Meara expressed the opinion that these were difficult to schedule as no one wanted to start earlier in the fall. Prof. Paul Conway said that students had told him they did not think the study period was long enough so he was doing a study of other university catalogs to see how long their study periods are. He felt that the serious student would use the time. Wurth agreed with this adding that student government has been in favor of this for several years. O'Meara mentioned that some hold an opposite point of view—that students misuse the time during extra study days. Borelli suggested that the students and faculty who are experts on student life be listened to, rather than rectors who are experts on student social life. O'Meara asked Burrell to send him a note and he would bring it up at the next meeting of the Provost's Advisory Committee.

Returning to the topic of faculty development, Barrett asked O'Meara if an associate professor who does the required teaching, research, and publication, has a chance of being promoted when his department already is half full of full professorships. The Provost said that there was no quota of so many fulls or so many associates. Then Barrett asked if the administration had any thoughts
of offering half salary or buying out contracts since the mandatory retirement age is 70 and so few faculty are retiring. O'Meara responded that several years ago the idea was discussed, but that no difficulties have arisen over the retirement age. Early retirements were occurring on their own. He had a hunch that this would continue. He did not see structured procedures for buyouts as satisfactory.

Conway next asked if the date of the October break had been reevaluated. At this point Burrell used his prerogative as chair and cut off further debate on the university calendar.

Rosenberg asked if the Administration would reconsider its decision of several years ago not to extend the Notre Dame Faculty Children's Tuition Grant Plan to non-teaching-and-research faculty. O'Meara answered negatively. When Rosenberg asked him why, he replied that this was not the time for extending benefits, our recent move to deductible health benefits being a case in point.

Returning again to the topic of tenure and research, Wurth commented that junior faculty is more worried about "publish or perish" rather than teaching. He asked if the better teachers were being weeded out at the time of tenure decisions because they had not published research. O'Meara reiterated his point that the University is achieving the tenure of people who are good in both teaching and research. Prof. Robert Lordi agreed with the Provost's comment.

Prof. Peri Arnold spoke of the relatively conservative view of TIAA's investments, and wondered if the administration had considered a cafeteria of benefits where faculty could choose which investment methods they preferred. O'Meara said he had no personal views on the subject as he did not know all the various plans available. However, he expressed the opinion that in moving to a cafeteria the individual could lose because of economy of scale and so-called adverse selection. Also he felt that in our kind of community the University had an obligation to protect the faculty member who might not want any retirement plan, and then could face the prospect of retiring with no money. Arnold asked if the investigation of various benefit plans could be put on the agenda for the new Director of Personnel. O'Meara agreed saying that a change of plan would ultimately have to go to the University officers for a decision. Despres suggested the establishment of a standing fringe benefit committee to look into the matter. O'Meara replied that while it was primarily the responsibility of the Director of Personnel to look into these matters, the senate could have input. A committee could be established, but certain material would have to be kept confidential.

Burrell thanked O'Meara for answering the senate's questions, and adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

Absent but not excused: Tomoaki Asano, microbiology; Subhash Basu, chemistry; David Dodge, sociology; James Flanigan, C.S.C., art history & design; Philip Gleason, history; David Kirkner, civil engineering; Donald Kommers, government and law; Thomas Kosel, metallurgical engineering; Bill McDonald, finance and business economics; Irwin Press, anthropology; Robert Williamson, Jr., accounting.
Absent and excused: Salvatore Bella, management; Jay Dolan, history; Michael Francis, government and international studies; Teresa Ghilarducci, economics; Alex Hahn, mathematics; Sandra Harmatiuk, freshman year of studies; Michael Katona, civil engineering; Ray Powell, accounting; John Uhran, electrical engineering.

Addendum: Quote from the Faculty Senate Journal, September 12, 1978

O'Meara read from the orientation speech which he presented to the incoming faculty on August 25, in which he dealt with the University structure for advancement; expectations for promotion and tenure (excellent teaching, distinguished research, compatibility with the goals of the institution); the moral and spiritual values which Notre Dame must uphold; and the need to maintain concern regarding the Catholic nature of the institution, as well as improving the representation of women and minorities at the University. Advancement in rank, he continued, would "be based on teaching, research, character and support of the basic goals of the institution, without regard for sex, color or religious affiliation."


Respectfully submitted,

Jean Pec Rosenberg
Fr. David Burrell called the meeting to order at 7:36 p.m. in room 202 of the Center for Continuing Education, and offered the opening prayer. As the agenda was full and there were no amendments, he declared the minutes for the December 3, 1984, meeting approved.

He then gave the floor to Mr. Patrick McCauley who distributed a questionnaire soliciting the faculty's responses with regard to intellectual life on campus. The student government is writing a report, and would like as much input as possible from the faculty.

Next Burrell thanked Prof. Robert Vacca for the work he had done in preparing the compensation report, and turned the meeting over to him to explain the report. Vacca said that the report again singled out women faculty members and library faculty members. Also little had been said about fringe benefits, especially retirement because it was not feasible in this year's report. He explained that the figures on the last few pages probably concealed the fact that Notre Dame has an atypical ratio of associate to full professors when compared to its peers, and that departments with market driven salaries distort the entire salary picture. He reminded the senate that the Provost had agreed that beginning salaries of $40,000 in accounting did skew the averages when this is also the salary of full professors in other departments. Prof. Ray Powell clarified this point by stating that the high figure had been applied in one instance, and was not indicative of all starting salaries in accounting. Prof. Eugene Henry brought out the fact that department chairs, endowed chairs, and deans raised the averages as well. Vacca said that the statistics were bimodel because of this.

Burrell asked what the purpose of the compensation report was. Prof. Mario Borelli responded that it was considered informational, and would be distributed to all faculty and administration, published in the Notre Dame Report, and mailed to all members of the Board of Trustees.

Prof. Donald Barrett questioned the data on retirement benefits as it indicated an approximate 20% increase and TIAA/CREF is directly tied to salaries. Also he wondered about the data on Blue Cross/Blue Shield as there was supposed to be a savings for the University by changing coverage and an increase in payments was also indicated there. Vacca said he did not know, and there was unfortunately probably no way of finding out.

