

Minutes of Notre Dame Faculty Senate Meeting
March 1, 2016
DeBartolo Room 141

Attended: Rebecca Blais, Matthew Capdevielle, Mark Caprio, Dominic Chaloner, Xavier Creary, Meredith Doellman, Mary Frandsen, David Galvin, John Gaski, Michael Hemler, Michael Kirsch, Howard Lanser, Byung-Joo Lee, Hai Lin, Adam Martin, Mary Ann McDowell, Paul McDowell, Paul McGinn, Hildegund Müller, Walter Nicgorski, Natalie Porter, Joe Urbany, Sandra Vera-Muñoz, Jeanne Romero-Severson, Nidia Ruelas, Christopher Shields, Joshua ShROUT, Anna Simon, Marsha Stevenson, Joe Urbany, Sandra Vera-Muñoz, Meng Wang, Richard Williams, Shauna Williams, Xiaoshan Yang, Samir Younes, Guangjian Zhang

Excused: Matthew Devine, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Chris Pratt, Cheri Smith, David Thomas, Aaron Striegel, Hannelore Weber, Sophie White

Called to order at 6:05pm

1. Opening Prayer offered by Jeanne Romero-Severson, Chair
2. The minutes of the February 2, 2016, meeting were approved
3. Chair's Remarks (Jeanne Romero-Severson)
 - a. Consolidated Appeals Procedure Update

The Chair met with a subcommittee of Academic Council and asked two questions: How many times has the "Appendix A" procedure been used, and how many times did that procedure result in overturning a denial of tenure? She was told that the Appendix A procedure has been used 17 times since the 1980s (although it has not been invoked since 2010). Everyone agrees that there was one successful overturning of tenure denial, but with respect to two other cases it was not clear whether they were successful (because other factors were involved—e.g., some candidates may have left Notre Dame for other reasons). Because it is not clear whether Appendix A is serving its intended purpose, the Chair is not comfortable recommending approval of the consolidated appeals proposal, and she thinks that the academic affairs committee should consider it further.

A senate representative suggested that perhaps the focus should be on how to make the Appendix A procedure better, with a consolidated appeals procedure being one option. The Chair suggested that perhaps some modifications could be made to Appendix A without eliminating it, so

that there would not be an impression that Notre Dame is not concerned with gender discrimination.

In response to a question regarding the concerns with the proposed consolidated process, the Chair mentioned that we would not want to deny tenure at three levels without diverse representation.

Additional information about the proposals will be posted on the Faculty Senate website.

b. University CIF Committee Update (Committee on Evaluation of Teaching)

The Chair (who is member of the University committee) presented a slide show summarizing what the committee has been doing. The committee has met 8 times, and has established 5 task forces. The committee is focusing on the appropriate use of CIFs. The Chair discussed the challenges, the points of broad committee agreement, the points of partial or less agreement (e.g., are student evaluations a valuable measure of teaching effectiveness), and questions the committee is addressing.

The chair reminded the Faculty Senate a survey has been distributed, and she asked representatives to encourage participation.

Any comments, relevant literature, etc., should be sent to any member of the committee.

c. Circumstances under which Special Professional Faculty can serve as the faculty representative for his/her department

We traditionally have not allowed this, but a request has been made by a department to allow it. This is not intended to suggest that tenure and tenure-track faculty should not take responsibility for governance issues. No decision has been made.

Mary Ann McDowell mentioned that this issue arose when departments that had not sent representatives recently were asked to appoint senate representatives. A relatively small department with a significant percentage of SPFs made this request.

A comment was made that SPFs do a significant amount of teaching, so it is not clear why allowing them to serve as representatives should be a problem; if anything, there should be an increase in SPFs on the faculty senate

But, others noted that there might be a concern additional pressure might be put on SPFs to serve in place of tenure or tenure-track faculty.

It was noted the Faculty Senate bylaws would need to be changed to allow this (art. III, section 2); also, as the university moves away from SPF titles, other aspects of the wording of Article III might need to be revisited.

Speculation was made as to why this restriction is in the bylaws; perhaps it reflects an earlier approach that is no longer appropriate. This concern would also apply to research faculty and professors of the practice.

The issue was referred to the Academic Affairs committee.

4. Old Business

John Gaski reminded the Faculty Senate that he is the representative on the University parking committee, so any concerns should be referred to him.

5. Committee Meetings

The Faculty Senate committees met.

6. Committee Reports

a. Benefits (Paul McGinn)

Several new benefits have recently been announced. The staff benefit for courses toward degrees is increasing to \$3,000. A service for emergency childcare & eldercare is being introduced (the user will pay a nominal rate for its use). There will be cap on staff future sick day accumulation, but this new approach will also address issues regarding the need to save days for short-term disability.

Parental leave currently exists for staff. A uniform policy for faculty is currently being considered.

b. Academic Affairs (Paul McDowell)

The committee recommends supporting the proposed Ph.D. degrees in Spanish and Italian.

c. Admin Affairs (Joshua Shrout)

The committee is considering revising the bylaws regarding SPF representation on the Faculty Senate. The committee also considered a University proposal to clarify the definition and role of research faculty, and has only minor suggestions (e.g., be sure the document emphasizes that research faculty are not tenure track, and clarify the document is merely informing policy), which the Faculty Senate Chair can pass along to the University.

d. Student Affairs (John Gaski)

The committee is working on a proposed resolution expressing concern about the current CIF instruments used by the University, and expressing support for the University committee that is examining faculty evaluation procedures.

7. New Business

Walt Nicgorski provided a report on emeritus affairs. There were recent problems by Aeon Hewitt in making accurate payments to help cover the Medicare supplement. Walt will ask his successor to encourage the administration to increase the stipends to more accurately reflect cost of living increases faced by retirees.

Mary Ann McDowell asked representatives to let their departments know about the new Faculty Senate website—in particular, the materials concerning the consolidated appeals process.

8. Next Regular Meeting: Tuesday, April 5, 2016; 6:00pm; DeBartolo 141

9. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:53pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Kirsch
Professor of Law
Co-Secretary