

University of Notre Dame
Faculty Senate
Meeting of November 5, 2003

Attendance will be added to the final approved version of the minutes, They were not available at the time I put the information packet together.

Minutes of October 14, 2003 were approved with one correction to the attendance record.

Presentation by Jennifer Younger the Director of the University Libraries: Dr. Younger addressed four questions presented by the Senate.

1. How is the library budget currently allocated? Dr. Younger provided spreadsheets enumerating the major components of the library budget. The 2003/2004 budget allocates 51% of the library budget to salaries and 39% to acquisitions. These figures are in line with most libraries of peer institutions. Allocations to colleges and departments for acquisitions of serials and monographs were determined in the 1970's and have remained proportional since that time. Dr. Younger provided a spreadsheet with information on library allocations by college.
2. What is the outlook for costs and resources in the future? The future is grim at this time. The libraries experienced a flat budget in 2002/2003, and a 5% decrease for 2003/2004. Inflation for serials prices is expected to be in the 10-12% range. Inflation for domestic monographs will be roughly 5% and inflation for international monographs is predicted to be around 8%. A decrease in purchasing power is inevitable. Shortfalls thus far have been covered by ad hoc money provided by the provost. Dr. Younger provided a graph comparing the Consumer Price Index to serials and monographs costs and purchases.
3. What is the library's strategic plan? Dr. Younger provided an overview of the strategic plan for the libraries. Major areas include 1) facilitating learning and teaching; 2) being a center for research and scholarship; 3) providing an intellectual commons; and 4) fostering a creative and knowledgeable organization. Strategies for managing the budget include leveraging buying power through consortial agreements, canceling paper versions of journals received in electronic form, purchasing trade bound monographs instead of hardbound, and engaging in cooperative collection development endeavors with other Indiana libraries.
4. What is the current process for deciding what is purchased and what isn't? There are currently 41 separate subject funds. Expenditures for serials and books purchased through the approval plan take primacy within each subject area. Money that is left over after these materials are paid for is typically used to purchase other monographic materials. Selectors have the option of canceling journal subscriptions to free up more funds for the purchase of monographs. Subscriptions to "Big 5" journal publishing packages limit options for

cancellation of many titles. Use statistics for electronic journals are readily available now, so the evaluation of journal costs and values will play a larger role in selection in the future. Faculty input on journal and book selection is welcomed and the library will re-double its efforts to gather this information.

Dr. Younger finished her presentation by making some comments on the system of scholarly communication. An article from the Chronicle of Higher Education and information on the University of California's negotiations with Elsevier were distributed to the Senate.

Questions and comments: Dr. Younger was asked about archiving of electronic journals, the lack of ephemera in some electronic journals, plans for a new library building, and how the library plans to deal with the "Big 5" packages in the future. A request that faculty have more advance notice regarding cancellations was also made.

New Business - Election of new Faculty Senate Chair - Due to illness, John Robinson is stepping down as Chair of the Faculty Senate. A call was made for volunteers to take this position, and one person – Jacqueline Brogan – has stepped forward. There were no other volunteers at the time of this meeting. Because Senator Brogan was not in attendance at this meeting, Senator Seth Brown moved to table the election of the new Chair until the next Senate meeting which Jeremy Fein (Senate Vice-Chair) will Chair. Motion was approved unanimously.

There were no committee meetings or reports. The meeting was adjourned at 8:55.

Faculty Senate Meeting
March 2, 2004

Present: Amitava Dutt, Barry Keating, BenGiamo, Cheryl Smith, Chris Waller, David Ladouceur, Edmund Goehring, Edmundo Corona, Elizabeth Moore, Jay Brandenberger, John Robinson, Joni Kanzler, Karen Richman, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Paula Higgins, Richard Williams, Seth Brown, Steve Buechler, Tom Laughner, Tom Anderson, Vera Profit, William Ramsey, Xioshan Yang, Al Miller, Jack Laskowitz (Undergraduate Student rep), Jacque Brogan, Jean Dibble, John Stamper, Norlin Rueschhoff, Patrick Flynn, Ramzi Bualuan, Umesh Garg, Belinda Byrne, Remie Constable, Peter Moody, Quing Han,

Absent: James Shelton, Christine Becker, Dean Porter, Tom Merluzzi, Martin Tenniswood, Oliver Collins, Peter Moody,

Excused: Donald Sporleder, Jeremy Fein, Paul Conway

The minutes of the February 3 faculty senate meeting were approved.