Then Prof. Thomas Kosel asked for a clarification of the ratios of full to associate professors and their salaries as represented in the report. Prof. Irwin Press suggested the addition of a section showing the influence of the deans and endowed chair holders on these averages and ratios. Vacca said it would be difficult and misleading to do so with the information available. However, Prof. James Bellis supported Press. Prof. Leo Despres brought out the point that one couldn't assume that there was a fixed budget dictating the distribution of ranks. He proposed that median salaries would give a better
statistical picture of the actual situation. He commented that there appeared to be a trading off of salaries at lower ranks to inflate salaries at higher ranks. Burrell said there was no hint of that at all.

Prof. Jean Rosenberg asked why the teaching and research faculty were not surveyed so that salary information would be more current and detailed. Vacca replied that it had not been done the previous years and that it would be difficult to do.

Then Prof. Alex Hahn made the comment that the report hints that the University intends to save money by keeping the ratio of full professors to associates low, and he suggested that this section be carefully clarified.

Prof. Sandra Harmatiuk asked why the other non-teaching and research faculty were not polled. Vacca responded that the group was somewhat small and mobile, so that the data was somewhat illusive.

Barrett commended Vacca for the job he had done in preparing the report, and suggested that he prepare a summary for the beginning of the report to catch the interest of the administration.

Prof. Linda-Margaret Hunt suggested a rewording of the definitions used in Table I to describe the various faculties. Vacca agreed to do this.

Burrell thanked Vacca again. Rosenberg moved that the 1983-84 Compensation Report be accepted by the senate with the suggested amendments. Prof. Phillip Helman seconded, and Capt. John Rohrbough called the question. The vote was unanimous for acceptance.

Discussion on the Office of Admissions/Faculty Senate Survey was the next order of business. Prof. Teresa Phelps introduced Mr. Kevin Rooney and Mr. Donald Bishop of the Admissions Office. Bishop recapped the reason the survey had been conducted and the focus of the reports. "Ideal" students had been identified by the faculty, and the second report focuses on their qualities as well as the characteristics of current Notre Dame students and the implications the survey has for the Office of Admissions and the faculty. Rohrbough asked what was the percentage of students who had scored above 1400 on the SAT's. Bishop responded that 3% had done so.

Prof. Joseph Blenkinsopp expressed the opinion that the lack of intellectual curiosity in the students might be a factor of the remarkable homogeneity of the student body. The gender break was a help, but the factors of age and socio-economic background countered this. He asked if there was anything the Office of Admissions could do about the situation. Rooney responded that in recent years Admissions has selected the best students from the pool of applicants. Unfortunately, there has not been great diversity in the pool. Rooney went on to say that to change the nature of the pool would take a much stronger financial aid program. Among private universities those with the most diverse pools of applicants have strong aid programs. Notre Dame has difficulty attracting blacks because there aren't many black Catholics, and with Hispanics
while religion is not a problem, the socio-economic background of one's peers is a problem. As for the intellectual group Rooney said: "There aren't enough true intellectuals aged 17-18 to go around." Admissions is trying to build ties with good college prep schools, but Notre Dame's intellectual reputation must grow also in order to attract better students.

Prof. Irwin Press wondered if the university was using parish priests to the best advantage in trying to target potential applicants. Rooney commented that they were trying to establish insecurity networks. Unfortunately, most priests were still recommending the "old Notre Dame" student type: the nice guy. Bishop added the interesting point that student applicants view a university through what you've rejected. The image of the type of student Notre Dame selects is very important.

Prof. Teresa Ghilarducci then inquired about the percentage of women in the applicant pool. Bishop responded that while women comprise 37% of the pool, they are only 28% of those admitted. Notre Dame has been turning away women who have higher qualifications than some male applicants. Housing seems to be the only constraint. Prof. James Powell asked if the Office of Admissions was considering not having a quota for women's admissions. Rooney replied that there would have to be a change in housing before admissions could be unrestricted.

Barrett and Bishop discussed the correlation between SAT scores, high school curriculum, and the student's intellectual drive. Barrett wondered if the pool was biased toward the quantitative skills because Notre Dame is presently projecting the image of an engineering/science school. Rooney said that letters of intent were divided 30% for Arts and Letters, 28% Engineering, 20% Science, and the rest for Business. Rohrbough suggested that this was a non-factor. Rooney agreed commenting that Engineering had reached a larger size than had been intended, but that technically letters of intent were not binding. There did seem to be a shift from engineering to business.

Mr. Douglas Wurth asked if Rooney was trying to link intellectual curiosity with socio-economic background. He responded no, but that a more heterogeneous mix of backgrounds stimulated intellectual growth. Intellectual curiosity was not just a factor of the drive to achieve, but also of the interest in learning a student had. Prof. Paul Conway inquired as to whether a group of students with lower qualifications was ever admitted in order to test the validity of the criteria. According to Rooney the children of faculty and alumni do often form such a group.

Prof. Harvey Bender wondered if there might also be diversity in homogeneity. He expressed the thought that perhaps the faculty and curriculum homogenized the students as one could do so much with such good students. Rooney replied that curriculum was a factor, and that the faculty could do more to reward diversity and intellectual curiosity. Phelps said that this was a serious charge to the faculty.

Rohrbough asked if the Office of Admissions was watching the geographical distribution of students admitted in order to increase diversity. Rooney responded that Notre Dame is doing better in this regard than universities. Only Harvard, Yale and the service academies are doing better.
Hunt inquired if there was any way the Office had of gauging the success of students for whom English is a second language. She noted that despite the high criteria, faculty have difficulty in communicating with them. Rooney replied that they did try to get an idea of their language skills through their written essay and teacher evaluations. The faculty in Freshman Year of Studies should be of assistance in dealing with language problems.

With regard to more room for women students, Prof. Andre Goddu asked Rooney if he knew of any plans to encourage students to live off campus during their first three years. He said no, and that the university felt it was best for students to live on campus during that time.

