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Prof. Jean Pec, Chair of the Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 7:34 p.m. and offered the prayer. As new members were present, she asked members to begin the meeting by introducing themselves. Pec then introduced Rev. Edward A. Malloy, C.S.C., the guest speaker, and announced that the business meeting would be conducted after Malloy's talk. Pec added that Malloy's next visit to the Faculty Senate as President of Notre Dame, usually scheduled in October, would be held at a mutually convenient time later in the academic year to give Malloy a chance to settle into his new job.

Before taking questions from members, Malloy made a brief statement to the Senate. Malloy began by commenting on his continuing desire to meet and interact with the faculty, and summarized his meetings with departmental faculties, college councils, centers, institutes, and laboratories. Despite the variety of his experiences at Notre Dame, Malloy commented on the continuing difficulty of sufficiently enlarging his perspective in order to grasp the big picture. As the result of his meetings with departmental faculties in which they detailed their dreams and hopes for Notre Dame, Malloy has heard plans that would cost about three billion dollars. Some of these proposals were of general concern, while others were particular concerns that were unknown to the rest of the University.

Malloy continued by commenting that he has enjoyed his work as a scholar, teacher, and administrator at Notre Dame, as well as his work in the dormitories, liturgical leadership and counseling. He stressed the richness of his experience at Notre Dame, emphasizing the growth in confidence and competence of students and faculty, and noting that he now hopes to take a leadership role in this growth without ceasing to be a colleague. While Malloy recognized that it is difficult for any administrator not to be perceived eventually as other, Malloy promised to resist this dynamic. At the same time, Malloy recognized that decisions have to be made, some of which are perplexing, some of which are a matter of scarcity of resources, some of which have to do with delicate matters of personnel, hiring, promotion, confrontation about performance, and the reward structure for quality performance. Having tried to listen carefully to faculty concerns, Malloy said that it is his intention to meet with the
central administrative group this July to discuss long and short term plans. Malloy believes that a number of areas of primary concern have already been identified.

Malloy commented briefly about speculations on his administrative style, adding that he would himself highlight that he is an administrator who would like to continue to be a teacher, taking advantage of the opportunity to address the major issues of Catholic higher education. He said that he would continue to make the effort to know all the members of the faculty as individuals, and that he wants to continue to be accessible to students. Malloy also noted that he has difficult decisions to make about how to spend his time--how to balance his time at Notre Dame with his time away. Finally, Malloy noted that he has tried to identify priorities in the task forces that he has appointed and that he has tried to balance their membership.

The first question from the floor came from Prof. Katharina Blackstead, who asked Malloy's opinion about establishing a uniform sabbatical policy at Notre Dame.

Malloy noted that this question has already been raised and debated by the Academic Council, which is the appropriate level for decision making in this case. The difficulty with sabbaticals is balancing the needs of individual faculty members for research time with problems of affordability. When recommendations have been strong, most applications for sabbatical leave have been granted. Malloy added that if there is the desire, this question could be raised and debated again by the Academic Council, but added that there were still obstacles that would work against a movement to a uniform sabbatical policy in the immediate future. Nevertheless, Malloy believes that Notre Dame has developed a decent sabbatical policy that is being applied to a wider cross section of the faculty as resources have become available.

Prof. Frank Connolly commented on what has been heard unofficially about low yields on the endowment for this year. While Connolly noted that he was not concerned that earnings might be down for a given year, he identified this as an important concern of the faculty, and asked Malloy whether he would consider making more open reports about this matter on a regular basis.

Malloy responded that his inclinations are in that direction but that there are some areas of the university where caution is called for. In a
formal way, this particular matter is entrusted to the Board of Trustees more than to the officers, so such a report would require a conversation with the Board about how much reporting is appropriate. However, Malloy concluded that he understood the force of Connolly's comments.

Prof. Philip Quinn summarized the senate's resolution declaring the *Scholastic* incident and noted that Malloy's response to the senate's communication of its concern had already been to emphasize the administration's desire for good relations with student publications. However, Quinn said that he had been hoping for a stronger statement, one that would have prohibited suspensions and lockouts as a strategy for dealing with student publications and asked Malloy whether he was willing to go on the record saying anything stronger.

Malloy responded that he believed in the principle of subsidiarity, and that the *Scholastic* incident was best left to lower administrative levels until the issue became irresolvable. No one in the upper administration was involved in the *Scholastic* incident. Malloy continued that it was regrettable that the impression was derived from that incident that there was the desire to suppress the portrayal of nude bodies, and added that the way in which lower administrators deal with such issues would need to be looked at. Nevertheless, the *Scholastic* incident never became a matter of first amendment rights or unnecessary intrusion into student life because the parties involved were able to come to an amicable resolution. Malloy continued that it would be inappropriate for him to make a large policy statement concerning an event that had been satisfactorily resolved. If a similar incident occurred where Malloy was forced to make a decision, he noted that his inclination would be to maximize the right of various opinions to be expressed in the media. There are all kinds of things that get published under Notre Dame auspices or by Notre Dame people that Malloy thoroughly disagrees with, but he has never in any public fashion done anything as a person or as an administrator to suppress that. Malloy stressed that this role is appropriate for him and for Notre Dame. On occasion, however, issues of appropriate disciplinary involvement get blown up as if they were some test of the constitution when they had a lot more to do with the personalities involved. Malloy concluded that his inclination is against lockouts, attacks, and attempts to suppress the legitimate right to speak on a variety of issues or to limit artistic creativity, but Malloy added that he would not rule out that there could be an occasion where the bounds of decency and good taste were exceeded, and in such a case concerned administrators have a legitimate right to
intervene. However, Malloy cautioned that intervention should be handled prudentially and with some discretion.

Quinn responded that it would then be important, and not in response to a specific incident, for lower administrators to know the intentions of the upper administration in this regard. Malloy responded that it was his preference not to issue edicts where there is no problem. He did add, however, that it is possible to discuss a historical incident to make a point about consultation from below with regard to administrative style.

Prof. Paul Conway then asked a general question about Malloy’s opinion of the senate and the validity of their representation of the faculty as a whole.

Malloy responded that a group is only as good as the members elected to it and its structural mandate. While the Academic council has more clout, the Faculty Senate has more freedom to explore issues and bring them to the surface. The senate has the potential to represent the faculty, but that depends on the credibility of and the faculty’s respect for those elected, and on the responsiveness of the administration when the senate does address an issue.

Conway then questioned Malloy about the function of the task force that has recently been appointed on benefits, noting that the senate already has a Benefits Committee.

Malloy responded that there is no task force on benefits, although one has been appointed to address marriage, family, and other life commitments. However, one of its mandates is to look at the structure of support for marriage, family, and other life commitments. The membership of that task force is a cross section of people in the university, including faculty, and they have available to them any kind of interaction with reports or people from the senate, which is a separately established body. Malloy stated that he does not see conflict, but rather the opportunity for a collaborative look at these issues. He further commented that a task force is different from a committee in that it has a limited life span.

Conway then asked Malloy if he had any thoughts about ways in which the senate could be more effective.
Malloy responded that this is an issue that he would be happy to explore with the leadership of the senate next year. Malloy also emphasized that he didn't think it was appropriate for him or anyone else in the administration to tell the senate what it ought to do. That is why there ought to be an independent body like the senate that can come forward whether anyone likes it or not. But the follow through depends upon building some rapport between the actors and a mutual recognition of the significance of what is being faced. Malloy stressed that he is prepared to work with the senate and its leadership to explore ways of maintaining a cooperative kind of interaction, although that does not always lead to some agreement.

Prof. Donald Barrett commented about the difficulty of getting any action, either positive or negative, on the proposals made by the senate to the Academic Council. Barrett stressed the interdisciplinary nature of the senate, and the hard work that the senate has recently devoted to a variety of complicated reports, citing as recent examples the report on junior faculty and the report on faculty development. Barrett noted that the Academic Council has never acted on either of these two reports, and cited the discouragement that this inactivity must provoke. Barrett asked whether there was any way to ensure some action, either positive or negative, within an academic year, on proposals by the Faculty Senate to the Academic Council.

Malloy responded that it has been his experience that the Executive Committee of the Academic Council has extensively debated every proposal received from the senate, and that those proposals have then been passed to the Academic Council as a whole. Malloy continued that the senate has formal representation on the Academic Council, and that these members can report back to the senate the disposition of any proposals. Malloy characterized Barrett's statements as an interpretation that is not necessarily correct, and countered with his belief that senate proposals have consistently been dealt with rather than being shunted aside.

At this point, Prof. David Burrell, C.S.C., intervened to emphasize the indirect and "educative" role of the work of the senate. He gave as an example the substantial, if indirect impact on Notre Dame policy that the senate's report on student aid prepared by Prof. Vaughn McKim has had.

Malloy said that to be honest what is involved is a lack of agreement, which exists in every university, about exactly who should have what authority about which matters. Malloy added that he believes in
consultation, which lays the groundwork for decision making, but that finally someone has to make a decision, and there is always going to be disagreement about the final result. Malloy added that he honestly doesn’t know whether the Faculty Senate, the Academic Council, or the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees are enough to make any individual faculty member feel appreciated or feel that their issues come to any final resolution. Malloy believes if communication is good and trust does not break down completely, Notre Dame will continue to promote the common good and people will feel heard and will feel that it is clear how decisions are made. Malloy further commented that the lack of decision or the bracketing of issues so that they never return or disappear may be the hardest reality to deal with. Malloy hopes that this can be avoided, but he also noted his impression, based on what he has heard from many faculty members, of pet peeves, or of small groups of faculty looking for a place to go against the grain of common opinion complaining about not getting the results they want when their colleagues simply disagree with them.

One can say the Academic Council is skewed because of the way it is made up, but that doesn’t go very far. There are mechanisms in place that ought to be used to their fullest extent. If it is discovered in the process of using them that they don’t work or that something else is needed, then that would have to be given a broad hearing. However, Malloy is confident that some combination of present vehicles with communication and consultation across the board about some of the acerbic issues Notre Dame might face in the future will enable the university to make progress and will give the university community a general sense of confidence in the system.

Prof. Mario Borelli stated that what he believes most of the faculty want is an improvement in the atmosphere of openness and communication between the faculty and the administration. It is this openness, the recognition of faculty efforts, a receptability to senate proposals on the part of the administration that the senate is hoping for. Borelli also noted that there are some questions that stop at lower levels, but that the spirit and style of an administration come from the top. At this point Borelli recalled a change in health benefits that had been imposed four years ago and had created a fair amount of unhappiness among the faculty. He then noted that he had heard about an additional change in benefits concerning the coverage of certain diseases that had been put in place by the office of personnel or perhaps by Blue Cross, a change discovered only when a faculty member filed a claim that Blue Cross refused to pay. Borelli then asked if Malloy would make an effort to establish in the echelons of his
administration a spirit of openness and cooperation with the more responsible activities of the senate.

Malloy responded by once again reaffirming his commitment to openness and cooperation with the faculty and the senate.

Borelli responded by telling Malloy how gratifying he found this statement.

Prof. Jay Dolan then asked Malloy whether he had any specific dreams for the next five years at Notre Dame.

Malloy began by stressing that he still believes, even if it seems an antiquated notion, that teaching—or the professorial profession—is a calling. Even though that may seem to derive from a Judeo-Christian theological reference point—and for Malloy it does—Malloy stressed that it isn’t restricted to that. It is a way of life, something you give yourself over to. Malloy then described an article he’d been reading about the tendency to couple academic life with asceticism—the notion that academics shouldn’t be concerned about the body, material possessions, income, and so forth—and that that was an age-old way of responding to any concern by the faculty about the structure of support. Malloy cited this article in order to explain that he didn’t mean to invoke its argument at all. Rather, in his own work and in his observation of contemporary society, Malloy has been struck by a decline among all professionals, including academics, of a sense that a profession is a calling, that it asks us to dredge up from the core of our being our gifts, energy, and drive, and to give them back in some way in service: for academics, teaching in the classroom, research, counsel, and taking responsibility for the larger world around us.