Chairman Brown presented his report (See attached).

Chairman Brown welcomed Provost Hatch to the senate. The chair briefly summarized the questions the faculty sent to Provost Hatch, including concerns about institutional culture, faculty governance, allocation of resources, library funding, the consequences of the break-up of the economics department, including its impact on other departments and the impact of the development of centers of excellence on continued support for departments (See attached letter of February 23, 2004 from Seth Brown to Nathan Hatch).

Provost Hatched addressed the senate in formal remarks (see attached) and then solicited the senators' questions.

Professor Brogan opened the question-and-answer session by voicing her concern about how student evaluations figure in the determination of merit raises in her department.

Provost Hatch responded that we need a more fullsome process for evaluating teaching, and that that is one of Professor Hahn's goals in the Kaneb Center.

She next questioned how faculty in the different colleges are awarded raises.

Provost Hatch explained that the pools for raises are equally distributed, but that how they are allocated varies by college and department.

Professor Brogan also inquired about consideration of publication in online journals for promotion and tenure.

Provost Hatch acknowledged that the evaluation process is complicated, the university doesn't want to be prescriptive, and wants faculty to try to publish in the

best places.

Professor Williams asked a question regarding faculty input on re-appointment of deans and administrators. How much value does faculty input have? For example, why might an administrator be reappointed before results from a faculty survey are complete? Or why might another administrator be reappointed in spite of a survey revealing faculty approval of less than fifty percent?

Provost Hatch responded that an administrative reappointment should not precede the conclusion of the review committee. Secondly the committee's conclusions are not the result of the faculty survey alone but also the result of extensive discussions.

Professor Goehring articulated his appreciation of the Provost's language at the beginning of his presentation about needing to keep certain forces in balance and in tension. He questioned, however, whether those tensions are holding or have snapped in the wake of such recent events as the elimination of the Arts and Letters Core Course and the allocation of merit pay. He suggested that if the amount for annual salary increases is very limited, its allocation as merit pay undermines morale and a sense of community. Faculty deserve cost of living raises. Merit increases should only therefore be distributed if there are additional funds.

Provost Hatch responded that giving everyone the same raise regardless of performance can be demoralizing as well. High performers should be rewarded over time.

Professor Higgins followed with a comment about the dismal state of academic publishing, which is preventing many of our colleagues from getting their books published. She described a letter by the editor of Harvard University Press which recently appeared in the Chronicle of Higher Education. She characterized the letter as a plea to academics to stop the tenure book publishing mania and focus instead on pithy articles. Professor Higgins asked whether the Provost's Advisory Committee is taking the current state of book publishing into consideration in tenure decisions.

Provost Hatch answered that he could not recall any cases where someone coming up for tenure or promotion had an outstanding manuscript that could not find a publisher. The Committee's practice in any case is to ask for reviews of the manuscript so they have ways to assess its qualities. He further mentioned that standards vary by discipline, such that some scholars make their reputation by articles as did his senior professor at Princeton. He nonetheless noted that it is as possible to write articles that don't make any difference as it is to crank out insignificant books. The main question is how important is the book and how much it contributes to the field. We need have to have ways to measure scholarship.

Professor Anderson reiterated the difficulty junior faculty face today trying to get

top presses to accept their manuscripts. He also described recent communications of the Modern Language Association calling for a reconsideration of the evaluation of book publication in tenure and promotion.

Professors Higgins and Smith both urged Notre Dame to take the lead, rather than follow comparable universities' practices, in reconsidering the role of book publication in tenure and promotion.

Professor Miller applauded Notre Dame's expansion of graduate education and research but expressed concern about the resulting creation of a two-tiered society within departments. He questioned whether the new rules governing the distribution of grant resources, which returns overhead funds to the school and the department along with the investigator fosters the separation between those who do research and those who don't.

Provost Hatch responded that such distribution is standard in universities and that Notre Dame's earlier practice was out of the norm. He characterized the practice as an effective way to build a research infrastructure around the particular activity. The grant money has the potential to enhance not only the researcher but also the college.

Recalling previous hostility between faculty and administration, Professor Brogan thanked the Provost for his willingness to ask for and listen to the concerns of the faculty senate tonight.