Despres said that independent of the SAT and geographic factors, a homogeneous group of students were being admitted. He added his opinion that after the first year on campus those that were different had blended into the group. Bellis commented that the first year on campus is really special because so few students leave Notre Dame. He felt that the policy against students dropping out of school worked against diversity. Some students need a time to mature. Bellis asked what the Office did when a student had good SAT's and a good mind, but not good grades. Rooney replied if there was a general spottness in grades which demonstrated a lack of motivation, and this was noted in the teacher recommendations, then the student would not be admitted. However, if there was real academic involvement in an area, and a personal quality of strength, then the university would probably admit the student. Bishop commented that students are readmitted if they had a legitimate reason for withdrawal. Rooney added the fact that freshmen can ask for postponed admission. He then went on to say that Notre Dame's freshman retention rate compared very favorably with that of the best private schools. This is because our applicants really want to come to Notre Dame as their first or second choice. He asked the senate to cosponsor a biannual meeting for faculty with children of college age at which time the Office of Admissions could give assistance in college selection. This met with the approval of all. Burrell thanked Bishop, Phelps, and Rooney on behalf of the senate for their report.

Then Burrell reported on the meetings which he and Prof. John Uhran had had with the Deans about faculty development. He explained the three pronged approach which the plan encompassed: endowed chairs, a comprehensive program of faculty development, and a procedure for recognition of faculty achievement in university professorships. Burrell circulated sections 8 and 12 of the Academic Articles to serve as a basis for prose style. He proposed that the senate develop by the end of the year both a viable plan for faculty development and the prose to be submitted as amending the Academic Articles.

Uhran commented that the deans were receptive to the ideas for faculty development which he and Burrell had presented to them, and that they were very sensitive to the differences between the colleges and the issue of endowed chairs. Uhran indicated that Barrett's ideas on university professorships had been incorporated into the document the senate was reviewing. Prof. Wilhelm Stoll opened the discussion by questioning the qualifications for the proposed university chairs. He asked if the senate was setting up a new rank, would the
departments do the promotion, and what the relationship would be to the endowed chairs. Burrell answered that this proposal was seen as an opportunity to recognize excellence although it did perhaps set up a three-tiered faculty which might be seen as a negative. He felt the departments were caught in a dilemma as they would like to honor present faculty, but still want to bring in outside scholars for endowed chairs. He described the proposal as "steady state." Stoll commented that the purpose of endowed chairs was to attract donors to give money to Notre Dame which would then use it to bring in good faculty.

Despres said that at first he was ambivalent to the idea, however now he asked why if the faculty members merited recognition, they weren't being considered for the endowed chairs as this would rectify the sense of injustice now. Barrett responded that while there are currently thirty-two endowed chairs, the new Notre Dame campaign could easily come up with the funding for one hundred. He felt now was the time to submit a proposal to garner funds for faculty recognition. He described the criteria for selection and naming of temporary endowed professorships which could be funded out of the endowment interest. It was his idea that Hesburgh chairs would attract contributions. Prof. Jay Dolan commented that he felt it was not a good idea to have temporary chairs, and that the amount was too low for much prestige. Uhran stressed the point that the idea of university professorships was not unique as other universities had them. Dolan responded that he did like the idea behind the proposal, but still did not think the amount involved as high enough.

Then Burrell brought up the fact that the deans would prefer not to have temporary university professorships. The name Hesburgh was proposed as a way around the problem of obtaining funds and a positive recognition of a Notre Dame honoree, rather than the donor. Both Bellis and Press disagreed with the proposal on the grounds that it did set up another faculty rank.

Changing the subject Hunt asked for clarification. She wanted to know how faculty could be rewarded for being excellent teachers, and then be given funding to enhance research and travel which would take them away from teaching. Prof. Peri Arnold felt that the senate should be worried about faculty development and research rather than chairs. He suggested perhaps a lessening of teaching loads so that more time could be devoted to research. He proposed the preceptorship idea as he felt the opportunity for development and the recognition of a job well done should come during one's career rather than near its end in the manner of a payoff. Burrell disagreed with the use of the term payoff as he had intended the proposal to further faculty development.

Uhran remarked that the proposal specifically left the manner in which the recognition was given in the hands of individual departments, and no specific manner of recognition was precluded. Press said that he felt rewards were fine, but he objected to the proposal. Uhran responded that the manner of granting these rewards still had to be provided, and the senate still did not have any concrete proposals.
Commenting that the criticism had been helpful, Burrell ended the meeting at 9:45 p.m.

Absent but not excused: Tomoaki Asano, microbiology; Subhash Basu, chemistry; Rudolph Bottei, chemistry; Francis Connolly, mathematics; James Flanigan, C.S.C., art history and design; Michael Francis, government and international studies; Donald Kommers, government and law; John Lucey, aerospace/mechanical engineering; Matthew Miceli, C.S.C., theology.

Absent and excused: Salvatore Bella, management; James Danehy, emeritus; David Dodge, sociology; John FitzGerald, emeritus; Robert Lordi, English.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Pec Rosenberg
Fr. David Burrell called the Faculty Senate meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. in room 202 of the Center for Continuing Education, and offered the opening prayer. There were minor changes to the minutes for both the January 17 and February 5 meetings. Prof. Katharina Blackstead moved that the minutes be accepted with these amendments. Prof. Mario Borelli seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Burrell distributed ballots for the senate's nomination of candidates to the Academic and Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. He then thanked Prof. Robert Vacca for the work he had done on the Compensation Report. The Report will be an appendix to the minutes of the February 5 meeting. He spoke of the interview he had with a candidate for the position of Director of Personnel as he acted a monitor to insure the faculty that the person chosen would be someone who could work with faculty. And Burrell reminded the senate about the charity ball for Ethiopian relief.

The floor was given to Mr. Patrick McCauley who spoke about the responses to the student government questionnaire which had been distributed at the last meeting. Although there were few responses, these were helpful in completing the student addendum to the curriculum report which will be discussed at the next Academic Council meeting.

Burrell then turned the meeting over to Mr. Kevin Rooney and Mr. Donald Bishop of the Admissions Office for a discussion on the implications for faculty which were raised by their report on the ideal student at the last senate meeting. Both expressed the opinion that once students who possess the qualities of intellectual curiosity and creativity have matriculated, they would like to see them nurtured in their academic life. There are the formal methods such as a stimulating curriculum, grading policies, good teaching which the faculty can employ as well as informal methods such as the Hall Fellows Program in the residence halls. Integration of academics into the general life of students will make Notre Dame more attractive to the type of students we want.