Malloy stated his belief that all of the Notre Dame faculty and administration collectively are privileged and that with that privilege goes a responsibility. Malloy is discouraged by some of the language about work and the academic situation that sounds no different from the assembly line, not that that can’t be worth-while and fruitful work. But insofar as academics have projected an exalted sense of themselves, their mission, and their social status, Malloy believes that there are correlative responsibilities, and Malloy would like to speak about those and to draw others into the conversation. Malloy would like to see Notre Dame as a place where a consensus could be reached about what it means to be a professor, or a librarian, or a staff person in an academic area. Indeed,
that overflows into the obligation Notre Dame has to provide preparation for its students, and to consider what this community would like its product to be, what kinds of persons does it want to turn out, what qualities of self, what virtues would it like to see them possess. It is possible to talk in that kind of a language at Notre Dame. Moreover, higher education in general in this country is struggling with this. If you read the presentations and speeches of the major university presidents over the past few years, almost every one of them, at least the ones Malloy respects, are trying to address this same issue. That is one thing that Malloy would dream about at Notre Dame, that everyone together could think and write about this and about how it comes to fruition in all the areas of our work. That is our goal which we ought to struggle to define, despite the specialities that tend to divide us and make it difficult for us to see the whole. In that sense Malloy characterized himself as a teleologist. Malloy furthermore suggested the senate as a particular place where that kind of thinking might go on because it brings people together across disciplines.

Dolan commended Malloy for naming such a worthy goal, commenting that one of the reasons that faculty lose sight of their vocation is that they don't feel a sense of ownership or belonging. Indeed, the very notion of a vocation intensifies a commitment to one's profession, but one has to work in an atmosphere where that vocation comes alive. Such an atmosphere cannot exist where there is a great gap between the faculty and the golden dome. If faculty are to be alive to their vocation, that gap must be removed.

Prof. Teresa Ghilarducci, reminding the senate about a labor union meeting simultaneously taking place in the basement of the CCE whose slogan is "craft is back," warned against a separation between staff on the one hand and faculty and administrators on the other, noting that the staff can also be very dedicated to their jobs and to working at a special place like Notre Dame. Malloy agreed, stating that the University indeed benefits from the loyalty and pride of the staff.

Pec thanked Malloy for his openness with the senate and invited him to stay for the business meeting and the reception afterward. Pec then turned to the minutes of the two previous meetings, which were read and approved.

Pec began the report from the chair by noting that the parental leave proposal came to the floor of the Academic Council on April 28 despite a
4-1 negative vote by the Executive Committee, who claimed that the proposal was not an academic matter. The proposal went to the floor because of the Faculty Senate's right of agenda. On the floor, Father Hesburgh suggested that the proposal be forwarded to the Task Force on Marriage, the Family, and Other Life Commitments, since it was not academic in nature and there was no other place to send it. Pec noted that the senate had contended that the matter was academic. That issue wasn't debated, and that the proposal was sent on to the Task Force. Pec concluded by noting that Ghilarducci, who helped to draft the parental leave proposal as co-chair of the Benefits Committee, is a member of that task force and that this seems the best resolution of the matter at the present time.

Pec proceeded to announce that letters have been sent out concerning the Scholastic incident and that six replies have been received. A response to the Faculty Senate Faculty Compensation Report had been received from the Provost. O'Meara commented that the report was informative and clearly written, and that he felt personal satisfaction when he read it. O'Meara promised to at least consider all of the recommendations made in the report, and asked that his thanks be extended to Frank Connolly for his fine job.

At this point, Pec noted that the senate had taken up a wide variety of important issues this year. She suggested that the senate thank the members of the Executive Committee for their hard work: Marlo Borelli as Vice-Chair, Pamela Falkenberg and Andre Goddu as Secretary, John Rohrbough as Treasurer, Frank Connolly as Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, John Yoder as Chair of the Administrative Affairs Committee, Katharina Blackstead as Chair of the Student Affairs Committee, and Paul Conway and Teresa Ghilarducci as Co-chairs of the Benefits Committee. On their behalf, Pec also thanked all of the active senators for their hard work. Finally, Pec thanked the senate for its support, and stated her pleasure in having served as Chair for this year.

Conway made the report for the Benefits Committee. Conway announced that the joint survey with the personnel office about the benefits packages of Notre Dame's peer institutions has gone out. Conway also announced that the change in benefits made in the Blue Cross/Blue Shield plan as of January 1 had been resolved and at least temporarily rescinded. Conway was also pleased to announce that the Benefits Committee would at least be consulted by Roger Mullins of personnel about changes in benefits for next year before they were made. Borelli added
that he wanted to go on record in the minutes saying that he believes that Mullins will indeed consult with the senate about changes, and that he has found Mullins to be very open and a pleasure to work with.

Blackstead then reported for the Student Affairs Committee about the new classroom building. Blackstead stated that an endorsement of the spirit of Prof. Robert Kerby's letter about the design of the new classroom building had been sent on to the appropriate parties, who had been urged to show the same attention to detail and pedagogical function in their design plans.

Since John Yoder could not attend the meeting, Pec gave his report for the Administrative Affairs Committee. Yoder's document on faculty participation in governance at the University of Notre Dame grew out of a discussion at the faculty caucus of the Academic and Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees and led to the senate being charged with the preparation of a white paper on the subject to be presented at the May meeting of the Board of Trustees. These same concerns were also raised early in the year within the senate by Jay Dolan. However, the document that has resulted is not a white paper, but rather a start toward drafting a white paper. Pec noted that the document had been discussed by the Executive Committee, and would be discussed by the AFACBT at their May meeting. Pec then asked for comments on the document. She called the senate's attention to a recommendation in the document, which stated that the Executive Committee recommends to the senate that the review process on the subject of faculty participation in university governance continue during 1987-88. Burrell so moved and Borelli seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Pec then called on Ghilarducci, who had been asked to compose a resolution of gratitude to Father Hesburgh. Ghilarducci then read the following resolution:

"The Faculty Senate on behalf of the faculties of the University of Notre Dame expresses its gratitude to Father Theodore M. Hesburgh for his life's work on behalf of the University.

Father Hesburgh has provided the leadership which embodies the highest standards for intellectual achievement without sacrificing moral commitment and engagement at an institution of higher learning. He stewarded the University of Notre Dame through its transformation from a provincial undergraduate religious college to a..."
still religious, but now internationally-known institution which aspires to meet the demands of an active and significant research and teaching university.

Furthermore, the senate extends its gratitude to Father Hesburgh for insisting on creating a Notre Dame family and calling it 'community.' The perception that good universities are nurturing and salubrious communities led to the creation of a Faculty Senate nearly twenty years ago during Father Hesburgh's presidency. We thank him for his efforts to enrich the administrative and academic life of the University by promoting faculty governance.

Borelli moved and Prof. Pam Falkenberg seconded the resolution, which passed unanimously.

Borelli then proposed a resolution of gratitude for his good work to Capt. John Rohrbough, a member of the Executive Committee who is going to leave the senate next year after many years of service. This motion was passed by acclamation. Rohrbough responded that he was overwhelmed, and described his five years on the senate as an invigorating academic experience.

The senate then turned to new business. Burrell asked for the floor and read a statement that he wanted to go on record: "As a member of the Commission on Higher Education of the Indiana Province of the Congregation of Holy Cross, I have been involved in the process of drafting a statement on Involvement of the Holy Cross in higher education—an involvement which engages our province in Portland, Santiago de Chile and Dhaka, Bangladesh, as well as here at Notre Dame. As your colleague, I would ask that you read and respond to the statement sent to you. As a member of the senate, I want to register my disappointment at the Executive Committee's decision to forego common discussion on the commission of this document—something we would very much have appreciated. That opportunity is now lost, since our final revision will be in June; in its place I would reiterate our earnest wish to receive your critical comments, for we are as interested in its reception as in its substance. Rev. Ernest Bartell, C.S.C., Executive Director of the Kellogg Institute, is the recipient."

Pee responded that every member of the senate received a copy of this document on February 23, 1987, and that members have been urged
several times to respond to the document. Pec stated that the Executive Committee had thought that a wider response would be elicited in this way, which would be of more benefit to the committee. Borelli then moved that the next Faculty Senate be urged to have a general discussion on the floor as soon as the final version of the document is ready. Burrell responded that a motion by the old senate is not binding on the new one.

At this point, Prof. James McCarthy, Emeritus, made two motions. The first motion, which was approved unanimously, was that the senate respectfully requests and recommends to the Vice President of the University and Chair of the Faculty Board in Control of Athletics and to the Director of Athletics that the long standing golf privileges granted to retired faculty members be restored immediately. The second motion, also approved unanimously, was that the senate respectfully requests and recommends to the Associate Vice President for Residence Life and to the Director of Security that the demeaning and very inaccurate practice of requiring a rear-view mirror hanging tag be immediately replaced with a respectable car window sticker.

Next, Pec called for a resolution of thanks to those members of the senate whose terms were expiring. Pec read the names of returning senators, who were dismissed so that the first item of new business, the election of new senate officers, could proceed.

The new senate Executive Committee for the 1987-88 academic year are: F. Ellen Weaver, chair; Paul F. Conway, vice chair; Suzanne Kelly, treasurer; Eugene F. Gorski, C.S.C and Philip Quinn, co-secretaries; Dennis Moran, chair, Committee on Academic Affairs; John H. Yoder, Chair, Committee on Administration; Mario Borelli, chair, Committee on Benefits; Patrick E. Murphy, chair, Committee on Student Affairs, Jean A. Pec, Past Chair.

Following the election, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela Falkenberg, Secretary
University of Notre Dame
The Faculty Senate

THE JOURNAL
September 14, 1987

Dr. F. Ellen Weaver, Chair of the Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 7:33 p.m., and Dr. Suzanne Kelly was asked to offer the prayer. Weaver requested a motion to approve the Journal of May 4, 1987. Prof. Jean Pec made the motion, and Prof. Philip Quinn seconded it. The floor was then opened for discussion and correction of the Journal. Prof. James McCarthy requested that a correction be made in the wording of his motion about the use of rear-view mirror parking tags. Weaver thanked McCarthy for the correction and went on to inform the senate that Fr. Edward Malloy had read and accepted the journal. The senate then unanimously approved the Journal of May 4, 1987 as corrected.

Weaver welcomed the new members of the senate to their first complete formal meeting. They are: Austin Collins, C.S.C., Kent Emery, Stephen Fallon, Mohamed Gad-el-Hak, John Halloran, Robert Hayes, Yih-Fang Huang, Alan Krieger, James A. McCarthy, Ray Powell, F. Clark Power, Walter Pratt, Jr., Karamjit Rai, J. Keith Rigby, Jr. Pamela Falkenberg was reelected for another three-year term.

Weaver then read her “Opening Statement to the Faculty Senate.” The full text follows:

The academic year 1987-88 is a milestone in the history of the University of Notre Dame. It is marked by the inauguration of a new president for the first time in almost forty years. The Faculty Senate also passes a milestone. This is the twentieth anniversary of the founding of this senate. I will have something to say about that later.

Such changes and anniversaries bring a sense of new beginnings. Could it not mean for us a time to review the role of the Faculty Senate? Might it not offer an opportunity for revitalization of this body? I would like to hope that we might reinvigorate the Senate this year, and I pledge, in my role as chair, to devote my best efforts to this goal. The excellent paper prepared by John Howard Yoder and his group on “Faculty Participation in
Governance at the University of Notre Dame has suggested to me some means by which we might move in this direction. Addressing the question of what types of corrective measures might be taken to assure the Faculty Senate of a stronger role in university administration, we read:

In the absence of any statutory statement, the Faculty is free at any time to define a growing role for itself simply by taking up more important issues and making more pertinent and well-argued recommendations on them. (9.IV.B)

I endorse this statement, and have recommended to the heads of the standing committees that the committees work to develop and present for debate and vote by the Senate resolutions pertaining to specific current issues. The Senate has the right to place such matters on the Agenda of the College Council, where legislative action can be taken. The more specific, current, and practical our motions, and the more numerous, the more likely we are to begin to have an active role in the governance of this University.

In a discussion I had with our new president, Fr. Edward Malloy, about the role of the Faculty Senate, I found him very supportive. We agreed that the senate should be a true voice of the faculty in university affairs, representative and respected. May I make a suggestion here? We are elected to this office by our colleagues in the Colleges. Are there ways by which we might become more truly their voice? How often do we speak with members of our own departments about the work of the senate? How often do we seek to know what their concerns are? One way to do this is simply to draw them out one by one in personal conversations. Another way might be to ask for the opportunity at a departmental meeting to make a brief report on the work of the senate and to solicit input from our colleagues. Another possibility would be for the senators from each college to caucus before a College Council meeting, and to ask to make a report and to solicit suggestions there. I, personally, am more in favor of going the route of the departmental meeting, since there we are in direct touch with all the members of our department, junior as well as senior.
These are only two suggestions for ways in which the Faculty Senate can become more strongly what it is: the voice of the faculty in the governance of the university.