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs Committee

The report of the Academic Affairs Committee was presented by Professor Brogan.

In response to the students' desire for tce's to be made public in the format faculty receive them, the committee voted "no." The committee recommends that strict numbers without percentile be released. The committee suggests that members ask their departmental colleagues for input. The committee is considering preparing a survey to distribute to the faculty. The committee will also pursue the issue of tce's in promotion and tenure.

Student Affairs Committee

The Student Affairs Committee's report was given by Professor Brandenberger. Student Affairs met with Academic Affairs. They will continue to collect information to give to Professor Buechler's committee at the Academic Council. (He can be reached at Steve@nd.edu.) Professor Brandenberger reiterated that we are all concerned that about the use of the tce.

Chairperson Brown said that in the normal course of events there would be a resolution at the faculty senate meeting to vote on the tce's.

Professor Miller asked if anyone has looked into the legality of publishing confidential information. He expressed concern about the paradigm being used to set up tce's at Notre Dame.

Professor Brandenberger envisions the discussion at the April meeting to be informational rather than for the purpose of voting on the tce issue.

Chairperson Brown stated that the senate could also vote to table the decision.

Administrative Affairs Committee

Professor Higgins spoke for the Administrative Affairs Committee

The Committee questioned Carol Mooney about the letter that goes out to reviewers. The Committee's recommendations resulted in changes in the wording of the question of whether on research alone the person would get tenure. One good thing that came out of the meeting was Carol Mooney's willingness to propose to the PAC that to be fairer to the candidate, the Committee be informed as to whether the letter-writers were the candidate's choices or were chosen by objective criteria. Vice-Provost Mooney was helpful in clarifying the process of tenure and promotion and thus reducing our anxiety. The Committee asked further if the University would consider having the department inform the candidate about its decision earlier in the process. Her response was that it was unlikely to happen. Chairperson Brown added that the information about what is in the letter is public.

Benefits Committee

Professor Nasir reported on the activity of the Benefits Committee. The Benefits Committee is in the process of meeting with Human Resources in order to find a way to implement new spending accounts for health care. Next on their agenda is retirees' saving accounts for health care purposes. They are also planning to meet with Jeff Cantor about contributions to TIAA-CREF for summer pay.

Chair's Report
March 2, 2004

I am pleased to welcome Provost Nathan Hatch to the Faculty Senate tonight, and so in order to give us as much time for the very important discussion with him, I will keep my opening remarks brief. This is an exciting time for the University as we try to reach very ambitious goals in this first decade of the twenty-first century. But there are many concerns about the road we are taking to reach those goals. For example, the university is committed to increasing its focus on research and graduate education. Few would argue with the notion that we should always be striving to enhance the quality of the scholarship undertaken at the university. But how will the university support faculty in trying to reach those goals? Will we become so focused on large capital projects and interdisciplinary, "cutting-edge" institutes that we neglect to support the roots that nourish our academic enterprise: adequate compensation for faculty; stipends and health insurance for graduate students; and the many small items that underly a first-class educational experience for undergraduates. What of support for the library, whose collections are vital for research and which are currently in a state of siege?

Furthermore, as we move forward, what costs are we willing to pay? Notre Dame has historically prided itself on providing a premier undergraduate education. What happens when that interest comes into conflict with our new focus on graduate education and research? How can we be fair to faculty who may have come to the university with expectations rather divergent from the direction it is now taking? Will our yearning for research superstars create a two-tiered faculty, to the detriment of collegiality?

Finally, what should the role of faculty be in guiding the university? Clearly, the motive force behind progress in research and education must rest with the individual faculty members. But will our pursuit of the bottom line—improved rankings in various surveys, for example—make our governance more corporate, with institutional decisions made by relatively few? Can faculty play a more vigorous role in steering the future of the university, and if so, how?

These are among the many concerns about the present and future of Notre Dame that you voiced to me, and that I forwarded to the Provost. They are issues about which a constructive dialogue between faculty and administration is absolutely crucial if the university is to improve itself while staying true to its core values. This discussion tonight will, I hope, help to advance this dialogue.

Seth Brown
Chair, Faculty Senate
March 2, 2004

Let me begin by thanking Seth Brown for stepping in to chair the Faculty Senate this year. I also want to express my deep appreciation to all of you for your service on behalf of your colleagues and for all you are doing for the common good of the University.