Bishop went on to say that perhaps as Prof. Harvey Bender had said at the February meeting, the faculty were dulling the intellectual curiosity of students by not stimulating them. There are a certain proportion of students who are isolated, but would respond to an opportunity to nurture their intellectual development. He felt that the "charged" student could be targeted for the faculty by the Admissions Office, and faculty could then concentrate efforts in developing these students. He said that college students lack the perspective that they should become better learners. He suggested that better counseling as to graduate schooling could be done by the faculty. Bishop stated that the Admissions Office wanted to stay involved with the faculty to insure a heterogeneous student body.

Prof. James Powell asked if he had a sense of the numbers of students who could be developed, and Bishop answered that at least half would respond to outside classroom contact with faculty. Powell felt that this was a significant number, and that every effort should be made to develop these students. Prof. Teresa Phelps said that this was exactly what the students have been actively pursuing.
Burrell restated the proposal that the Admissions Office identify students who are interested in certain fields, and then the senate could approach the Deans with this information so that groups of faculty could be found who would set up discussion groups outside the hall structure. Bishop felt that the hall basis was useful.

Then Burrell asked Rooney what effect the honors program had on admissions. He said that as the selection to the program was made during the summer it was not helpful in recruiting except if an honors student went back to his high school to help recruit. However, the socialization process these students had experience was significantly different. They were found to be stimulated by their close identity with each other rather than becoming tired of each other and Notre Dame.

Rooney then asked Bender if he felt the discussion had responded to the point he had made at the last meeting. Bender said that he felt the later discussion on the junior faculty would also prove helpful as he felt the fundamental problem was the role of teaching at the university. He went on to describe the Fellows Program at Yale where it was deemed a super honor to be appointed. Bishop asked if he meant that a fellows program gained in stature because it was seen as being worthwhile. Bender agreed.

Fr. Matthew Miceli expressed the opinion that it would be problematical to set up a program like Yale's because of the lack of facilities in the dorms. Bishop commented that it was fortunate that Mr. John Goldrick was both interested in this program and did oversee student housing as well. Powell differed with Miceli stating that the key element in the program of student development was faculty involvement, not where to meet. Miceli disagreed, expressing the opinion that students would only leave their rooms if they knew the discussion was going to be very exciting as the average student would not know what to expect and would be hesitant to make much effort.

Blackstead proposed as a model meetings which Dartmouth faculty had in their homes with students; these were subsidized by the college. Bishop commented that this could tie in with department involvement. Phelps ended the discussion by thanking everyone for their ideas and requesting that any others be sent to her.

Burrell then reported the results of the election. As there were ties, the following eight had been selected as candidates to Academic and Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees (AFACBT): Harvey Bender, Katharina Blackstead, Mario Borelli, Paul Conway, Leo Despres, Linda Hudgins, Jean Pec Rosenberg, and Donald Sporleder.

The draft of the Junior Faculty Report was then opened for discussion. Prof. Robert Vacca presented the background and basis for the report: comments made at the faculty fora for junior faculty and those gathered from the department chairs in response to the issues raised. Unfortunately the responses from department chairs have been erratically reported, but the report is still too long. He expects to arrive at an eight page report which will be sent back to the junior faculty and department chairs for further comment. He will then draw up a final report incorporating these responses for the May senate meeting. He pointed out the following: 1) there has been a lack of discussion at the university about the transition from an undergraduate teaching college to a research
university. "Our report will be the opening statement of this discussion.";
2) the draft has a negative bias in that we were looking for problems and that
over-condensation contributed to the negative style; 3) the draft's salient
points were the Provost's policy of a single style in which each member was
a successful researcher and teacher, research standards, and the lack of a
definition of what constituted good teaching; and 4) that the Administration
sets the pace and standards for seemingly weaker departments which creates
friction and a lack of candor as viewed by junior faculty.

Prof. Joseph Blenkinsopp expressed his opinion that part of the problem was the
view of junior faculty that if they worked through the various procedures, then
they would be rewarded with tenure. He pointed out the fact that as the Princeton
Report had stated, tenure was a competition. Vacca disagreed saying that this
varied from department to department and college to college.

Borelli summarized his views as: 1) junior faculty did not need to have good
research defined for them, and 2) there was a definite need to define good
teaching or else at least affirm what model of teaching was acceptable. He
stressed the point that there must be an open discussion of teaching models,
that this might not preclude the Provost's single faculty concept, and that we
had to arrive at some definition of what constitutes good teaching.

Prof. Abraham Goetz said that while we should not be afraid of definitions, so
many of the great teachers really don't seem to fit into any definition. Burrell
suggested the term description be used rather than definition.

Prof. Wilhelm Stoll said that Notre Dame shouldn't be compared to Princeton or
Stanford in that their junior faculty expect to move on. In turn Notre Dame
hires their junior faculty. He also expressed the opinion that the university
had to make up its mind as to what it did expect of the junior faculty, but that
it would not be fair to change standards for these faculty after they had been
hired under a different set. It is difficult to expect junior faculty to be
superhuman and balance both teaching and research.

Prof. Francis Connolly said that he was troubled by the draft in that he felt
no sense of the long tradition of research and teaching which some departments
do successfully combine. Vacca agreed blaming this on the previously mentioned
negative bias. Connolly stressed how negative he felt the report was, and said
he objected to the methodology the draft employed. The senate's report should
be reacting to the Administration's deployment of resources: how much to research
and how much to teaching. There has been no attempt to evaluate this deployment
because one would have to explain why it was valid. He asked Vacca to reconsider
the methodology.

Prof. Andre Goddu was sympathetic with Connolly's views, and suggested that some
emphasis be made as to whether it was the faculty who came to the conclusion that
the deployment was good, or whether it was imposed upon them by the Administration.
He asked if this had ever been discussed by the faculty.

Borelli spoke again about his two models: the friendly, involved teacher and
the effective communicator of knowledge. He had heard comments in some depart-
ments that the university needs to attract better students who can learn from
the effective communicators. Vacca commented that this tied in well with the
previous discussion on student intellectual development and faculty involvement.
Burrell said that as the market changes, we are attracting faculty who have drives to teach and do research. He agreed with Connolly on the methodology problem, and with Stoll on not changing the rules without full explanation.

Stoll supported the unity of teaching and research, and felt that they must be defined in each department with the Administration's agreement or understanding of departmental differences. Then the junior faculty would be assured of the "rules."