I conclude with two brief announcements and requests:

First, I have already alluded to the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the Faculty Senate. We need to plan ways to publicize and celebrate this event. Toward that end, at the recent meeting of the executive committee, we decided to form an ad hoc committee for this purpose. Paul Conway has volunteered to chair it, and Suzanne Kelly has offered to work with him. I invite those of you who have ideas and willingness to work on plans for this twentieth anniversary celebration to sign the sheet which will be passed along with those for the standing committees, understanding that the prerogative to decide the final composition of the committees rests with the chairs.

Finally, as chair of the senate this year, I have been asked to offer greetings in the name of the faculty at the inauguration of Fr. Edward Malloy as president. I will, of course, draw upon our May meeting with Father Malloy, but I would welcome any input you would like to wish to offer. However, time is short. If you have any ideas, please send them to me in writing as soon as possible.

F. Ellen Weaver

The next agenda item was the formation of the four Standing Committees: Committee on Academic Affairs, Committee on Administration, Committee on Benefits, and Committee on Student Affairs. Weaver requested the senators to sign up for the committees of their first and second choice. She reminded them that the bylaws of the senate require each senator to be a member of one of the committees, exception being made for senators who are also members of the Academic Council. Weaver also encouraged the senators to sign up for the two Ad Hoc Committees. The first, chaired by Prof. Paul Conway, is concerned with the twentieth anniversary celebration of the founding of the Faculty Senate. The second, chaired by Prof. Mario Borelli, has the task of following up the issue of the work of the various University committees; this issue was raised in the paper on faculty participation in government. The chairs of the Standing and Ad Hoc
Committees were asked by Weaver if they wished to comment on the work and goals of their respective committees. None of them wished, at that time, to speak.

Opening the floor to new business, Weaver solicited a motion to send a letter of condolences to Fr. William Beauchamp, C.S.C., on the occasion of the death of his parents. Borelli made the motion, and seconded it.

Martin Rogers, a student representative of the Multi-Cultured Fall Festival Committee, was called upon by Weaver to address the senate. He spoke of the various goals and activities of the Festival to be held October 5-10, and he urged the senators to promote the Festival and personally to take part in it.

Borelli made a motion that the senate go on record with an official expression of sorrow over the death of Prof. Donald Barrett, one of the senate's most supportive and productive members. Yoder seconded the motion.

Prof. Ray Powell requested that Prof. Dennis Moran and the other members of the Committee on Academic Affairs consider the following issue: the desirability of uniformity among College Councils as to the appointment of reviewers in cases where a faculty member alleges material failure of review procedures. Weaver supported this request; she asked Powell to write a statement so that the issue could be placed on the committee's agenda.

At this point Weaver referred to a letter sent to the Chair of the senate from the Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies. This letter spoke of planning for a conference on racial and ethnic relations in American higher education. The senators were asked to speak to Weaver for further information about this conference.

At the request of a member, the chairs of senate committees then gave brief outlines of the issues their committees plan to consider during the coming year.

Borelli spoke on behalf of the Benefits Committee. He began by noting that the senate had made a recommendation about parental benefits last year.
That recommendation is now in the hands of one of the presidential task forces, and the task force’s response to the recommendation will be reported back to the senate. He then mentioned that he had met with Roger Mullins, Director of Personnel. Mullins had endorsed the goal of working to equalize faculty and staff benefits by improving staff benefits and had promised open communication with the Benefits Committee. His office is investigating the following issues which are of interest to the Benefits Committee: 1) the relative merits of "cafeteria" and "flexible" benefits packages; 2) the desirability of offering disbursement accounts as a benefit; and 3) the unexplained rising cost of Blue Cross/Blue Shield to the university during a period when HMO costs have not risen by nearly so much. The Benefits Committee intends to keep track of work on these topics, and Mullins is to be invited to address the senate as soon as possible.

Yoder spoke on behalf of the Administrative Affairs Committee. He began by recalling that the Committee had devoted considerable time last year to discussion of questions about governance. The result was a document, which the members of last year’s senate had received, that is more an agenda for further discussion than a final report. The Administrative Affairs Committee plans to continue the discussion this year and may come up with recommendations for changes in the governance structure at a later date.

Prof. Patrick E. Murphy spoke on behalf of the Student Affairs Committee. It plans to be concerned with three topics during the current year. First, there is follow-up on the report on undergraduate advising that was released late last year. Next there is faculty-student interaction outside the classroom and, particularly, ways in which the senate might support it in practice as well as in principle. And, finally, there is the problem of student DUI. In response to a remark from the floor, Murphy stated that the Student Affairs Committee would also be concerned with the design of the proposed new classroom building. He also asked for suggestions about other topics the Committee might take up.

Dennis Moran spoke on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee. He observed that it has been the tradition that the major project of the Committee is to prepare the Faculty Compensation Report. However, it has been suggested that a large report on faculty compensation is not needed every year, and so other issues might be taken up this year. Moran
mentioned three major projects the Committee might undertake: 1) a study of the compensation of non-teaching research faculty, especially library faculty; 2) an inquiry into appointment and promotion procedures and related grievance procedures with an eye to reaching conclusions about whether they are or should be uniform across colleges and departments; and 3) a discussion of non-regular faculty appointments, including adjuncts and others. He also mentioned three other possible projects of lesser urgency: 1) discussion of faculty-student relations in conjunction with the Student Affairs Committee; 2) discussion of the recent Carnegie Report; and 3) a study of contributions by individual faculty and by departments to the university with an eye to showing that the university gets good value for the compensation it gives faculty.

Borelli spoke on behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee on University Governance. He noted that the senate's present knowledge of what university committees do and how they do it is mostly anecdotal and so is unsystematic. The Committee's aim is to develop a more thorough and systematic understanding of how university committees in fact presently function. Preliminary questions that must be addressed concern the kinds of information to be sought and the methods for gathering such information.

Prof. Robert L. Kerby requested that the members be sent copies of the senate's Bylaws. The Chair, F. Ellen Weaver, said that she would see to it that this was done.

Kerby made and Moran seconded a motion to adjourn. Adjournment took place at 8:29 p.m. An informal reception for members of the senate was held immediately after adjournment.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Panos Antsaklis, electrical engineering; Frank J. Bonello, economics; Mario Borelli, mathematics; Paul F. Bosco, emeritus; Austin I. Collins, C.S.C., art, art history and design; JoAnn DellaNeva, modern and classical languages; William M. Fairley, earth science; Pamela R. Falkenberg, communication and theatre; Stephen M. Fallon, program of liberal studies; Richard W. Fessenden, chemistry; Mohamed Gad-el-Hak, aerospace and mechanical engineering; Eugene F. Gorski, C.S.C., theology; Sandra J. Harmatiuk, freshman year of studies; Robert G. Hayes, chemistry; Yih-Fang Huang, electrical engineering; Suzanne Kelly, institute for pastoral and social ministry; Robert L. Kerby, history; George Kolettis,
mathematics; Alan Krieger, library; James A. McCarthy, emeritus; Dennis Moran, Review of Politics; Michael H. Morris, accountancy; Patrick E. Murphy, marketing; Maria Rosa Olivera-Williams, modern and classical languages; Jean A. Pec, library; Ray M. Powell, accountancy; F. Clark Power, program of liberal studies; Walter Pratt, law; Philip Quinn, philosophy; Karamjit S. Rai, biological sciences; J. Keith Rigby, Jr., earth sciences; John D. Rohrbough, naval science; Robert A. Vacca, modern and classical languages; F. Ellen Weaver, theology; John H. Yoder, theology.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Dino S. Cervigni, modern and classical languages; Paul F. Conway, finance and business economics; Jay P. Dolan, history; Kent Emery, program of liberal studies; Michael J. Etzel, marketing; John A. Halloran, finance and business economics; Mark A. Herro, electrical engineering; Nai-Chien Huang, aerospace and mechanical engineering; Howard J. Saz, biological sciences; William D. Shephard, physics; Donald E. Sporleder, architecture; Anthony M. Trozzolo, chemistry.

MEMBERS ON LEAVE: Steven M. Bell, modern and classical languages; Andre Goddu, program of liberal studies; Gilburt D. Loescher, government and international studies; Donald E. Sporleder, architecture.

Respectfully submitted,

Eugene F. Gorski, C.S.C.
Philip L. Quinn
Co-Secretaries
The Chair of the Faculty Senate, F. Ellen Weaver, announced that, before
the formal opening of the senate meeting, the senate's Standing and Ad Hoc
Committees would caucus to begin consideration of their work for the
current year. She then read out the lists of committee assignments, which
had been approved by the Executive Committee, and the committees
dispersed to caucus severally.

Weaver formally called the meeting to order at 8:05 p.m., and Prof. Robert
L. Kerby offered a prayer. Weaver noted that the minutes of the September
meeting were not yet ready and would be sent out to members of the
senate when they were ready.

Weaver then delivered the report of the Chair. She began by reading a
letter of sympathy which she had sent to Rev. William Beauchamp on
behalf of the senate. She next reported on a meeting of the Academic
Council. At that meeting, Rev. Edward Malloy had expressed thanks to the
senate, among others, for cooperation at the time of his inauguration. He
had expressed hope for greater rapport between the Academic Council and
the Senate, had invited open and informal communication, and had pledged
continuing availability to faculty and students. Weaver noted that she had
found the climate of the Academic Council meeting relaxed and open. She
went on to report that the main business transacted at the council meeting
was making changes in Regulation 12.2 of the Academic Code, which spells
out requirements for the Freshman Year of Studies. These changes are
recorded in the minutes of the Academic Council. Their primary effect
will be to retain freshmen who have deficiencies in the Freshman Year of
Studies until those deficiencies are removed and to require that such
deficiencies be made up at Notre Dame, either in a summer session or
during the third semester. Prof. Mario Borelli remarked that these changes
seem to imply that a wider variety of summer courses will have to be
offered and that the burden of doing this will fall differentially on
different departments.

Weaver concluded her report by announcing that Rev. Ernest Bartell had
sent the third draft of "A Policy Statement on Higher Education by the
Priests of Holy Cross, Indiana Province" to the senate. Acknowledging that he had received comments on earlier drafts from individual members of the senate, Bartell had requested comment on this draft from the senate as a whole. Weaver reported that the Executive Committee had decided to refer the draft to the standing committees of the senate for review and to request that they come up with draft statements which could be combined by the Executive Committee and then brought to the full senate for discussion and possible adoption.

The next item of business was preliminary reports from standing and ad hoc committees.

Prof. John H. Yoder reported on behalf of the Administration Committee. The Committee will continue discussion of faculty participation in university governance, using as a starting point the document "Faculty Participation in Governance at the University of Notre Dame," which was the result of its deliberations on this question last year. Yoder mentioned that this document had been discussed last spring by the Academic and Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees; that committee had found the document helpful but had taken no action on it. The change in the picture this year is that the senate's Ad Hoc Committee on University Governance will be investigating ways in which governance systems work here and elsewhere. Borelli added that the Academic and Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees will be discussing the issue of faculty participation in governance again at its next meeting; it is his impression that the new Chair of that committee will be very receptive to faculty input. Yoder noted that this committee is another part of the governance picture but remarked that it is a thin channel of communication because it seldom meets.

Prof. Dennis Moran reported on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee. It is already concerned with two grievances. The general question it proposes to consider is whether there is any uniformity, department by department or college by college, in the standards employed by Appointments and Promotions Committees.

Prof. Patrick E. Murphy reported on behalf of the Student Affairs Committee. It has two items of continuing business. One is to follow up on the question of the design of the proposed new classroom building and to find out whether there is room for formal input from the senate, and the other is to study ways in which the committee and the senate can
facilitate faculty-student interaction outside the classroom. It also has two items of new business. One involves the Alcohol Task Force, and the other involves a grant the Counselling Center has for alcohol education on campus. The committee will discuss its role in both these projects, and it already has members involved in both of them.

Borelli reported on behalf of the Benefits Committee. He announced that the committee plans an open meeting of the senate with the Director of Personnel, possibly as early as December. In cooperation with the Office of Personnel, the committee plans to do four things. First, it will take a new look at the current status of and policies governing benefits to retirees. Second, it will try to get a clear description of so-called "cafeteria-style" benefits plans. Third, it will investigate the possibility of extending the present faculty children in-house tuition for undergraduate education benefit to faculty spouses. And, fourth, a subcommittee will look at both the skyrocketing costs and the confusing claim reporting system of Blue Cross/Blue Shield.