As we pursue stated goals of becoming a top-tier research university, how will we manage the conflicts that will arise between this and our "old" identity as a mission-driven, quality undergraduate institution?

“Fulfilling the Promise” sustains and advances a bold experiment: to build the first great non-secular university in the modern world, one that seeks to integrate faith and reason, teaching and research, achievement and service, Catholic identity and increasing diversity. Toward this end, the University has set its sights to advance in four distinct areas, each of which extends vital elements in Notre Dame’s storied tradition. We aspire to sustain premier undergraduate education, to advance the research potential of the university, to strengthen the University’s Catholic identity, and to enhance diversity and internationalism.

Our goal is to strengthen the core, to build upon the rich tradition of building the first truly great Catholic University in the modern world, the vision that Father Hesburgh began to articulate fifty years ago. There are no radical departures here. It is easy enough to identify these core ideals, to raise the banner and salute; the harder challenge is to translate them into concrete practice, to ensure a level of quality we have not known before.

If Notre Dame is to fulfill its promise as a Catholic university of genuine renown, it must be an institution that advances on multiple fronts. We aspire to be an institution known for creative teaching *and* for premier research. We expect a new urgency for the centrality of research *and* for the application of scholarship to the world’s most pressing problems. We hope to make tough judgments about academic quality *and* at the same time sustain a generous and accommodating academic community. We expect disciplinary expertise *and* a concern for broader, integrative questions. And we hope to become more diverse *and* more solidly Catholic.

Our great and distinctive challenge is a move forward on these different fronts. Holding together these multiple aims—and living with the resulting creative tensions—is our calling.

How do we go about this challenging task? Let me suggest three points of reference:

1. We are building on a long tradition, a community of learning with great tradition and momentum. We respect those traditions, and hope to sustain a level of community life that treats everyone with dignity and respect. We need persons of great talent and expertise; but also persons committed to the common good.
2. We cannot assume that goals are inversely relational. We must underscore teaching and research, religious mission and diversity, the ivory tower and service to society.
3. We need to foster a greater sense of the complexity of the University and of its dreams.

As the standards for faculty promotion and tenure change in response to changing goals, are these changes communicated effectively to the faculty?

It is important to note that our stated standards have not changed; we have long espoused standards comparable to those at the leading research universities in the country—as the Faculty Handbook says, “outstanding teaching, notable achievement in scholarship.”

Yet we are an evolving university and as departments and colleges improve, they do come to have expectations for what these standards mean in practice. We do attempt to communicate these standards in a number of ways. 1) At the retreat for new faculty we devote one session to the issue of balancing commitments to research and teaching. 2) I think our deans in the last five years have also pushed hard for clarity at the department level for what is expected; and we are far more consistent than ever before in chairs having annual evaluation sessions with junior faculty. At every level, we are certainly open to better ways to communicate these standards; and more effective ways to evaluate the quality of teaching, scholarship, and service.

3) The Provost’s Advisory Committee has become an excellent arbiter of standards and fairness for the university. In the last few years, that body consistently advises deans about the danger of allowing junior faculty to accumulate too much service in their early years.

What support will the university offer individuals to help achieve institutional goals?

I have always been a firm believer that a University should match high expectations with ample faculty support. In the mid 1980s, I was the founding director of the Institute for Scholarship in the Liberal Arts, whose goal was nothing other than finding support for Arts and Letters faculty and the projects which they envisioned. One reason that Notre Dame ranks among the very top universities in NEH fellowships is that we require external grant applications for research leaves; but also provide good assistance in writing and clarifying these grants.

Similarly, the University has attempted to provide robust support laboratories in science and engineering—with ample capitalization packages, with leaves of absence, and with the commitment to cover the full cost of tuition for graduate students. The recent decision to return a portion of indirect costs to principal investigators, as well as the colleges and departments, is an additional means of support.

In business and law, faculty have come to enjoy discretionary accounts for research and other professional expenses. Arts and Letters has greatly increased start-up packages for faculty, particularly in the social sciences and all faculty have been provided pro-card accounts for incidental professional expenses.

On another front, the Kaneb Center for Teaching and Learning is helping many faculty and departments hone their classroom and laboratory skills.

Is the corporate model for running the university, including large salary disparities between administration and faculty, compatible with our identity as a Catholic university committed to justice, collegiality, and morale?