Then Vacca took back the floor to give more background data. He described the promotional brochure which the Admissions Office distributes telling prospective parents that the faculty spend most of their time teaching and in contact with students. He contrasted this to the emphasis departments and the Administration are placing upon research. He reminded the senate that at the fora the junior faculty said that they did not know whom they were to please and how they were to do so. He urged candor.

Blenkinsopp felt that there was a need to abbreviate the report, that the university would not change its favorable view of research, and that we had to arrive at proposals to lower the level of anxiety for the junior faculty. He proposed preceptorships to help teaching and leaves to foster research.

Prof. William McGlinn expressed the opinion that there was now an emphasis on research over teaching. The university is asking some professors to teach different courses than before because tenure track professors are doing research.

Prof. Linda-Margaret Hunt remarked that class size is a factor. The single faculty concept could work with smaller classes as in large classes it is impossible to deal with all the students.

Stoll stated that he subscribed to the idea of Notre Dame being a research university, but he was not sure that the Administration really knows what it is demanding of the faculty. To carry out the single faculty concept the faculty needs assistance. It is impossible for faculty to deal with the three functions American schools seem to have: remedial education, general education, and professional education. A university needs three separate faculty to teach at the three levels.

Then Borelli asked if we wanted experts to teach the basics to freshmen, and if we didn't, then Notre Dame's image would have to change, or we would have fewer students to teach.

Burrell hoped there might be a chance for further discussion with the junior faculty, and he thanked Vacca for his work on the draft report. As there was no new business, Prof. Robert Lordi moved that the meeting be adjourned. Prof. Jean Pec Rosenberg seconded, and the meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Absent but not excused: Tomoaki Asano, microbiology; Subhash Basu, chemistry; Leo Despres, anthropology; David Dodge, sociology; Jay Dolan, history; James Flanigan, C.S.C., art history & design; John FitzGerald, emeritus; Teresa Ghilarducci, economics; Philip Gleason, history; Thomas Kosel, metallurgical engineering; John Lucey, aerospace/mechanical engineering; Irwin Press, anthropolog...
Absent and excused: Peri Arnold, government and international studies; Donald Barrett, sociology; James Bellis, anthropology; Rudolph Bottei, chemistry; James Danehy, emeritus; Pamela Falkenberg, COTH; Michael Francis, government and international studies; Alex Hahn, mathematics; Sandra Harmatruk, freshman year of studies; Eugene Henry, electrical engineering; Ray Powell, accounting; John Rohrbough, naval science; William Slowey, accounting; Robert Williamson, Jr., accounting.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Pec Rosenberg
The Faculty Senate meeting was called to order at 7:32 p.m. in room 202 of the Center for Continuing Education by Fr. David Burrell, who then gave the opening prayer. Burrell asked if there were any changes to the minutes. There being none the minutes were approved.

Burrell then introduced Mr. Pat Collins, Mr. Dan Harris, and Fr. David Porterfield who asked for the senate's support of the ND/SMC Charity Ball: a Family Response to the Crisis in Ethiopia, to be held April 20, 1985. Prof. Mario Borelli made a motion that the senate approves of the idea of the charity ball as a fund-raising event for the starving Ethiopians, and commends the students group for organizing it. Prof. Harvey Bender seconded, and it was unanimously approved.

Burrell announced that at the next meeting of the senate elections would be held for senate officers. He asked for volunteers to contact members of the current executive committee. Continuing with his chairman's report, Burrell commented on the beginning of the new foreign study program in Cairo and Jerusalem. As the senate had shown an interest in foreign study last year, he felt it was interesting to note that this program would set a new pattern for the extension of university involvement in foreign study. He then went on to apologize to the senate for giving the impression that he had had senate approval of his views on the ROTC curriculum question. He had been concerned that it had not been included on the circulated agenda to Academic Council members, and had a letter, unfortunately on Faculty Senate stationery, sent out appraising them of this and expressing his personal views.

Next on the agenda was the Report on Faculty Development. Burrell and Prof. John Uhran had taken the comments made at the senate's February meeting, and had the draft in hand for further discussion. Burrell explained that this was the senate's way of keeping alive the discussion of sabbaticals, which was conceptually and politically a problem with the Administration, under the rubric of faculty development. Prof. Paul Conway announced that this idea was also to be discussed at the Academic and Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees upcoming meeting.

Prof. Robert Lordi asked if setting up university professorships meant that as a reward higher salaries would result. Uhran answered that he felt the issue had been diplomatically side-stepped as the money issue was left to later discussion after the principle of university professorships itself was approved. Lordi said he felt this might compound a two tiered faculty into three tiers. Burrell noted that the phrase "modest discretionary fund" would not result in much differentiation. He also reminded the senate of Prof. James Bellis' comment by paraphrasing: "If you have difficulty between strata, you add a few more."

Conway suggested that parliamentary procedure required that a motion to accept the report be made, and he did so. Borelli seconded it, and further discussion continued. Prof. Leo Despres expressed his opinion that the previous difficulties with strata had been resolved. Borelli said that he found it to be well thought out and that he was in agreement with the side-stepping of money issues in favor of a discussion of principles.
At this point Prof. Jay Dolan disagreed saying he found the writing to be verbose. Burrell suggested that he take on the task of shortening the report, and Dolan agreed. He commented further that he did not see anything unique or striking in the suggestions for faculty development. Borelli disagreed feeling that if anything were said too sharply, then the tone and not the content would be judged negatively by the Administration. A low key document with even a little repetition would be better received. Despres was not sure if the report could be collectively edited. He felt that the phrasing was improved, more positive in stating that university professorships were a reward for good work. Burrell commented that he would have liked the report to be more direct, but that the committee had tried to present a consensus view. That it was a consensus did not, however, mean that the report was not asking for quite a lot. It asks for a position of positive commitment to faculty development.

Prof. Donald Barrett asked for clarification about the wording with regard to endowed chairs and their relationship to faculty development. Both Uhran and Burrell said that endowed chairs were not to be the major focus of a report on faculty development. Barrett then asked what would be the fora for discussion of the principles of the report as it would die in the Academic Council. Uhran responded that three proposals would go to the Academic Council for discussion and vote, but that much of the report would go to the colleges as it was up to the Deans and departments to adapt the ideas to their own situations. Barrett felt that some momentum was needed. Burrell reminded the senate that the Faculty Senate Chair did have the right of agenda and would bring the report up at next year's Academic Council. Uhran also said that the six faculty members on the Board of Trustees Committee on Faculty and Administrative Affairs would bring it up for further discussion. Although Barrett felt that this committee did not involve itself with specific proposals, Uhran said they did indeed pressure the Administration when necessary.