Speaking on behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee on the 20th Anniversary Celebration, Prof. Paul Conway reported its thoughts about possible activities to celebrate the anniversary. Prominent among them are the following: 1) gathering and disseminating information about the history of the senate; 2) publicizing the senate and its activities in various media, which might promote faculty interest in serving in the senate; and 3) sponsoring a social event, a reception or dinner, for all those who have served in the senate. Conway requested that members of the senate transmit to the Committee their ideas about appropriate activities to mark the anniversary. The Chair, F. Ellen Weaver, renewed the call for volunteers to work on implementing the Committee's ideas. Borelli suggested asking the four colleges and the central administration to share the costs of a social event such as a dinner. Weaver remarked that a list of all those who have served in the senate and of the projects it has undertaken is currently being prepared.

Under New Business, Prof. Panos Antsaklis raised the question of whether the senate should look into the faculty parking situation. Borelli urged caution on this topic, suggesting that a consequence of making an issue of it might be a mandatory parking fee for faculty. Conway suggested that the senate might investigate planning for future faculty parking needs. Antsaklis stated that it seems that each year the parking situation gets
worse. Weaver brought the discussion to a conclusion by referring the matter to the Faculty Affairs Committee for study.

Also under New Business, Borelli brought to the attention of the senate a recent incident in which O'Shaughnessy was fumigated during normal working hours without advance notice to those who work there, thereby causing some people to become ill and disrupting their work. Prof. Philip Quinn suggested that Borelli might wish to propose a resolution deploring the disruption and urging that advance notice of such activities be given in the future if they cannot be carried on outside normal working hours, and Borelli agreed to consider this course of action.

Prof. Frank Bonello moved and Jean Pec seconded a vote of thanks to F. Ellen Weaver, the Chair, for her remarks on behalf of the senate at the Inaugural of President Malloy. The motion was adopted by a unanimous voice vote.

Borelli moved and Pec seconded adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Panos Antsaklis, electrical engineering; Frank J. Bonello, economics; Mario Borelli, mathematics; Paul F. Bosco, emeritus; Dino S. Cervigni, modern and classical languages; Austin Collins, C.S.C., art and art history; Paul F. Conway, finance and Business; JoAnn Della Neva, modern and classical languages; Michael J. Etzel, marketing; William M. Fairley, earth science; Pamela F. Falkenberg, communication and theatre; Stephen M. Fallon, program of liberal studies; Richard W. Fessenden, chemistry; Mohamed Gad-el-Hak, aerospace and mechanical engineering; Eugene F. Gorski, C.S.C., theology; Robert G. Hayes, chemistry; Mark A. Herro, electrical engineering; Nai-Chien Huang, aerospace and mechanical engineering; Suzanne Kelly, Institute for Pastoral and Social Ministry; Robert L. Kerby, history; Alan Krieger, library; Dennis Moran, Review of Politics; Michael H. Morris, accountancy; Patrick E. Murphy, marketing; Jean A. Pec, library; Ray M. Powell, accountancy; F. Clark Power, program of liberal studies; Walter Pratt, law; Philip L. Quinn, philosophy; Karamjit S. Rai, biological sciences; J. Keith Rigby, Jr., earth sciences; John D. Rohrbough, naval science; William D. Shephard, physics; F. Ellen Weaver, theology; John H. Yoder, theology.
MEMBERS ABSENT: Jay P. Dolan, history; Kent Emery, program of liberal studies; John A. Halloran, finance and business; Sandra J. Harmatiuk, freshman year of studies; Yih-Fang Huang, electrical engineering; George Kolettis, mathematics; James A. McCarthy, emeritus; Maria Olivera-Williams, modern and classical languages; Howard J. Saz, biological sciences; Anthony M. Trozzolo, chemistry; Robert A. Vacca, modern and classical languages.

ON LEAVE: Steven M. Bell, modern and classical languages; Andre Goddu, program of liberal studies; Donald E. Sporleder, architecture.

Respectfully submitted,

Philip L. Quinn
Co-Secretary
Dr. F. Ellen Weaver, Chair of the Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m., and Prof. Austin Collins, C.S.C., was asked to offer the prayer.

Weaver requested the Senators to strike out item six from the meeting's agenda, and then the floor was opened for discussion and correction of the Journal of September 14, 1987. Prof. Jean Pee requested that the following corrections be made: on page four, it should read that Dr. Suzanne Kelly seconded the motion made by Prof. Mario Borelli. Pee made a motion that the Journal of September 14, 1987 be approved as corrected, and Prof. Pamela Falkenberg seconded it. The senate unanimously approved the corrected Journal.

Weaver made the following report: Prof. Timothy O'Meara, Provost of the University, has accepted to address the senate during the meeting of January 20, 1988; Father Edward Malloy, C.S.C., President of the University, will speak to the senate on April 18, 1988, as part of the celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the senate's founding; the meeting for December 10 has been changed to December 9.

Weaver then introduced Mr. Rex Rakow, Director of Security, who was invited to speak about the question of on-campus parking. Rakow opened his remarks by stating that the parking question is indeed complex and emotionally charged because everyone would like to park near his or her office and at the same time enjoy the beauty of a pedestrian campus. He also stated that faculty and staff parking here is unique in that Notre Dame, unlike many other institutions, charges no fee for parking privileges. And he added that in spite of rumors to the contrary, the University is not planning to charge a fee in the future. Rakow then opened the floor for questions.

Prof. Paul F. Conway asked whether the penalty charged for a second parking violation was something new. Rakow responded in the affirmative, adding that this was one of the decisions made by the Ad Hoc Committee
on Parking established by the Provost. Conway requested that more parking spaces be made available in the B1 lot, and Rakow promised to look into the matter.

Prof. J. Keith Rigby, Jr. asked how it is that several cars remain in the A15 lot for what appears to be long and unwarranted periods of time. Rakow explained the situation by stating that several faculty members who reside on the campus in Brownson Hall as well as some staff people who work midnight shifts are assigned to the A15 lot. Rakow asked the senators to inform him if they observe any parking abuses in A15 or in any other lot.

Rigby asked whether it would be possible for three faculty members of the Earth Sciences Department to park in the laundry lot, and whether it would be possible to enlarge that lot. Rakow said that he saw little possibility of enlarging present on-campus parking facilities, but that he was actually trying to work out parking places in the laundry lot for Earth Sciences faculty.

Rigby then asked whether on-campus parking and appropriate access were being considered as critical issues as part of the plans for the construction of new buildings and future modification of the campus. Rakow answered: "All of those things are talked about down the road, but I have never seen a twenty-five year plan for the University." He added that Fathers Malloy and Beauchamp have as one of their priorities the formulation of such plans for the future, and that they are in fact in the midst of such planning. Rakow said that one of the things talked about is the closing of Juniper Road. In twenty-five years it probably will be closed, but this will not involve the reduction of any parking spaces.

Rigby inquired whether there were any plans to construct additional parking lots for faculty as the campus expands. Rakow responded that he did not know of any such plans, and that Mr. Donald Dedrick, Director of Physical Plant, should be consulted.

Prof. Mario Borelli then made the following comment for the record: official representatives of the Faculty Senate should work on the problem of faculty on-campus parking; before any changes be made, the senate should be consulted or at least informed.
Prof. Mark Herro remarked that in his estimation the present manner of enforcing parking regulations and imposing penalties is not sufficiently effective. Rakow stated that the Ad Hoc Committee on Parking found the enforcement of parking regulations not to be uniform. In an effort to improve the situation students are now hired to do some of the policing. Rakow pointed out that in the matter of enforcement the Security Department is undermanned.

Pec asked about the possibility of building parking garages to improve the situation. Rakow responded that the University is reluctant to build parking ramps because they are expensive, and because they pose problems from the point of view of security and aesthetics.

Capt. John Rohrbough brought up the possibility of enforcing parking regulations with the use of towing and “boots.” Rakow said that towing is actually used; four hundred and fifty cars were towed away last year. According to present regulations, cars with three unpaid parking violations may be towed away.

Rakow commented that faculty children and tourists are known to abuse parking privileges. This is a problem the Security Department must deal with.

Conway stated that the faculty needs to complain about the parking problem in order to get results. Rakow agreed; he called for input from the faculty.

Borelli, speaking for the Benefits Committee, said that compared with other institutions the overall parking situation at Notre Dame is not unsatisfactory. He wanted to go on record as opposing any fees for parking privileges.

Rakow ended the discussion with comments on plans to hire in the near future a Manager of Parking. This special member of the Security Department would deal with all aspects of this important issue. Weaver expressed the senate’s deep gratitude to Rakow.

Weaver then introduced Mr. Michael Murdock, Academic Coordinator for Student Government. Murdock, along with Student Senators Steve Viz and Michael Carrigan, were present to collect a questionnaire each member of
the Faculty Senate was asked to complete and return at the meeting. The essential elements of the questionnaire are presented below.

1) Does the current seven choice grading system offer enough options in measuring the academic accomplishments of students?

Always_____ Usually_____ Rarely_____ Never_____ 

2) If you could give B pluses would you give less A minuses?

Yes_____ No_____ 

3) If you could give C pluses would you give less B minuses?

Yes_____ No_____ 

4) In your opinion, is it common practice to raise borderline grades (high B's or C's) to the higher grade (A- or B-)?

Often_____ Occasionally_____ Only in Special Cases_____ Never_____ 

5) Which grading system do you believe would help the most students?

Current System_____ System with Pluses and Minuses_____ 

6) Would you personally favor plus and minus system?

Yes_____ No_____ Other Change_____ (what?) 

If this questionnaire was sent to all faculty members, how could it be improved?

Murdock, Viz and Carrigan were also present at the meeting to receive the oral comments of the senators in regards to the grading system and the possibility of adding the grades of B plus and C plus. A number of senators spoke out, expressing a variety of opinions and raising some questions.

Weaver then opened the floor for new business. Prof. Kent Emery spoke of problems not being remedied by the library's new computer system, and he requested the senate to look into these problems. He proposed that the
card catalogue system be maintained as a backup to the computer system, and he asked that a senate committee investigate his proposal.

Pee made the following remarks: there were no immediate plans to close the card catalogue; the present system in use at the library is widely used and therefore may be believed in; there is already a committee established for such concerns, namely, the University Committee on Libraries.

Prof. Dennis Moran said that the card catalogue continues to be necessary and that it should be maintained. Weaver ended the discussion on the library by stating that before the senate consider Emery’s proposal, it should be examined by the senate’s Academic Affairs Committee.

Weaver then reported that the senate’s Administration Committee, chaired by Prof. John Yoder, was continuing to work on the question of the senate’s responding to “The Policy Statement on Higher Education by the Priests of the Holy Cross, Indiana Province.”

Conway made and Pee seconded a motion to adjourn. Adjournment took place at 9:16 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mario Borelli, mathematics; Jacqueline Brogan, English; Austin Collins, C.S.C., art; Paul Conway, finance; JoAnn DellaNeva, modern and classical languages; Kent Emery, program of liberal studies; Michael Etzel, marketing; William Fairley, earth sciences; Pamela Falkenberg, communication and theatre; Stephen Fallon, program of liberal studies; Thomas Flint, philosophy; Edward Goerner, government; Eugene Gorski, C.S.C., theology; John Halloran, finance; Sandra Harmatuk, freshman year of studies; Mark Herro, electrical engineering; Douglas Hemphill, ROTC; Nai-Chien Huang, aero/mechanical engineering; Steven Hurtt, architecture; Suzanne Kelly, institute for pastoral and social ministry; Robert Kerby, history; George Kolettis, mathematics Alan Krieger, library; Dennis Moran, review of politics; Michael Morris, accountancy; Patrick Murphy, marketing; Maria Rosa Olivera-Williams, modern and classical languages; Jean Pee, library; Ray Powell, accountancy; F. Clark Power, program of liberal studies; Walter Pratt, law; Philip Quinn, philosophy; Karamjit Rai, biological sciences; J. Keith Rigby, earth sciences; John Rohrbough, naval science; William Shephard, physics; F. Ellen Weaver, theology; John Yoder, theology.
MEMBERS ABSENT: Panos Antsakiis, electrical engineering; Frank Bonello, economics; Paul Bosco, emeritus; Dino Cervigni, modern and classical languages; Jay Dolan, history; Richard Fessenden, chemistry; Mohamed Gad-el-Hak, aero/mechanical engineering; Robert Hayes, chemistry; Yih-Fang-Huang, electrical engineering; James McCarthy, emeritus; Howard Saz, biological sciences; Daniel Sheerin, modern and classical languages; Anthony Trozzolo, chemistry; Robert Vacca, modern and classical languages.

MEMBERS ON LEAVE: Steven M. Bell, modern and classical languages; Andre Goddu, program of liberal studies; Donald Sporleder, architecture.