Our goal is to build a Catholic university and to sustain a culture and form of administration appropriate to higher education in the Catholic tradition. It is important for us to find the right balance between efficient use of our resources and retention of our ability to feel like a small university that welcomes personal contact and a sense of community. We do not want to become overly bureaucratic, yet we need to be fiscally responsible.

My predecessor as Provost was a distinguished Mathematician, Tim O'Meara. His great passion was to build a faculty of distinction at Notre Dame. Finding salaries at Notre Dame decidedly below market across the board, he determined that he could never recruit talent to Notre Dame unless we developed a competitive salary structure. And starting in the 1980s he set the target of being in the top ten percent of AAUP institutions.

What such benchmarking also implied was that salaries by college and department would be established not just by internal reference; but by external comparisons. Hiring an historian or philosopher would be different than hiring a finance or a law professor.

In recent years, the committee of the Trustees that oversees compensation of senior officers of the University has done very careful benchmarking with other universities in keeping with a goal that Notre Dame have competitive compensation for deans and University officers.

I know many faculty and administrators that have come to Notre Dame for mission reasons; but I have never heard anyone suggest that the University should offer them less compensation that they could rightfully earn at Stanford, Vanderbilt, or the University of Michigan.

How can we better assess teaching, so that the TCE's are not torn between their roles as an aid to improving teaching and a potentially punitive role in assessing faculty performance?

In 1999 an Academic Council committee chaired by John Affleck-Graves produced, and the Council passed, a document "Evaluating Teaching at Notre Dame." This report was a forthright attempt to evaluate teaching more closely to student learning and to move beyond relying solely on TCEs for teaching evaluation. At the heart of the document was a set of three questions:

1. Are the learning objectives of the course being met?
2. Are the course materials, concepts, and activities rigorous, current, and relevant?
3. Do students perceive themselves to be well taught?

In the five years since this report, the University has attempted to move on several fronts to foster more fulsome evaluation of teaching. The PAC, which sees teaching evaluations from all departments, offers advice to the deans on best practices and notes when too much burden is placed on TCEs.

More recently, Alex Hahn has made evaluating teaching a central priority of the Kaneb Center. Last spring he sponsored a very effective panel on the subject which was repeated at the retreat for Chairs and Deans in August. Several of our departments evaluate teaching superbly with multiple measures and significant engagement. Our goal is to make these practices more consistent across the University.

2. Faculty governance.

How can the university improve the often difficult communication between faculty and administration, in both directions?

Address and Remarks from Provost Hatch
March 2, 2004

Improving communication between administration and faculty involves building ties of trust day by day, month by month, year by year. Administrators must be willing to listen, to hear bad news as well as good. They must be willing to explain the framework for complex decisions and invite appropriate input as priorities are set. This is an ongoing process needing constant attention.

From my perspective, one key ingredient is finding administrators at every level—dean, department chair, associate provost, or whatever—who manifest these qualities. We enjoy a very talented set of deans currently and overall the quality of communication in our respective colleges has improved over the last decade.

An example of this was our strategic plan, which for the first time started at the department level and percolated up. This process itself involved faculty as never before in defining the strategic direction of the university.

Communication between faculty and administration has also been improved by the restructuring of the Provost's Advisory Council a decade ago. More recently, the restructuring of the Faculty Senate and the Academic Council has greatly assisted the quality of communication.

Is the administration open to increasing faculty empowerment by, for example, having meaningful faculty votes for respective college Deans and other administrators?

Notre Dame's system of appointing deans involves the election of faculty committees to a committee chaired by the Provost. A Dean's review is performed by a similarly elected committee that presents its report to the Provost and President. I have chaired a number of these committees and am convinced it is a process that works superbly, balancing the interests of faculty in a given college with those of the overall leadership needs of the University. Most quality private universities use similar processes, although at places like Harvard, Yale, and Stanford the President makes appointments with less faculty input than at Notre Dame.

I think requiring a faculty vote for deans would hamper attempts to recruit the most qualified candidates for these positions. Similarly, I do not think careful review can be done en masse. Without question, senior administration has to read carefully prevailing viewpoints among faculty; and respond appropriately.

How can the interface between Centers and Institutes on the one hand and academic departments on the other be changed to improve opportunities for recruiting excellent faculty who would be attracted to an Institute but are not readily housed in a department?