Prof. Joseph Blenkinsopp wanted the report's style sharpened, and questioned the intent of the word "colleagues" suggesting that perhaps the Administration might apply university professorships to the holders of endowed chairs. He wanted it to be modified by the phrase "university colleagues" or "Notre Dame colleagues." Borelli remarked that while he agreed with the change of phrasing, he would prefer to give the Academic Council the opportunity to sharpen the report. Despres suggested that the section of university professorships could be strengthened by the idea that additional support would separate them from the usual reward system and raise them to a more distinguished level. Then Bender suggested that wording in a previous section clarified the situation and should be moved here. Despres agreed to the inclusion of wording to that effect, but wanted to insure that the reward was not thought of as an ordinary type of reward.

Prof. Linda-Margaret Hunt expressed the opinion that the section still did not preclude university professorships from being awarded to endowed chairs. She suggested the phrase "to recognize colleagues at Notre Dame." Burrell commented that the committee had tried to push for the concept of subsidiarity. Conway then called the question given the amendments to the section on university professorships. Prof. Robert Vacca suggested that there be a clarification with the
Academic Articles as two of the sections are institutional policy matters, and another is actually a suggestion of attitude which department chairs and/or deans ought to have. Specifically section 4.1 does not call for a precise definition of policy and the Administration could say that it is already being considered. Borelli suggested that this be taken into consideration in the revision. The motion was then further amended, and passed with one vote against, and two abstentions.

Burrell thanked everyone for their contributions. Then Borelli made a motion that next year's senate chair be directed to bring the report to the Academic Council. Barrett seconded this, and the motion passed unanimously.

Burrell introduced Mr. Robert Miller, Director of the University Libraries to the senate. Miller reported on the status of the University Libraries and the developments of the last five years. He cautioned against reading too much into the Association of Research Libraries' statistics in which Notre Dame was near to the bottom in all rankings but collection size, where we stand 70th out of 104. He was of the opinion that the differences between the various parent institutions make the ARL statistics less valuable for comparisons. He spoke of the growth in the budget for collection development primarily and of the systematic analysis which must be done along with it. The approval programs have assisted in the growth of size and quality of the Libraries' collections as have the gifts which are unfortunately a problem in that there is not enough staff and money to process them. Staffing is a major concern as it is stretched now to cover current needs. Any expansion of programs, services, acquisitions, cataloging or binding will require additional funds for staff at all levels. Miller considered this the Libraries' first priority.

Although reference service to faculty and students has improved, Miller said that orientation and bibliographic instruction programs cannot be increased unless additional staff and space are acquired. Database searching has grown considerably, and consideration will have to be given as to how database services will be funded. Interlibrary loan volume has increased and delays have decreased somewhat. Photocopy service will be improved as well. The Exhibits Committee has been reorganized to be more responsive to input from what is happening throughout the University.

Next Miller spoke of the Libraries' automation project. In 1982 Ryan gave enough money for the Libraries to develop a "state of the art" automated system. By early 1984 based on responses to the RFP the Libraries were ready to sign a contract. The university-wide committee on computing policy as well as the selected company's fiscal position have delayed this however. Miller was hopeful that soon a positive decision would be made. While these negotiations were going on, over 80% of the monographs have been converted to machine readable form, and currently received serials are being converted as well. According to Miller if all goes well, the hardware will be installed this summer with pilot public access by spring 1986 and pilot circulation in fall 1986. Full-scale circulation would then be available in early 1987.

Miller then spoke of the problems of preservation where there has been some increased funding for binding and staff. However, faced with rapidly deteriorating
books more needs to be done. Unfortunately the Libraries have been unable to get the physical plant staff to recognize the need for filters over the lights and for stable temperature and humidity. This is also a problem for the Snite Museum.

Miller described the Libraries' biggest asset as its faculty and staff. Saying that it was both highly frustrated and educated, he spoke of the recent Libraries Planning Day at which the need for training and development activities had been voiced. Faculty development is a problem in that funding sources available to teaching and research faculty are not available to library faculty, and yet their promotion and reappointment is dependent upon research. Notre Dame also has one of the smaller staffs for its collection size which leads to frustration in trying to accomplish all its desired service goals.

In closing, Miller spoke of the changes which are coming to the Law Library as they are also automating, and of the development of the Friends of the Library. The improvements which have come about are due to the support of the Provost, the Faculty Committee on University Libraries, the teaching and research faculty, and the library faculty.

Conway, Bender, and Miller spoke of the fund drive for $10 million, and of the need to have unrestricted funds. Dolan asked if there was any way the senate could pass a resolution to help persuade the Administration to investigate the environmental control problem. Miller responded that he would work out a possible resolution with the library faculty representatives.

Barrett asked if the approval plans had been evaluated. Responding affirmatively Miller said that there were still a few unadjusted areas in the American Plan. Prof. Thomas Kosel inquired as to what the approval plan had done to the total book budget. According to Miller the American and German plans have rearranged the structure of the budget allocations. Bender brought out the point that the approval plans have saved money by reducing retrospective buying costs. Prof. Kathy Blackstead said that staff costs were saved as well. Kosel asked if it might be possible to raise the amount which could be spent per book through the approval plans, and if the publisher's list could be expanded. Miller responded that both would substantially raise the cost of the plans; however, publishers could be added to the list. Kosel said there was difficulty with the cost of conference proceedings and the current maximum limit. Miller said that if a department wanted to give up their allocations to do so, the Libraries would do so. Kosel asked if it might be possible for faculty who attend the conferences to purchase their proceedings for the Libraries at lower costs. Miller said he would consider this plan if it could be regularized. Barrett asked what bibliographers might be added to the library faculty. Miller said he was considering either one in the social sciences or in Latin American studies.