Respectfully submitted,

Eugene F. Gorski, C.S.C.
Philip L. Quinn,
Co-Secretaries
Dr. F. Ellen Weaver, Chair of the Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 7:39 p.m. and Prof. Pamela R. Falkenberg offered the prayer. Prof. Robert L. Kerby moved approval of The Journal for October 14, 1987; Prof. Dennis Moran seconded the motion. There being no additions or corrections, the motion to approve was adopted by a voice vote.

Weaver then delivered the Report of the Chair. She began by noting that Mr. Robert Miller, Director of the Library, had volunteered to say a few words about recent changes in the library system and would do so under item Six on the Agenda, Changes in the Library System. She then reported on a recent meeting of the Academic Council. The Council plans to take up in the spring two items that affect all faculty: 1) reconsideration of the grading system; and 2) reconsideration of the academic calendar. The latter item may have been prompted both by the extension of the Thanksgiving break this year and the fact that next year school begins two weeks before Labor Day. Weaver urged members of the senate to gather the views of their colleagues on these matters and transmit them to Moran, Chair of the Committee on Academic Affairs. These issues are, she emphasized, preeminently academic affairs. Weaver then reported on developments in connection with the twentieth anniversary celebration. First, the Charter of the Faculty Senate will be presented to the University Archives at the January meeting. The Provost, Prof. Timothy O'Meara, whose annual address to the senate will take place at that meeting, has agreed to remain for the ensuing reception at which the presentation will be made. Second, the Provost has agreed to cover costs of the twentieth anniversary banquet, which will take place on April 18, 1988, if they go beyond the senate's budget. Formal thanks for this generous gesture are to be given to the Provost at the January meeting.

Weaver then introduced Mr. Roger Mullins, Director of Human Resources, and extended thanks to him for coming to address the senate. He began his presentation by showing transparencies that summarized benefit legislation since 1974 and nationwide benefit growth since 1973. He next discussed the impact of the 1986 Tax Reform Act on benefits. Among the
purposes of that Act are the following: 1) reducing revenue loss; 2) limiting tax advantages received by the highly paid; 3) restricting capital accumulation; and 4) limiting disparities by pay level in the use of tax advantages.

Compliance with the Act comes in stages. In 1987, a salary reduction limit of $9,500 must be imposed, and it must be determined who the highly paid, roughly those who earn $50,000 or more, are. Notre Dame has done these things. In 1988, a discrimination test must be applied to welfare benefits, primarily health insurance, to determine what the disparities are between the benefits given to the highly paid and those given to other employees. At present no regulations for such tests have been issued, and so this issue may be pushed back to 1989. Notre Dame believes it will be in basic compliance with the health benefit compliance test when regulations are issued because of recent changes in its health benefit plans. In 1989, a similar set of discrimination tests must be applied to retirement benefits. There are three tests. The first is that 70% of the lower paid rank-and-file employees must be included in the richer benefit plan; Notre Dame fails this test. The second is that the ratio of highly paid in the richer plan to rank-and-file in the richer plan must be no more than 70%; Notre Dame fails this test too. The third is that the value of the richer plan cannot exceed the value of the lower plan by more than 70%; Notre Dame does not know whether it passes this test but probably does not. The consequence of failure is that the highly paid will be taxed on contributions to the retirement benefit, including university contributions. It assumes it will have to upgrade staff retirement benefits in order to pass the retirement benefits discrimination tests, which will be costly. Its intent is to bring itself into compliance without reducing the benefits of anyone. Tuition benefits are not affected by this piece of legislation because all employees are eligible for some tuition benefit. Mullins noted that, underlying the specific compliance issues, there are two philosophical questions: 1) Should there be differences between faculty benefits and staff benefits?; and 2) If there should, as is generally assumed, how large should such differences be?

Mullins then pointed out that the Benefit Review Task Force is addressing these questions. It is currently meeting and has on it faculty and staff representatives. When it has completed its work, other groups, including the Benefits Committee of the Faculty Senate, will have the opportunity to
comment upon its conclusions before any formal recommendation is made to the Officers of the University.

Mullins next turned to a discussion of health insurance. He began by showing a transparency that demonstrates a large increase in the cost per employee of Blue Cross/Blue Shield beginning in 1981 and projected into 1988. Another transparency showed steep increases in the costs of both the base plan and the flex plan during the years 1986-1988. In response to questions, he said that the Cost Guard provision has not sufficed to control the rates of increase and that administrative costs are only 6% of premiums. Another transparency indicated a large increase in usage by retirees during the years 1986-1987. Prof. James A. McCarthy interjected the observation that the cost of coverage to retirees has been increased several times recently; this is a special hardship, he asserted, for the few retirees who have very small incomes. He made a special plea that this group receive consideration in future planning. In reply, Mullins noted that those increases would have been even larger if the retirees were not included in a larger group, and so health insurance for retirees is already being subsidized by other members of the larger group. Another transparency showed a substantial growth in HMO membership and a corresponding decrease in enrollment in the basic plan during the years 1985-1988. Mullins stated that Notre Dame is trying to find out whether younger and healthier people become HMO members, leaving in the basic plan what is called an "adverse group." He noted that this is suggested by the fact that, within the past two years, the average age of those in the basic plan has jumped from 45 to 50. He estimated that in the short term there will be an increase in the cost of health insurance from Blue Cross of from 30%, which is likely, to 40%, which is possible.

In response to questions about health insurance, Mullins made the following points: 1) Notre Dame's use is not high compared to Blue Cross norms; 2) health care costs in this country are expected to rise from 17% to 19% this year; 3) during the past couple of years HMO costs have risen less rapidly than Blue Cross costs; 4) a Preferred Provider Organization contract with Blue Cross would be of some help in controlling costs but would require use of Memorial Hospital; 5) there have been conversations with Partners HMO, which might be added to Notre Dame's options, and there have been problems with Maxi Care HMO, which might be dropped; and 6) it is the law that an employer must offer at least one HMO if approached by federally funded HMOs. He stressed that Notre Dame has to get control
of the costs of health insurance and will try to do so without any benefit reduction.

Finally, Mullins commented briefly on flexible or so-called "cafeteria-style" benefits plans. He pointed out that the Benefits Review Task Force is studying such plans. They are of three sorts: 1) modular; 2) reimbursement account; and 3) a mixed plan with a non-optional core plus a reimbursement feature. He observed that the current legislative climate is hostile to such plans and that pending legislation would restrict them. And he conjectured that, if Notre Dame goes to such a plan, it will most likely be introduced gradually over a period of 3 to 5 years.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the senate thanked Mullins with a round of applause.

Weaver then directed attention to a memo from Prof. John H. Yoder, which had been circulated with the Agenda, concerning the kind of response the senate ought to make to the C.S.C. "Statement on Higher Education." That memo sketches five distinct levels of response, ranging from no formal response at all to a substantial report drafted by a committee and adopted by the senate. Noting that this option had found favor with the Executive Committee, Yoder moved that the response be a collection of all the comments made by anyone, gathered and ordered without reviewing them for consistency or for how many senators would support them. Kerby seconded the motion, and a lively discussion ensued.

Moran noted that some members of the Committee on Academic Affairs had expressed dissatisfaction with this course of action. They had argued that an unordered collection of comments would not adequately reflect intensity of concern with certain issues. Yoder responded that intensity of concern would be expressed both by the number of comments on a given topic and by the way comments were phrased. Moran continued by saying that some were of the opinion that the senate should either make no response at all or prepare a substantial report.

Prof. Jean A. Pec noted that some members of the senate had responded as individuals last year to an earlier draft of the statement and that the present draft seems to have been influenced by such responses.
Prof. J. Keith Rigby, Jr., raised the question of the intended audience for the statement. Discussion quickly revealed that there was no consensus on the answer to this question. Some expressed the view that it is meant to be a purely internal document of the C.S.C.; others thought it to be addressed by the C.S.C. to the wider Notre Dame community; and others considered it primarily a policy document of the C.S.C. but one with implications for the whole university community.

Kerby argued that it would be best for the senate to make no formal response since it is an internal document; the motion under discussion, he suggested, would be a courteous way of doing this. He also remarked that a formal senate response would signal other bodies in the university that they should take the statement seriously. Rigby responded that it should be taken very seriously indeed, because it has implications for the standards governing evaluations of faculty performance. He drew attention to Sections 52 and 53 which conclude with the claim that "the full range of accomplishments any faculty member contributes to the total institution should by right be assessed and appreciated at every level of evaluation." It seems that making this university policy would bring considerations other than teaching, research and routine committee service into the process of reappointment, promotion and tenure.

Kerby rejoined that since this is not at the moment an issue confronting the university, the senate should not take it up at present. Prof. Kent Emery wondered why any formal response would be desirable if individual responses by members of the senate were in order. Prof. Philip L. Quinn suggested that response at the level proposed in the motion under discussion was a matter of courtesy in light of the disappointment expressed by the C.S.C. at the responses by individual members of the senate last year, but Prof. Daniel J. Sheerin argued that there would be no discourtesy in declining to respond. Prof. JoAnn Della Neva expressed the view that the senate, in virtue of being representative of the faculty, should make some formal response. Capt. John D. Rohrbough called the question, and the motion was defeated by a show of hands.
It was then moved by Rohrbough and seconded by Rigby that the senate's response to the C.S.C. Statement be an acknowledgement of having received the text, with gratitude that the C.S.C. supports the University, but without any substantial comment. Discussion resumed. Della Neva expressed concern that the senate's silence might be construed as consent to or agreement with the contents of the Statement. Rev. Austin I. Collins, C.S.C. claimed that other groups have responded to the Statement, but Pec noted that the Academic Council has not been asked to respond. Emery argued that the Statement raises a serious issue because it proposes a citizenship requirement as a third formal criterion for promotion. Rigby expressed the view that it is not the senate's business to comment on the Statement if it is an internal C.S.C. document; Prof. Mario Borelli replied that it is not a purely internal document. Prof. Jay P. Dolan asserted that if pastoral care is made a criterion of promotion, this will water down the quality of the university. Prof. Karamjit S. Rai argued that if the senate responds to the document at all, it should do so in a meaningful fashion. Prof. Alan Krieger maintained that the document is too unspecific, except on one or two points, to deserve a detailed response. Borelli proposed a friendly amendment according to which the acknowledgement of receipt of the document would be accompanied by an expression of grave concern about Sections 52 and 53. Prof. Edward A. Goerner proposed another friendly amendment according to which the acknowledgement of receipt would be accompanied by a statement that if the proposals contained in Sections 52 and 53 are ever to be considered for adoption as university policy, they should go to the Academic Council for appropriate action. The mover and the seconder accepted these two amendments. Kerby then stated his intention of voting against the motion as amended; he announced that should the amended motion fail to pass, he would reintroduce the unamended motion with the added condition that the acknowledgement of receipt be accompanied by a copy of The Journal of the present meeting, which expresses the concerns some members of the senate have about the contents of the Statement. Recalling that the C.S.C. had been disappointed by the senate's response to the draft which was circulated last year, Pec warned that the senate might get the Statement back again at a later date. Prof. Paul F. Conway then made a motion to table, and Pec seconded it. The motion to table passed by a show of hands.

Weaver then introduced Mr. Robert Miller, Director of the Library, and expressed thanks to him for offering to address the senate and answer questions about changes in the library system. Miller began his
presentation with a brief history of systems for storing bibliographical information, ranging from the human brain to the digital computer. He emphasized the point that each such system has both pluses and minuses. He then moved on to a comparison of the card catalogue with the computer database UNlOC. The card catalogue has the advantage of familiarity; we have a hundred years of experience with it and only three months of experience with UNlOC. But UNlOC also has advantages, particularly making quicker cataloguing feasible. Miller then announced that as of December 5, 1987, the Hesburgh Library had stopped filing cards in the card catalogue; henceforth, bibliographical information will be added only to UNlOC. He stated that there are no present plans to move, render inaccessible or get rid of the card catalogue. He also acknowledged that there are at present some problems with UNlOC. In order to deal with these problems, a major effort will be made during the next six months to clean up the present database and to enter volume holdings information on serials into the system. Within the next year, it is hoped that errors will be corrected and new databases added to the system. The decision to stop adding to the card catalogue was made in order to free up the resources needed to perform these tasks. Miller concluded his formal presentation with a request that faculty members use the forms to be found near the terminals in the library to report problems with UNlOC to the library staff.