In the last year the Provost's Advisory Council has devoted two sessions to discussing whether the appointment of tenure-track faculty should be expanded beyond academic departments to include centers and institutes. Overall, the faculty and the deans are very cautious to do so. They are concerned about quality-control of appointments outside normal disciplinary boundaries.

What they did support was the idea of certain endowed chairs being appointed outside of departments. Carol Mooney is now working on such a proposal for the academic council.

3. Allocation of resources.

While the university's building and facilities expansion remains robust, financial commitment to personnel is less so. Faculty and staff raises are persistently small; raises are unevenly distributed, so some faculty's salaries (notably those of foreign language instructors) remain disproportionately low; and graduate student support, including stipend amounts, medical benefits, and number of students supported, is stagnant. How is the university addressing the financial support of its people?

The University remains fully committed to meeting the needs of all of faculty and staff, who are our most valuable resource. Thus, when the University had to cut budgets for this year—by 5% for academic units, 7 to 8% for business units—the officers made the decision not to lay off personnel and to build in modest salary increases for faculty and staff. Similarly, the budget for next year is quite constrained but also includes a modest salary increase. The last 3 years have seen pressure on faculty salaries, but we retain our firm commitment to maintaining faculty salaries in the top quintile of AAUP universities. We are currently at the 12th percentile across the entire University. We are not complacent about this but note that we are still well within our target. We continue to monitor this carefully, both at the overall University level and within each

rank. The University does not think that a policy of maintaining market competitive salaries is counter to our identity as a Catholic University.

4. Library.

A particular area of concern about finances is the Library collections, because of their impact on all areas of research and teaching. Why do funds continue to be so limited? Is there a plan for future, sufficient support? How can we make sure that all stakeholders are maximally satisfied with the way the (limited) money is being spent? What steps to encourage sustainable publishing practices, such as appropriate crediting of online publications in tenure and promotion, is the university taking?

The Library is a concern to all on campus. Double digit inflation for over a decade has placed stress on budgets in all Universities (see almost any issue of the Chronicle over the past 6 months.) Over the last decade library funding has been enhanced substantially, growing from \$9 million in 1993 to over \$19 million in 2003. This rise of 114% was higher than the increase in any other aspect of the Academy over the decade and contrasts with a less than 30% increase in the CPI.

Last year and this, the library was constrained by the overall 5% reduction; and by a reduction of endowment payout. Library inflation is also a major issue and we are struggling to find a feasible solution, as are all major University Libraries. The cost of the big five commercially-published e-journal packages, including Elsevier's Science Direct is \$1.8 million. For next year, those costs will rise by over \$200,000. We have tried to respond as responsibly as possible. In the past two years the Provost's Office has made significant transfers to assist the Library.

Addressing this problem will require careful thought by all in our community. I am recommending to the President that he appoint a University-wide task force to consider options and propose directions for the future. I want to stress, however, that there is no simple solution. The budget is tight and any increase in Library funding will have to come from other sources. We also need to ensure that we employ our existing funds in the most beneficial fashion. We greatly appreciate the help of the Colleges in working with the Library faculty to find areas of potential

reductions. Finally we need to recognize the importance of books to the humanities and make sure that proper investment is made in that sector.

Looking back.

One year later, what is your impression of the outcome of the breakup of the economics department? What impact has it had on the departments, and what lessons has it taught the university as a whole?

It is too soon to make any judgments but we are very encouraged that both departments are making good progress and we will continue to support both. Mark Roche asked Associate Dean Greg Sterling, who has good credibility with both departments, to serve as an intermediary during this year to ensure that both departments and their common undergraduate program could prosper. The relationship between the departments has been civil and both have been allowed to pursue their respective agendas. Greg Sterling's assessment is that things have worked out as well as we might have hoped, not ideal, but better than they were before.

What lessons has the University learned? This situation was highly exceptional and should be avoided if at all possible. Yet the process does represent a healthy example of faculty governance as this body and the Academic Council carefully worked through the very complex set of issues set before them.

What about the impact of the development of "centers of excellence" in your tenure as Provost? How have they been assessed, and what impact have they had on support for departments' operations?

Centers of Excellence are essential in attracting the best faculty to an emerging university; and in building the institution's overall reputation. Many of our centers of excellence are embedded within departments: We have great strength, for instance, in nuclear physics, or organic chemistry, or tropical disease and environmental research in biology, or political theory, or philosophy of religion, or market microstructure in finance, or marketing and public policy.