After thanking Miller, Burrell turned the meeting over to Barrett who reported on the Faculty Senate Committee on Benefits. About 5% of Notre Dame members signed with Maxicare, the HMO, and less than that signed for the FlexPlan, which compares to the old plan. The Benefits Office in Personnel has done an excellent job, and the administration of the plans has been accurate and prompt. The Blue Cross/
Blue Shield Cost Guard Program had been explained to the Committee. They are just beginning an investigation of the retirement contributions paid by the University to TIAA/CREF as well as the interest/dividends and "payout" of retirement benefits by TIAA/CREF. The Committee has also developed a proposal that the University provide a $60 scholarship to all faculty and administrators, aged 60 and over, to take the Forever Learning Institute's pre-retirement training course. They have also sent out a questionnaire designed to study the Quality of Life of Notre Dame Faculty, their Wives and Widows.

Barrett then announced that the Committee had been able to secure the VIP List of all physicians in Indiana who have agreed not to charge more than the standard Blue Cross/Blue Shield rates for specific procedures. The list is in the Faculty Senate Office and may be consulted any weekday from 9 a.m. until noon.

Various suggestions as to how to disseminate the list were discussed from xeroxing the entire list to sending copies of notification to each faculty and staff member. Capt. John Rohrbough pointed out the cost of such mailings, the senate agreed that the announcement of the availability of the VIP list in the Notre Dame Report would be enough.

While Barrett was giving his report the senate voted for nominations to the Judicial Review Board, the Campus Life Council and the Board of Traffic and Parking Appeals. There being no other business, Bender moved that the meeting be adjourned. Borelli seconded, and as the motion was unanimously passed the meeting adjourned at 9:27 p.m.

Absent but not excused: Gerald Arnold, physics; Peri Arnold, government and international studies; Tomoaki Asano, microbiology; Subhash Basu, chemistry; James Bellis, anthropology; James Flanigan, C.S.C., art history and design; Teresa Ghilarducci, economics; Andre Goddu, program of liberal studies; David Kirkner, civil engineering; Bill McDonald, finance and business economics; William McGlinn, physics; William Slowey, accounting.

Absent and excused: Salvatore Bella, management; Rudolph Bottei, chemistry; James Danehy, emeritus; David Dodge, sociology; Eugene Henry, electrical engineering; Teresa Phelps, law; Ray Powell, accounting; Irwin Press, anthropology; Robert Williamson, Jr., accounting.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Pec Rosenberg
Fr. David Burrell called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. in room 202 of the Center for Continuing Education. After leading the opening prayer, he thanked everyone for contributing to a productive year for the senate. He proceeded to introduce the newly elected senate members and then the senators whose terms had expired.

The next order of business was the approval of the minutes from the April meeting. There were several corrections to the list of absentees, and Prof. Thomas Kosel had several amendments to make to his exchange with Mr. Robert Miller. After noting these changes, Burrell suggested the minutes be approved as amended.

Burrell introduced Mr. Roger Mullins, the new Personnel Director, who told the senate of his background in personnel work in private industry and hospitals. Prof. Teresa Ghilarducci asked if the hospital with which Mullins had worked had unionized. He replied that there had been several unsuccessful unionization attempts. He said: "Any employer can function without a union, and do it in a positive manner." Prof. Katharina Blackstead asked if he had any plans to upgrade both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards for the university staff. Mullins felt that money itself was not the answer to any problems. He would work on a three year plan, and he expected to be public about his plan and ideas for changes and improvements. Prof. Mario Borelli spoke of how difficult it had been to get any information from the Office of Personnel. Mullins said he would try to keep open channels with the faculty. It is unfortunate that personnel management tends to hide behind laws, but he would do what he could to facilitate relationships between the administration, faculty, and staff. Mullins then said that it was his style to be direct and brief in his dealings with people. This was the manner in which he had dealt with doctors, and he felt it would be successful with faculty as well. Burrell thanked Mullins for taking the time to speak with the senate. Borelli asked for a public vote of thanks to Burrell for asking Mullins to come to the meeting.

Next Prof. Robert Vacca presented the report on The Junior Faculty at Notre Dame. He asked whether the four recommendations were substantial enough to achieve satisfactory results: 1) Committee on Teaching - would this be just cosmetic, or would subjects like teaching loads be investigated? Also would interpretation of the single faculty policy and questions raised in the report by both the senate and the students be addressed in such a committee? Vacca felt this committee would have quite a substantial agenda. 2) The letter idea suggested itself as this had come up at earlier meetings, and faculty have asked for such a clarification. 3 & 4) While this would mean more meetings, it would increase communications between faculty and administration. A candid set of meetings off the record would be helpful. College Council meetings on research expectations and support would be beneficial to jr. faculty.

Capt. John Rohrbough asked if the College of Law was included in the third recommendation. Vacca replied that as a School it
would not be. Prof. Joseph Blenkinsopp felt it was unlikely that the Provost would issue a letter outlining administration policy on religious and moral considerations as they affect tenure and reappointment. He pointed out a discrepancy in the report and asked that the issue be more clearly stated. Burrell responded that if there was any difficulty in clarity it was a problem of perception. Prof. Pamela Falkenberg wondered if the issue needed to be mentioned at all. Prof. Francis Connolly felt it would be good to get such a statement, but did not think we would. Prof. Barrett said the meeting on research would be an extraordinary type of meeting with jr. and not sr. faculty invited. Borelli proposed that it be made open to all faculty. Vacca agreed.

Burrell expressed the opinion that this dovetailed with the senate’s work on faculty development. Borelli asked for further clarification on this meeting. Burrell said this would be an opening of the College Council.

Falkenberg said that she liked the report, and asked that the questions mentioned on pg. 9 be included in the recommendations. Burrell asked what the response had been to it. Vacca replied that there had been some two dozen responses from jr. faculty, the Provost’s Advisory Committee, and Deans, and these had been reflected in the changes to the report.

Ghilarducci commented that the three year renewal decision appeared to be the most important at Notre Dame no matter what the administration said about it. She suggested that the criteria for this renewal be reviewed. Prof. Michael Francis agreed saying however, that the view on renewal changed each year. He felt that standards should be clearly stated. Burrell said that the criteria for tenure were stated in the Faculty Manual, but none were for renewal. He suggested including a recommendation that criteria for renewal be clarified and included in the Academic Manual. Borelli agreed as this is an important matter with the jr faculty. Prof. Andre Goddu felt it was clearly spelled out, however there must be a consensus between jr faculty. Several other senators expressed the opinion that college and departmental differences would make these criteria difficult to express.