The senate then began to discuss the matters covered in Miller's presentation. Sheerin asked about the source of bibliographical information for UNlOC, and Miller replied that it comes from OCLC. Sheerin then inquired about local quality control over such information, and Miller replied that it is exercised in accord with rules widely used by professional librarians. Emery expressed dismay that the decision to stop adding to the card catalogue had been made in a way that confronts the faculty with a fait accompli; he urged that there should have been wider consultation with the faculty prior to such an important decision. Borelli asked whether the University Library Committee had been consulted, and Miller replied that it had. Emery pressed the point that there should have been wider consultation, and Miller said that he would have welcomed more input from the faculty. Kerby reported that members of the History Department had asked in October when the switch to UNlOC was to be made and had received no answer; he also stated that they had recommended against the change. Sheering argued that the fact that this important issue was not widely discussed by the faculty indicates that the
University Library Committee is not doing its job properly. He went on to urge that the university has to do more for the library and that faculty should put pressure on the university to this end. Emery warned against seeing the issue as pitting old-fashioned scholars against high-tech librarians. He also suggested that the real purpose of the switch was not to enhance library services but to cut costs. Miller retorted that he at least had never claimed that the new system would save money. He maintained that Notre Dame has not in general supported its libraries at the level customary in outstanding research institutions and expressed some frustration at working in a situation in which aspirations exceed potential resources. He added that he has recently sensed a stronger recognition of library needs among administrators and a new willingness to devote increased resources to them.

Borelli returned to the question of how major decisions such as the decision to stop adding to the card catalogue are and should be made. On the basis of his experience with government libraries, Kerby reported that they generally have had the money to computerize early and extensively; however, they have recently started reviving card catalogues. He suggested that it might be wise for Notre Dame to devote new library resources to keeping the card catalogue going. Miller replied that the card catalogue had been closed in such a way that it could be updated if it were discovered in five years that card catalogues are the wave of the future, but he confessed that he would be hard pressed to say now that keeping the card catalogue going ought to have a claim of the highest priority on new resources. Pec described briefly some of the expertise librarians have been acquiring and will acquire to enable them to do a good job of running an on-line catalogue.

Goerner mentioned a recent encounter with a member of the University Library Committee who appeared to be unaware that the issue of closing the card catalogue was even under consideration, and Emery asked what is to be done to insure wider faculty participation in major decisions involving library affairs. Miller promised to try to develop mechanisms to insure such participation but cautioned that his experience with trying to involve faculty in library affairs provides few grounds for optimism about the success of such efforts. Prof. Dino S. Cervigni concluded the discussion by observing that, though problems remain, the library situation now is substantially better than it has been in the past and stating that he looks forward to using the computerized catalogue.
Under New Business, Prof. Patrick E. Murphy moved a vote of thanks to Capt. John D. Rohrbough for outstanding service to the Faculty Senate. Rohrbough has served continuously in the senate since 1982 and has been a member of the Committee on Student Affairs throughout that period. He served two terms as Treasurer and ex officio member of the Executive Committee. This is his last Faculty Senate meeting. Borelli seconded the motion, and it was adopted by acclamation.

Adjournment was moved by Kerby and seconded by Borelli. The meeting adjourned at 9:48 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Frank J. Bonello, economics; Mario Borelli, mathematics; Paul F. Bosco, emeritus; Jacqueline L. Brogan, English; Dino S. Cervigni, modern/classical languages; Rev. Austin I. Collins, C.S.C.; Paul F. Conway, finance/business economics; JoAnn Della Neva, modern/classical languages; Jay P. Dolan, history; Kent Emery, program of liberal studies; Michael J. Etzel, marketing; William M. Fairley, earth science; Pamela R. Falkenberg, communications and theatre; Stephen M. Fallon, program of liberal studies; Richard W. Fessenden, chemistry; Thomas P. Flint, philosophy; Mohamed Gad-el Hak, aerospace/mechanical engineering; Edward A. Goerner, government and international studies; Eugene F. Gorski, C.S.C., theology; Sandra J. Harmatiuk, freshman year of studies; Robert L. Kerby, history; Alan Krieger, library; James A. McCarthy, emeritus; Dennis Moran, Review of Politics Michael H. Morris, accountancy; Patrick E. Murphy, marketing; Jean A. Pec, library; Ray M. Powell, accountancy; Philip Quinn, philosophy; Karamjot S. Rai, biological sciences; J. Keith Rigby, Jr., earth sciences; Capt. John D. Rohrbough, naval science; Howard J. Saz, biological sciences; William D. Shephard, physics; Daniel J. Sheerin, modern/classical languages; Anthony M. Trozzolo, chemistry; Robert A. Vacca, modern/classical languages; F. Ellen Weaver, theology; John H. Yoder, theology.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Panos Antsaklis, electrical engineering; John A. Halloran, finance and business economics; Robert G. Hayes, chemistry; Mark A. Herro, electrical engineering; Nai-Chien Huang, aerospace/mechanical engineering; Yih-Fang Huang, electrical engineering; Suzanne Kelly, institute for pastoral and social ministry; George Kolettis, mathematics; Steven W. Hurtt, architecture; Maria Rosa Olivera-Williams, modern/classical languages; F. Clark Power, program of liberal studies;
Walter Pratt, law.
MEMBERS ON LEAVE: Steven M. Bell, modern/classical languages; Andre Goddu, program of liberal studies; Donald Sporleder, architecture.

Respectfully submitted,

Philip L. Quinn, Co-Secretary
Dr. F. Ellen Weaver, chair of The Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and Prof. Eugene F. Gorski, C.S.C. offered a prayer. Weaver then asked if there were additions or corrections to the Journal for the November 10 meeting of the Senate. Prof. Jean A. Pec suggested a minor correction in a report of a discussion about the library card catalogue. There being no other additions or corrections, the Journal was approved as corrected.

Weaver next introduced Provost Timothy O'Meara, who said he would be happy to respond to questions from members of the senate.

Prof. Dennis Moran asked about the status of proposals to make changes in the academic calendar for the fall semester. O'Meara began his response by noting that there are exactly seven lunar configurations into which one can put an academic calendar for the fall. They are determined by the day of the week on which Christmas falls. Among the questions that must be addressed in choosing an academic calendar are the following: Is there to be a mid-semester break? If so, how long is it to be? How long is the Thanksgiving break to be? Should the semester begin after Labor Day? How many class days should there be? An additional complication is that students would like to see the faculty more involved in orientation. O'Meara stated that he has referred the question of the calendar for the fall semester to the Academic Council, which will discuss the pros and cons of the alternatives. Prof. Mario Borelli reported that the Mathematics Department had discussed the question of changing the calendar and suggested reducing the Thanksgiving break to Thanksgiving Day itself.

Prof. Ray M. Powell raised a question about the process for appeals of negative tenure or promotion decisions. He observed that there is the possibility of conflict of interest if deans or department chairs are involved in appointing committees to consider such appeals. He also asked about the number of appeals and the percentage of successful appeals in recent years. O'Meara noted that deans in fact do not appoint the committees to consider appeals. He went on to say that the appeals process is academic rather than legal. Appeals which are upheld are referred back to the originating department since the professional
judgment of its members must be respected. The appeals committee makes a recommendation to the Provost, who transmits it to the President along with his own independent recommendation. In recent years, O'Meara said, all cases in which his recommendation differed from that of the committee had involved either a disagreement on his part with the committee's reasoning or a separate investigation he had conducted. Powell pressed the point that people about whom an unsuccessful candidate might have complaints should not be involved in the appeals process. He asked whether the university's endowed chairholders or some such group might serve as a standing committee to consider such appeals. O'Meara replied that this idea could certainly be presented for discussion.

Prof. Paul F. Conway asked whether the Provost ever withholds information from a committee considering an appeal. In response, O'Meara noted that, in order to prevent frivolous appeals, a person making an appeal must begin the process by proposing a scenario under which some specific procedural error has occurred, and the committee is supposed to investigate the proposed scenario and may ask the Provost questions related to this scenario. O'Meara reported that he has in fact never refused to answer a committee's questions but also said that he can imagine possible cases in which he would be obliged to do so because a question was not related to the scenario under investigation.

Powell observed that the loss of able people through negative promotion or tenure decisions is a cost to the university and pointed out that concerns about promotion and tenure influence our ability to recruit new faculty. O'Meara replied that the cost of keeping unsuitable people for life is even higher. He agreed that there are financial reasons that make it particularly difficult to attract talented people away from business and into the academy. He insisted that appeals should not automatically result in reversals of negative decisions because this would create a bad climate in which people would believe that it is never worthwhile to oppose an appeal. He also observed that Notre Dame's retention rate at the tenure decision has been quite high in recent years, which is a result of both an increase in the quality of the junior faculty and the fact that more negative decisions have been made in recent years after the initial three-year contract.

Prof. Suzanne Kelly asked about future building plans and, specifically, about the priority assigned to constructing a new classroom building. After a brief review of the recent history of construction of academic
facilities at Notre Dame, O'Meara enumerated some of the projects under consideration for the future. They include a facility for earth and space sciences, graduate student housing and a building for the Kellogg and Peace institutes. O'Meara said that it is clear that we must have a new classroom building and that constructing it has top priority. However, it is an expensive project, with costs estimated in the range of $12-15 million, and so construction can be begun only when additional resources become available.

Prof. Philip L. Quinn asked about what Notre Dame could do to increase minority representation on its faculty. Noting that the numbers of members of minority groups receiving advanced degrees are very small in many academic disciplines, he also asked what Notre Dame can do to recruit minority graduate students now in order to increase the minority representation in applicant pools for faculty positions later. In reply, O'Meara noted that a report on minority affairs at Notre Dame has recently been completed. It has been studied by the administration and the trustees have been kept informed. Decisions have already been made about steps that will be taken to increase minority representation on the faculty and in the student body, and they will be publicly announced at appropriate times. O'Meara added that the steps that should be taken in response to this problem will differ from institution to institution and from one academic discipline to another. But he agreed with Quinn that there is a problem with getting minority candidates, particularly Blacks and Hispanics, into the pipeline for academic positions.

Borelli asked whether the stock market crash would have an impact on next year's budget. He also inquired about faculty salaries, specifically library faculty salaries for next year. O'Meara responded that the stock market crash would have little influence on the operating budget for next year because it did not have a large effect on income the university can spend. He reported that the budget process is proceeding in a particularly smooth fashion this year. The minimum salary for regular faculty will go from $29 thousand this year to $31 thousand next year. The effort to improve faculty salaries over the past several years has succeeded in a way that is matched or exceeded by few of Notre Dame's peer institutions. O'Meara acknowledged a need to improve library salaries, but he stated that teaching and research faculty will get somewhat larger salary increases than library faculty next year. Pec asked for the rationale for this difference. O'Meara answered that its purpose is to lock in the improvements in salaries for the teaching and research faculty before moving to other faculties.
Prof. Kent Emery asked about the potential for conflict in admissions policy between considerations of merit and commitments to helping to solve social problems. O'Meara responded that Notre Dame must both address social problems and promote intellectual excellence. He suggested that American Catholics had historically lagged in making intellectual contributions, and he offered the opinion that it is important for Notre Dame to engage in changing this culture.

Prof. Frank J. Bonello asked whether there is a movement to reduce class sizes in lecture courses. O'Meara responded that there is not a general policy of reducing the size of lecture classes but that there is pressure to do so in some particular cases. He added that additional resources are needed to improve instruction in writing, foreign languages, mathematics, and possibly economics.

Pec asked about plans to reorganize instruction in languages and literatures. In response, O'Meara said that there is a plan under discussion to organize language instruction in three groups: romance languages, Germanic and Slavic languages, and Classical and Oriental languages. He repeated that Notre Dame needs new resources to devote to languages and literatures. Pec asked about a timetable for changes in this area, and O'Meara replied that they will depend on when we get the resources to make them.

There being no more questions, the senate thanked Provost O'Meara with a round of applause.