We also have an array of institutes and centers, some of which have become very powerful centers of excellence. The Medieval Institute has emerged as the best interdisciplinary center of its kind in North America; the Kellogg Institute has made us a major player in Latin American studies; the Center for Nano Science and Technology brings together numerous scholars from several departments in an area of critical importance; as does the Walther Cancer Center and the Center for Transgene Research.

The twofold value of such centers and institutes for departments is enhancing the ability to recruit distinguished faculty; and enabling groups of faculty to address research topics in an interdisciplinary or multi-disciplinary perspective.

Moving forward I think we have to pay special attention to the improvement of core departments.

**Faculty Senate Meeting
April 14, 2004**

The minutes of the March 2, 2004 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved.

Chairman Brown presented his report (see attached).

The treasurer's report was presented by Professor Rueschhoff (see attached).

The following amendments to the bylaws of the Faculty Senate were proposed and approved.

1. Representation for Research Faculty, Article III, Membership in the Senate, Section 1, Distribution
2. Changes in Election Procedure, Article I, Officers of the Senate and Article III, Membership in the Senate, Section 2, Elections
3. Role of the Vice Chair and Procedures for Filling Vacancies among Officers During the Academic Year (See Attached).

The Chair expressed thanks to Professor Buechler and Keating for their help on this committee.

A Report from the Student Affairs Committee was presented by Professor Jay Brandenberger (See attached).

As a result of many meetings with students and the combined group of the senators and Academic Affairs committee members recommend making TCE's public minus the percentage relative to the department. The deletion of the percentile figure is a result of concern that about its use against a teacher in consideration of raises.

Professor Profit commented on how the evaluations limit teaching. She has heard an increasing number of faculty make such remarks as, "I'd like to do such and such but I don't dare do it because they'll punish me on the TCE's." She heard a physician say that he has learned to view every patient walking through the door as a potential litigant rather than a patient. Are we going to see them as adversaries? She doesn't know if people would admit it publicly but there would be a shift in thinking if they were made public. People who have advanced degrees have proven we can do what we do.

Professor Amitav added that conversations with his colleagues reveal that the perception that people who give out more A's get higher TCE's. If students know that a high TCE means A, they will flock to those professors. So withholding one number won't alleviate that problem.

Professor Williams said that he has supported the proposal in committee but there is tremendous hostility against it among his colleagues. He thinks the vote is really against the TCE's rather than simply their publication. There is great anger at how they are being used by the administration for merit raises, tenure and promotions. The issues need to be addressed together; they aren't separate issues. Publication of the results will only escalate concerns about an already flawed instrument.

He called for an examination of TCE's for use in merit raises, promotion and tenure.

Professor Ladouceur talked about the responsible use of TCE's. As a former chairman, he said, you have to look at a whole series of factors and never in a one year mode. A chair shouldn't say, "Oh, you're not quite up to snuff this year." The evaluations have to be used over a period of years. Another question is what course is being considered, for example, core course. Many complain that they run into resentful students and as a result their TCE's suffer. There is a complexity that is hidden by the naked numbers. He would use a qualitative way of looking at things. He sees a quantitative mentality as an ill-suited, naive business and it makes me very wary.

Professor Yang noted that students are already using ND Today when they choose what course to take. The choice for us is, do we give them ND Today or something other? We have legitimate concerns about the TCE's. Granted the TCE is flawed, but given the choice which one would you rather have?

Professor Garg argued that ND Today and TCE's are not comparable.

Professor Stemper suggested that it would be better to have a broad standard with all faculty members on an equal footing rather than some featured on ND today. Of the top 20 universities, 13 make TCE's available to students. Most are research institutions. So what are we afraid of? There are a lot of good teachers here. We ought to be proud of our teaching at ND and it sounds like everyone wants to hide it.

Professor Higgins also suggested that if we are invoking the top 20 institutions, perhaps we should do an in-depth study of the instruments used at those universities.

Peter Moody questioned how we can work out an officially sanctioned way to leave room for the student evaluation.

Professor Tennyson asserted that number 17 on the TCE should not be included but the others should. He sees nothing wrong with in addition to making a proper course description available also having TCE's for the last 5 years there too. At the university where he was previously for 12 years, all of TCE's were published except those of untenured faculty. He offered a second amendment for TCE's to be published minus question 17 and only for tenured faculty.