Rohrbough asked those who were departmental chairs and ex-chairs to comment. It was Vacca’s opinion that the chairs were flexible, and that this would aid the jr faculty. Francis said that the Deans changed their instructions from year to year as to how the criteria would be applied. According to Prof. Philip Gleason the three year renewal was made more important due to pressure from above. There is no college committee of review which could allay the high degree of mistrust. He asked if an actual peer review committee had ever been proposed. Burrell said that the Provost’s Advisory Committee was not analogous to this. He then suggested that the Provost appoint a selected group of faculty to consider the problem of mistrust.

Prof. Paul Conway felt there must be miscommunication between the Deans and departmental chairs. He said that this year’s signal was to look ahead for tenure at the three year renewal. He was in favor of a meeting between the Provost, Deans, and departmental chairs. Ghilarducci suggested that the three year
renewal was becoming more of a termination decision, and if so, then it should be more formalized. Prof. Alex Hahn suggested that such a document of criteria could be beneficial, but would be probably very stiff and difficult to apply. Vacca pointed out the fact that the third recommendation did speak to that.

Borelli commented on the administration’s attitude toward teaching which he characterized as somehow with good people good teaching will evolve if you have good research. He did not agree with this attitude, nor with the attitude of some jr faculty that one did not have to bother with teaching. Vacca felt that these sentiments were included in the report, and he asked for a summation as to where the senate now stood with regard to the report.

Burrell suggested that the criteria on renewal be withheld, and said he was pleased with the way the discussions had gone throughout the year enabling the committee to improve the report. Borelli suggested that each recommendation be voted on separately. The first recommendation called for the Provost to appoint a University Committee on Teaching, and Borelli commented that the Provost would have to agree to this in the first place. Prof. Jean Pec Rosenberg proposed that the committee could be an elected committee from the faculty. Conway refined this to half elected and half appointed. Burrell suggested that the Academic Council select the committee. Blackstead wanted to include the p. 9 questions for the committee to address. Vacca felt that they would read the report. Barrett expressed the opinion that the Faculty Senate, and not the Academic Council should appoint the committee. Burrell said he felt that involving the Academic Council was the way to insure that the report would be taken up by the council. The vote taken was unanimously in favor of having the Academic Council appoint the committee.

Taking up the third recommendation next Prof. Bill McDonald wanted to make the jr faculty responsible for calling a meeting with the Deans. Prof. John Yoder suggested alternative wording: The senate recommends annual meetings between deans and jr faculty for candid and informal discussion. Borelli countered with: The senate recommends that annual meetings be established between jr faculty and deans. Vacca defended his wording. The three versions were voted upon with Borelli's wording passing.

The fourth recommendation called for annual meetings to discuss research within the colleges. Various periodicities were discussed with McDonald suggesting the use of the less specific word periodic. All present approved the wording of the original report.

Vacca commented that the second recommendation calling for the Provost to clarify the administration's policy on religion and morals wrote itself. Blenkinsopp felt it was improbable that the Provost would write such a document. Rohrbough commented that while the PACE Report spoke about religion, it did not speak to moral issues. Goddu agreed that the Provost was under no obligation to respond to our request, and furthermore we could get more than we bargained for if he did respond. A lengthy discussion ensued with both sides of the moral and religious issues being defended. Blenkinsopp recommended that the words
"...and moral" be dropped. There was only one opposing vote to this recommendation's rewording.

Conway asked what would now happen to the report. Burrell requested that the senate vote on the entire report. The results were twenty-five in favor, and four against. Burrell said the report would be forwarded to the Provost and appended to the senate's minutes in the Notre Dame Report. (See Appendix 1.) Burrell then thanked Vacca and the committee for their hard work.

Rohrbough then gave the treasurer's report. As of April 1 the senate was within its $4500 budget for the year.

As time was short, Barrett asked everyone to read the two handouts from the Benefits Committee. (See Appendix 2 & 3) He hoped the senate would hold them for discussion at the first meeting in the fall. Burrell commented that the Benefits Committee was one of the year's most significant achievements.

Next Burrell presented his report. He felt that the senate had met its first two goals in the final reports on the jr faculty and on faculty development. The third goal of exploring the relationships between students and faculty could be taken up by next year's senate. It was his opinion that everyone should sign up for a committee, and that reports should be discussed by the senate as a whole.

He then commented that he and Prof. John Uhran had discussed the Faculty Development Report (see Appendix 5) with Provost who suggested that the College Councils discuss the recommendations first. The Board of Trustees' Committee on Faculty Affairs was interested in our recommendations as well. While student affairs questions were still in need of attention, Burrell suggested that the Notre Dame Credit Union and the University's investments and accountability to the community were possible topics for investigation in the fall. He then thanked the Executive Committee and the senate for all their hard work during the year.

Rohrbough presented the following resolution which Prof. Harvey Bender seconded: Resolved: The Faculty Senate membership commends and thanks Fr. David Burrell for his leadership and inspiration as its chairman during the 1984-85 academic year. This was unanimously approved.

Next Burrell presented the slate of officers which the Executive Committee had drawn up for the 1985-86 academic year: John Yoder, chair; Jean Pec Rosenberg, vice-chair; Sandra Harmatiuk, student affairs; Thomas Kosel, administrative affairs; Francis Connolly, faculty affairs; John Rohrbough, treasurer; and Joseph Blenkinsopp and Bill McDonald, secretary. Conway moved that the slate be adopted, and Borelli seconded. All were unanimously elected.

Rosenberg moved that the meeting be adjourned. Prof. David Dodge seconded, and as the motion was unanimously passed the meeting was adjourned at 9:28 p.m.

Absent but not excused: Peri Arnold, government & int'l studies; Tomoaki Asano, microbiology; Subhash Basu, chemistry; Salvatore Bella, management; James Bellis, anthropology; James Danehy, emeritus; Leo Despres, anthropology; Jay Dolan, history; James Flanigan, C.S.C., art history & design; Phillip Helman, radiation lab; Michael Katona, civil engineering; David Kirkner,
civil engineering; James Powell, director, graduate admissions; Irwin Press, anthropology; William Slowey, accountancy.

Absent and excused: Eugene Henry, electrical engineering; Linda-Margaret Hunt, biology; Robert Lordi, english; Matthew Miceli, C.S.C., theology; Teresa Phelps, law; John Uhran, electrical engineering.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Pec Rosenberg