Adjournment was moved by Pec and seconded by Quinn. The meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

Following adjournment, there was a formal presentation of the Bylaws of the Senate to the University Archives as part of the 20th anniversary celebration and an informal reception.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Panos Antsaklis, electrical engineering; Frank J. Bonello, economics; Mario Borelli, mathematics; Paul F. Bosco, emeritus; Jacqueline L. Brogan, English; Austin I. Collins, C.S.C., art; Paul F. Conway, finance/business economics; JoAnn Della Neva, modern/classical languages; Kent Emery, program of liberal studies; William M. Fairley, earth science; Pamela Falkenberg, communication/theatre; Stephen M. Fallon, program of liberal studies; Richard R. Fessenden, chemistry;
Thomas P. Flint, philosophy; Mohamed Gad-el-Hak, aerospace/mechanical engineering; Andre Goddu, program of liberal studies; Eugene F. Gorski, C.S.C., theology; Sandra J. Harmatiuk, freshman year of studies; Douglas R. Hemphill, military science; Nai-Chien Huang, aerospace/mechanical engineering; Suzanne Kelly, institute for pastoral and social ministry; Alan Krieger, library; James A. McCarthy, emeritus; Dennis Moran, Review of Politics; Michael H. Morris, accountancy; Patrick E. Murphy, marketing; Maria Rosa Olivera-Williams, modern/classical languages; Jean A. Pec, library; Ray M. Powell, accountancy; F. Clark Power, program of liberal studies; Walter Pratt, law; Philip Quinn, philosophy; William D. Shepard, physics; Daniel J. Sheerin, modern/classical languages; Donald E. Sporleder, architecture; Anthony M. Trozzolo, chemistry; F. Ellen Weaver, theology; John H. Yoder, theology.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Dino Cervigni, modern/classical languages; Michael J. Etzel, marketing; Edward A. Goerner, government and international studies; John A. Halloran, finance/business economics; Robert G. Hayes, chemistry; Mark A. Herro, electrical engineering; Yih-Fang Huang, electrical engineering; Robert L. Kerby, history; George Kolettis, mathematics; Karamjit S. Rai, biological sciences; Howard J. Saz, biological sciences; Robert A. Vacca, modern/classical languages.

MEMBERS ON LEAVE: Steven M. Bell, modern/classical languages; Jay P. Dolan, history.

Respectfully submitted,

Philip L. Quinn, Co-Secretary
Dr. Ellen Weaver, Chair of the Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 7:34 p.m. and Prof. JoAnn Della Neva offered the prayer. Prof. Raymond Powell moved approval of the Journal for December 9, 1987; Prof. Robert Kerby seconded the motion. The motion to approve was adopted by a voice vote.

Weaver reminded the senate of a motion tabled during the meeting of December 9, 1987, namely: the motion that the senate’s response to the C.S.C. "Statement on Higher Education" be a collection of all the comments made by any Senator, gathered and ordered without reviewing them for consistency or for how many Senators would support them. The motion was made by Prof. John Yoder and seconded by Kerby. It was tabled by a motion by Prof. Paul Conway.

Prof. Mario Borelli then moved that the motion be taken from the table, and Prof. Jean Pec seconded it. The motion was unanimously approved, and the floor was opened for discussion.

Prof. Jacqueline Brogan spoke in favor of the motion. Prof. Austin Collins, C.S.C. suggested that Prof. James Burtchaell, C.S.C. come to a senate meeting for the purpose of explaining and discussing the motion. Kerby commented that he opposed further delay in acting on the motion and supported the motion as taken from the table.

Weaver then requested the senate to vote on the motion originally made by Yoder and seconded by Kerby. It was passed with the following hand vote: twenty-seven (27) approved; seven (7) opposed; no abstentions. The senate’s response to the C.S.C. "Statement on Higher Education" was to be communicated to the Holy Cross Committee on Higher Education with a cover letter expressing the senate’s gratitude and commending the Congregation for its contributions to the University.

Weaver went on to make a report on the meeting of President Edward Malloy with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. The text of this report follows below:
We were invited by Fr. Malloy to a luncheon on the 26th of January. All members of the committee except Paul Conway, who had a class, were present. Fr. Malloy invited questions, and we asked them. He was pleasant and candid in his answers.

To the question about faculty representation on the Board of Trustees he said that it was up to the Board, but he had no objection. He said that up to now no clear request for such representation has been presented. He said that if he received such a request, and if he were sure it had the backing of a substantial consensus of the faculty at large, he would be willing to bring it to the Board.

To a question about the appeals procedure, he said that he personally would not be in favor of the kind of broad peer representation at the top level of decision which was proposed in the question. He pointed out that there is, however, considerable freedom at the college level to involve more faculty, and that some deans have formed committees for that purpose.

There was a good discussion about the general question of communication, of the image of "fog around the Dome." A specific example was the question of the classroom building. It was stated that despite the fact that faculty were asked for their input and it seemed plans were going forward, the perception of faculty is that all that input seems to have fallen into a black hole. Malloy laughed and said that as a matter of fact that is what has happened. He then explained at length that, because of funding problems, the project of a new classroom building was put on hold. However, now it has been moved to the front burner again, and he is going to be holding high level discussions on it very soon. He says that those involved in planning will consider all the recommendations that have been made. But also, Malloy feels strongly that wider faculty input is necessary. He says that they need to know all the various needs--Engineering and Science have needs very different from Arts and Letters and Business. We thanked him for his openness, and urged him to make this information known to all the faculty. Mario Borelli suggested a Newsletter from the Administration in which such items could be reported on.

Malloy also, in answer to a question, gave us a good report of what the various task forces are doing. By March of this year he expects to have recommendations and reports from all of them, which will be
public. Then it will be a matter of considering how to allocate budget according to the various recommendations.

All in all, it was a good exchange, and we had the impression that President Malloy is making a serious effort to know as much as possible about the various components of the University and to know as many of the people that make them up as possible. A new image of the President is emerging. My own conviction is that we have a president who is sincerely concerned about our concerns, and that we need to give him time to develop an organization which will facilitate his style of leadership which is considered, just, and collegial.

Weaver then asked for brief reports from the standing committees. Borelli, Chair of the Benefits Committee, moved that the senate poll the faculty on whether the benefits accorded to faculty children ought to be extended to faculty spouses; Prof. Andre Goddu seconded the motion. After some discussion, the motion was defeated by the following vote: twenty (20 approved; nine (9) opposed.

Prof. Dennis Moran, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, called upon Prof. Keith Rigby to make a report. Rigby informed the senate of the following procedure the University has agreed to put into effect:

all scholarly achievements to be published in the "Notre Dame Report" and the "Annual Report" are to be reported to one single source namely, the office of the Vice-President for Advanced Studies.

Prof. John Yoder, Chair of the Administration Committee, had no committee process to report.

Prof. Patrick Murphy, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee, made a report on a meeting he and his committee had with Daniel Gerlach, student representative on the University Honor Code Committee. Gerlach was of the opinion that students should play a major role in the formulation and implementation of the University Honesty Code.

Weaver requested the Senators to bring up items of new business. Brogan urged that the University take creative measures to hire minorities; she also suggested that a survey be taken in regards to salaries according to rank and department. Prof. Donald Sporleder suggested that a University Committee on Facilities be formed, such a committee would gather opinions from the faculty concerning the design and construction of new
University facilities. Prof. Edward Goerner commented that because there are so many University committees, it is difficult to discern whom they represent and what precisely they do. Weaver suggested that a survey of University committees be taken in order to coordinate and evaluate their work.

Adjournment was moved by Murphy and seconded by Borelli. The meeting adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Frank Bonello, economics; Mario Borelli, mathematics, Paul Bosco, emeritus; Jacqueline Brogan, English; Dino S. Cervigni, modern/classical languages; Austin Collins, C.S.C., art; Paul F. Conway, finance/business economics; JoAnn Della Neva, modern/classical languages; William Fairley, earth science; Stephen M. Fallon, program of liberal studies; Richard Fessenden, chemistry; Thomas P. Flint, philosophy; Mohamed Gad-el-Hak, aerospace/mechanical engineering; Andre Goddu, program of liberal studies; Edward A. Goerner, government and international studies; Eugene F. Gorski, C.S.C., theology; Douglas R. Hemphill, military science; Suzanne Kelly, institute for pastoral and social ministry; Robert L. Kerby, history; Alan Krieger, library; Dennis Moran, Review of Politics; Michael H. Morris, accountancy; Patrick E. Murphy, marketing; Maria Rosa Olivera-Williams, modern/classical languages; Jean A. Pec, library; Ray M. Powell, accountancy; F. Clark Power, program of liberal studies; Philip Quinn, philosophy; Karamjit S. Rai, biological sciences; J. Keith Rigby, Jr., earth sciences; William D. Shephard, physics; Daniel J. Sheerin, modern/classical languages; Donald E. Sporleder, architecture; F. Ellen Weaver, theology; John H. Yoder, theology.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Panos Antsaklis, electrical engineering; Kent Emery, program of liberal studies; Michael J. Etzel, marketing; Pamela Falkenberg, communication and theatre; John A. Halloran, finance and business economics; Sandra J. Harmatiuk, freshman year of studies, Robert G. Hayes, chemistry; Mark A. Herro, electrical engineering; Nai-Chien Huang, aerospace and mechanical engineering; Yih-Fang Huang, electrical engineering; George Kolettis, mathematics; James A. McCarthy, emeritus; Philip Quinn, philosophy; Howard J. Saz, biological sciences; Anthony M. Trozzolo, chemistry; Robert A. Vacca, modern and classical languages.
MEMBERS ON LEAVE: Steven M. Bell, modern and classical languages; Jay P. Dolan, history.

Respectfully submitted,

Eugene Gorski, C.S.C., Co-Secretary
Dr. F. Ellen Weaver, Chair of the Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m., and requested that a moment of silent prayer be observed.

Weaver began the Report of the Chair by announcing the birth of a child to Prof. JoAnn Della Neva and Prof. Thomas P. Flint, both of whom are senators. She then reported on progress with plans for the 20th anniversary celebration. A brochure is currently being prepared, and invitations to the banquet will soon be sent to all past and present members of the senate and to various officers of the University. Weaver concluded her report by announcing that in late March a slate of nominees will be drawn up for the May election of new officers of the senate. She called for suggestions for the slate from members of the senate and urged that consent to serve be obtained from a person before he or she is suggested.

Martin W. Rodgers, Student Recruitment Coordinator, who had been scheduled to address the senate at this point in the agenda, had not yet arrived, and so Weaver passed on to the next agenda item, which was faculty participation in governance. She began by providing some background information on the topic. There are two bodies involved in governance on which some favor increased representation either from the Senate or from the faculty generally; they are the Academic Council and the Board of Trustees. The chair of the senate is an ex officio member of the Academic Council and thereby a member of its Executive Committee. At present two senators are elected faculty representatives on the Academic Council, but there is nothing that guarantees senators will be among the eighteen faculty elected to the Academic Council. A resolution calling for an increase in guaranteed senate representation on the Academic Council would be in order; such a resolution could go directly from the senate to the Provost and President.

At present there is no guarantee of faculty representation on the Board of Trustees, but one regular member of the faculty, Prof. Thomas Blantz, serves as a Fellow in virtue of being a member of the C.S.C. community. When the senate Executive Committee had raised with President Malloy the
possibility of having elected faculty representatives on the Board of Trustees, he had expressed willingness to have a proposal for such representation brought before the Board of Trustees provided he had assurances that such a proposal had the support of a faculty consensus. Accordingly, a resolution on this topic should be preceded by a poll of the faculty at large to determine whether there is such a consensus.

Rodgers having arrived during Weaver's presentation of background information, consideration of faculty participation in governance was briefly suspended in order to allow him to address the senate. He spoke about Minority Visitation Weekend, which is scheduled for April 14-17. About 100 prospective students from all parts of the country are expected to visit the campus then, and it is hoped that this visit will help Notre Dame to break past minority recruitment records next year. There will be a Faculty Reception on April 15 from 4:00 to 5:30 p.m. in the Courtyard of the Snite Museum, and Rodgers urged all members of the senate to attend. Prof. Panos Antsaklis suggested that a letter be sent to department chairs asking them to send representatives to the reception. Rodgers replied that this is being done through meetings with deans and department chairs and that all faculty will receive letters of invitation to the reception.

Discussion of faculty participation in governance then began with a statement by Prof. Keith Rigby, Jr., to the effect that more faculty representation on both the Academic Council and the Board of Trustees seems desirable. The question that needs discussion, he said, is how this might be brought about. Prof. Michael Etzel suggested that faculty representatives could be elected to the Academic Council but that faculty representatives to the Board of Trustees would have to be appointed by the Fellows, perhaps from a slate elected by the faculty at large. Prof. John H. Yoder noted that there are elected faculty representatives on the Board's Committee on Faculty Affairs and suggested that this arrangement might serve as a precedent.

Prof. Jean A. Pec raised the possibility, which had been discussed by the senate executive committee, of having the chairs of the senate's four standing committees made ex officio members of the Academic Council. Prof. Robert L. Kerby argued that any additional senate representatives on the Academic Council should be elected. This would, he said, both serve to make the point that elections are desirable and feasible and increase the pool of those members of the senate eligible to represent it on the Academic Council.