Professor Ramsey spoke against the second amendment. Students are very unprofessional in their evaluations. The question about availability of the professor is also directly correlated with the size of the class. Hence not only question 17 raises issues.

Professor Rueschhoff stated that in some cases the students make comments on the written part that are demeaning or discriminatory involving race or gender. Somehow we should suggest that a code of conduct be developed for these teacher evaluations.

Prof Higgins also addressed the problem of student accountability. Students need to understand that these are serious, and I do inevitably get comments bordering on outrageous sexual harassment and it needs to be brought to the attention. It is a unidirectional instrument.

Prof Buechler presented the results of his survey among 100 faculty respondents were 2:1 against releasing TCE's. Those voting for cited benefits of representing better information and promoting accountability. Those against cited excessive attention to TCE's, causing faculty to focus on trying to raise their scores which could work against promoting student learning, concerns about role of TCE's in evaluating teaching.

His committee tried to look at the question of how to advise students to take the courses that best promote their education. We should do a better job of promoting learning goals, preparing syllabi, and publicizing our teaching skills so students will have a better idea of what to expect from us. There was uniform agreement on the committee and from the surveys that using only one measure is counter-productive. We can't just rely on student rating. We expect to recommend that the campus move decisively toward a system to evaluate teaching that is better tied to student learning. He met with Alex Hahn of the Kaneb Center and he reported that the fellows of the Center have agreed to focus next fall on quality assessment of teaching and courses on campus.

Professor Buechler also described his intention to write a report citing what he has been reading about teaching evaluations. He has learned, for example, that if scores differ by .3, then they are equivalent. He intends to discuss reliability, grade inflation, etc. There needs to be an increased awareness that the connections are very weak or nonexistent. He intends to raise questions about their validity to press the issue of trying to replace this one dimension with something much broader. He senses from Alex Hahn and others that there is real momentum for re-evaluation

Professor Porter suggested that the committee look into how the TCE's were designed and used at least 15 years ago since some of these issues were dealt with then.

Professor Flynn commented that we do a miserable job in describing our courses, and what the goals are. Our course descriptions are meager and inaccurate. He sees nothing wrong with faculty preparing decent, detailed syllabi explaining grade distributions, homework, how grades are based, how many hours a week are expected outside of class, and the availability of tutorials.

Professor Ramsey seconded his point and further recommended that faculty register our courses through a website that requires entering standard information.

Professor Merluzzi agreed that if we had a valid instrument that was unbiased then there wouldn't be so many objections. There are questions about the validity of the TCE's. There is a sex bias in TCE's. Women are usually rated lower. He agrees with Professor Ramsey's idea of using a standard format available electronically. We know from psychology that a single item is a very bad instrument for measuring a construct like good teaching.

Professor Giamo summed up the discussion that it is clear that there are larger issues here with TCE's such as the implications for academic freedom. Do student evaluations infringe on academic freedom? Do they contribute to the decline of educational standards and the decline of the quality of education? Is it a controlling and inhibiting factor, for example, contributing to grade inflation? These are big questions that we need to be careful about. The other problem is that it enforces a consumer model of education, a reversal from academic merit to consumerism. That completely fits into a consumer model. That should concern all of us: faculty, students, administration and trustees. The Faculty Senate can play a role in addressing these broader

issues.

Professor Higgins echoed Professor Giamo's concern about the increasing influence of a corporate model in the academy. We are seeing it at Notre Dame in the administration's use of US NEWS and World Report to evaluate departments. We need to get much more proactive as a senate to ask the administration to be accountable for the way they are running this university. These are very important issues. Thus she is arguing against publication of the TCE's. Moreover she doesn't think students take them seriously. They are of limited value when asked to comment discursively.

A motion to approve the amendment supporting publication of the TCE's minus the percentage was not approved. Professor Robinson put forth an alternative amendment. A vigorous discussion of the wording culminated in the following amendment, which carried.

The faculty believes that students are entitled to better information about their courses. However, because the current tce instrument is of questionable validity and because it can be misused, the faculty opposes the release of the TCE's to students. The senate further recommends that valid measures of teaching effectiveness be developed in consultation with the faculty senate. The senate further recommends that faculty members give students detailed information about content, teaching method, and grade-producing mechanisms with respect to each course.