Prof. Mario Borelli expressed approval of the idea of having some members
of the senate elected to the Academic Council. Pec interjected the caution that it might be difficult to find senators willing to stand for election. Prof. Edward A. Goerner observed that the size of the Academic Council has recently been cut in order to insure that a majority of its members are elected and raised the question of whether an increase in size would even be feasible at the present time. Borelli suggested that positions for senators might be reserved from among the slots for elected faculty, but Yoder expressed skepticism about whether senators have any special claim to being the faculty's representatives on the Academic Council. Yoder also expressed doubts, based on his own experience, about whether the Academic Council provides an effective means for faculty participation in governance.

Rigby pressed the question of the rationale for allocating positions from among the at-large elected faculty on the Academic Council to the senate, and Weaver replied that senators might be thought to be particularly well qualified to serve on the Academic Council because of their participation in the senate in discussions that cut across departmental and college lines. Noting that the Academic Council cannot discuss the budget, Goerner argued that the narrow charges of bodies on which faculty are permitted to serve often make those bodies ineffective ways of achieving genuine participation in governance. This portion of the discussion concluded with no action being taken.

Rigby remarked that the Board of Trustees is an exception to the strictures on effectiveness mentioned by previous speakers, and Borelli urged the senate to press for one or more elected faculty representatives on the Board. Pec observed that there are two questions concerning such representation: Does the senate favor it? and Does the faculty as a whole favor it? Prof. Philip L. Quinn suggested that a straw vote should first be taken to determine whether the senate favors there being such representation and that, if the senate does favor it, then a vote should be taken on whether to poll the faculty as a whole on the matter. The senate then voted by a show of hands on the general question of whether there should be elected faculty representatives on the Board of Trustees; the result was 26 in favor of the idea, one (1) opposed and three (3) abstentions.

Discussion then turned to the question of polling the faculty at large about the desirability of elected faculty representation on the Board of Trustees. Kerby argued that the faculty should be asked to express opinions about the proper length for the term of office of such representatives. He noted that it is important for the term of office to be long enough to permit the
representatives to become effective but short enough to insure that they remain responsive to their constituency.

It was moved by Rigby and seconded by Borelli that the faculty be polled on two questions:

1) whether there should be elected faculty representatives on the Board of Trustees, and

2) whether their terms should be one, three, six or some other number of years.

As a result of friendly amendments proposed by Kerby and Pec, which were accepted by the mover and seconder, the questionnaire would specify that only tenured faculty or, in those parts of the faculty not under the tenure system, the nearest equivalent rank are eligible for election. Antsaklis then raised the question of whether the questionnaire could usefully seek guidance from the faculty on any related matters. Pec suggested that it might be worthwhile to ask about how the slates for the election of representatives should be prepared. Borelli remarked that the senate and the several deaneries ought to have input on this question. Yoder then proposed that it be left to the senate's Committees on Administration and Academic Affairs to work out the details of the wording of the questionnaire. With this being understood, the senate adopted the motion by a voice vote with no dissent.

At this point Prof. William D. Shephard brought to the attention of the senate the fact that the term of office of trustees is specified as three years. Consequently, the senate reconsidered briefly the main question to be asked of the faculty at large. By a voice vote with no dissent, it was decided to ask the faculty whether it favors in principle having on the Board of Trustees faculty representatives, elected from the tenured ranks or the nearest equivalent, for renewable terms of three years.

Under New Business, Yoder made the following motion on behalf of the senate's Committees on Administration and Academic Affairs

MOVED. It is the sense of the senate that decisions on reappointment, promotion and tenure should be announced at least one month before the end of the spring term.

In seconding the motion, Borelli observed that the present late date for such announcements is a recent innovation. There being no further discussion, the motion was adopted by a voice vote with no dissent.
Next Yoder made and Prof. Dennis Moran seconded a motion concerning the
procedures for review of negative decisions on reappointment, promotion
or tenure. After a couple of friendly amendments that affected only the
wording of the motion had been made by Pec and Borelli and accepted by
the mover and seconder, the motion read as follows:

MOVED: Pursuant to the remarks of Provost O'Meara at the
senate meeting of January 20, 1988, it is the sense of the
senate that greater uniformity in the implementation of
the review procedures, as provided for in the Academic Articles,
Article III, Section 4, Subsection (e), is needed in the
several colleges. We urge the Provost to encourage
compliance by all the colleges.

In the brief discussion that followed, the point was made that the senate
should not now preclude the possibility of later proposing changes in the
grievance procedures that apply to decisions on reappointment, promotion
and tenure. In order to emphasize this point, it was moved and seconded
that the motion be amended by prefacing it with a statement to the effect
that, while the senate feels that changes should be made in grievance
procedures, it urges uniformity of compliance with present procedures for
the time being. It was quickly pointed out by Goerner that, if the
amendment were adopted and the amended motion passed, the senate would
go on record as thinking that changes in grievance procedures are needed.
Noting that the senate had not yet discussed the desirability of changing
the grievance procedures applicable to decisions on reappointment,
promotion and tenure, Kerby urged defeat of the amendment. The
amendment was thereupon rejected by voice vote with no dissent.

Without further discussion, the unamended motion was adopted by voice
vote with no dissent.

Borelli reported briefly on the response so far to two questionnaires he
had sent out to the faculty at large on behalf of senate committees. The
response rate on the questionnaire about committee service has been
approximately 50%, and the response rate on the questionnaire about
benefits has been approximately 25%. He urged members of the senate who
had not yet done so to return the completed benefits questionnaire.

Adjournment was moved by Borelli and seconded by Rigby. The meeting
adjourned at 8:40 p.m.
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Respectfully submitted,

Philip L. Quinn
Co-Secretary
Dr. F. Ellen Weaver, Chair of the Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and Prof. Eugene F. Gorski, C.S.C. offered a prayer.

Weaver asked if there were additions or corrections to the Journal for the January 20 meeting of the senate. Prof. Jean A. Pec suggested that the journal be corrected as follows: on page three, the second line of paragraph three should read: "Borelli also inquired about faculty salaries, specifically library faculty salaries for next year." The Journal of January 20 was approved as corrected. Weaver then asked for a motion to approve the Journals of February 4 and March 2. These Journals were approved.

Weaver next introduced the following new members of the senate: Arts and Letters: Kathleen A. Biddick, Frank J. Bonello, Leo A. Despres, Mark C. Plankington, Louis A. MacKenzie, Jr., William L. Peterson; Science: Harvey Bender, Mario Borelli, Bruce A. Bunker; Business Administration: Robert E. Miller, Michael J. Etzel; Library: Margaret Porter; Special Professionalist: Peter Lombardo; Emeritus: Charles E. Parnell. Engineering elections not as yet conducted. Weaver reminded the new senators that they would become voting members when the last item of New Business was reached, namely the election of officers for 1988-89. She reminded the senators whose term was expiring that they had the vote until the business of the year, up to the election of officers was concluded.

Weaver went on to make the following report from the chair: 1) In the name of the senate she sent flowers to Harriet Flowers on her birthday, and she received a note of thanks from her. 2) She sent a note to the Provost calling his attention to the motion passed at the meeting of March 2 relative to uniformity in implementation of the Review Procedures. 3) She wrote a note to Fr. Bartell, chair of the C.S.C. Committee to Draft the Statement on Higher Education, thanking the Committee for sharing the statement with the senate and advising that a report would be forthcoming. 4) She extended personal thanks to the members of the Executive Committee for their work and support during the year. She also extended thanks on behalf of the Executive Committee to all the senators for their contributions.

Weaver turned to the report of the Committees. Prof. Mario Borelli, chair of the Committee on Benefits, stated that the responses made to the survey on the faculty's perception of the status of benefits were being tabulated, and that the results would be communicated in a future report. Borelli then reported on the
report of the Ad-Hoc Committee on University Boards and Committees. He suggested that if any senators were interested in a further analysis of the report, they should concentrate on those items where the responses were contradictory. Borelli also commented on the report concerning “Future Prospectives for Health Benefits and Other Benefits at the University.” This report was compiled from remarks made by Mr. Roger Mullins, Director of the Human Resources Department. Borelli moved that the senate go on record as appreciating Mullin's openness and his sharing information with the senate. The motion was seconded, and it was carried unanimously.

Weaver then called on Prof. John Yoder to report for both the Committee on Academic Affairs and the Committee on Administration. Yoder in turn asked Prof. Phil Quinn to make the following motion which he had proposed and written:

RESOLVED: 1) It is the sense of the senate that the recommendation of the Task Force on Teaching (Notre Dame Report, Special Issue of April 8, 1988, “Report of Task Force on Teaching,” p. 10) that several senior faculty be added to the Provost's Advisory Committee should be promptly implemented; 2) Upon adoption by the senate, a copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to the Provost.

After Quinn spoke in favor of the motion, it was seconded, and accepted unanimously by the senate.

Yoder then made the following motion:

Whereas President Malloy, in his conversation with the Senate Executive Committee on January 26, 1988, expressed openness to the possibility, of direct faculty representation on the University Board of Trustees, and

Whereas a polling of the faculty indicated strong support for the motion.

The Senate

a) resolves that it would be desirable that there be on the Board of Trustees members of the faculty, tenured or of equivalent rank, elected at large by the faculty;

b) requests that President Edward Malloy, C.S.C. forward this request to the Board of Trustees;

c) authorizes its Executive Committee to negotiate further the details of implementation.
The motion was seconded, and then accepted unanimously by the senate.

Prof. Patrick Murphy, chair of the Committee on Student Affairs, reported that four separate subcommittees were working on issues like: continuation of the Hall Fellows Program; classroom space; social space for interaction of faculty and students; faculty involvement in the Freshman Orientation Program. Reports from these subcommittees are forthcoming.

Under New Business, Prof. Paul Conway made the following motion in order to reinforce and implement a parallel motion made and accepted during the meeting of March 2:

Moved further. It is the sense of the senate that a date one month prior to the end of the academic term be established and recorded in the University Calendar for the announcement of decisions on reappointment, promotion and tenure.

Yoder seconded the motion, and it was adopted unanimously by the senate.

Weaver then asked Borelli to conduct the elections of Faculty Senate Officers for 1988-89. Before proceeding to the elections, Borelli made a motion that the senate express gratitude to Weaver for her work as Chair. The motion was seconded, and it was accepted unanimously by the senate.

The results of the elections are as follows:

Chair: F. Ellen Weaver
Vice-Chair: Dennis Moran
Co-Secretaries: Eugene F. Gorski, C.S.C and Peter Lombardo
Treasurer: Paul F. Conway
Chair, Committee on Academic Affairs: Kathleen Biddick
Chair, Committee on Administration: Philip Quinn
Chair, Committee on Benefits: JoAnn Della Neva
Chair, Committee on Student Affairs: Mario Borelli

Adjournment was moved by Borelli and seconded by Yoder. The meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Members present: Steven M. Bell, modern & classical languages; Kathleen A. Biddick, history; Frank J. Bonello, economics; Mario Borelli, mathematics; Paul F. Bosco, emeritus; Jacqueline L. Brogan, English; Bruce A. Bunker, physics; Rev. Austin L. Collins, C.S.C., art; Paul F. Conway, finance/business economics; JoAnn Della Neva,
modern/classical languages; Leo A. Despres, anthropology; Kent Emery, program of liberal studies; Michael J. Etzel, marketing; Pamela R. Falkenberg, comm/theatre; Stephen M. Fallon, program of liberal studies; Thomas P. Flint, philosophy; Mohamed Gad-el-Hak, aero/mech. engineering; Andre Goddu, program of liberal studies; Edward A. Goerner, government & international studies; Eugene F. Gorski, C.S.C., theology; Sandra J. Harmatjuk, freshman year of studies; Robert G. Hayes, chemistry; Douglas R. Hemphill, ROTC; Suzanne Kelly, Institute for Pastoral and social ministry; Robert L. Kerby, history; Alan Krieger, library; Peter J. Lombardo, CCE; Louis A. MacKenzie, Jr., modern/classical languages; Robert E. Miller, management; Dennis Moran, “Review of Politics;” Michael H. Morris, accountancy; Charles E. Parnell, emeritus; Jean A. Pec, library; William L. Petersen, theology; Mark C. Pilkinton, comm/theatre; G. Margaret Porter, library; F. Clark Power, program of liberal studies; Walter Pratt, law; Phillip Quinn, philosophy; William D. Shephard, physics; Donald E. Sporleder, architecture; F. Ellen Weaver, theology; John H. Yoder, theology.

Members on Leave: Jay P. Dolan, history.

Respectfully submitted,

Eugene F. Gorski, C.S.C.
Secretary