

Minutes for Notre Dame Faculty Senate Meeting
April 7, 2015
DeBartolo Room 140

Attendees: Matthew Capdevielle, Mark Caprio, Christopher Chowrimootoo, Zavier Creary, John Duffy, David Galvin, John Gaski, David Gasperetti, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Alexandra Guisinger, Michael Hemler, Michael Kirsch, B. J. Lee, Hai Lin, Linda Major, Adam Martin, Paul McGinn, Walter Nicgorski, John Polhamus, Sylwia Ptasinska, Jeanne Romero-Severson, Nidia Ruelas, Cheri Smith, Marsha Stevenson, Joe Urbany, Sandra Vera-Munoz, Meng Wang, Richard Williams, Xiaoshan Yang

Excused: Gail Bederman, Karen Buranskas, Paul McDowell, Hildegund Muller

Absent: George Howard, Donald Kommers, Christopher Shields, Joshua Shrout, John Stamper, Kyle Watson, Sophie White

Called to order at 6:01pm

1. Opening Prayer (Paul McGinn)
2. Introductions
3. Minutes of Feb. 3, 2015, meeting were approved
4. Chair's Remarks (Paul McGinn)

A 6pm start time will be considered for next year's meetings.

Risk Management should be notified of any falls or other accidents related to snow.

Academic Council is considering additional policies for the protection of children on campus.

The University is undertaking discussions to rework the tenure appeals process

The University is undertaking discussions to consider changes to Academic Council to have stronger faculty representation

The University is creating a Committee to look at CIFs ; they are looking for statistics-minded people for the committee. Please provide the Chair with the names of recommended faculty.

The Provost will ask department chairs to have Faculty Senate reports at

departmental meetings.

Healthcare Strategy Working Group

John Affleck-Graves (JAG) would like increases to be no more than COLA + 2%

There has been discussion of a possible 2-tier structure: slightly higher premiums for those making more than a cutoff amount (e.g. 60k or 70k).

The Chair met with JAG to discuss the possibility of a university club; JAG gave a copy of an old report on this topic to the chair. The Benefits Committee will do a survey to see the level of interest.

In the fall, Department Chair training on mentoring issues will include some of the best practice recommendations resulting from the Senate survey last year.

The Chair looked into insurance coverage for problems that could arise in labs; he asked Bob Zerr (Dir. of Risk Management & Safety) to prepare and post a clear policy.

Indiana Religious Freedom Restoration Act statute - some faculty thought the University should have a formal position statement. The Chair contacted Fr. Jenkins, asking for a statement and suggesting that, in the absence of a statement, the Faculty Senate might pass a resolution asking for a statement. Soon thereafter, the University released a vague statement (published in the South Bend Tribune).

Annual Faculty Senate reception with Fr. Jenkins will be on Thursday, April 23, at 5:00pm, in the Hesburgh Library Penthouse.

At the May meeting we will hold elections for next year – we need a nominating committee.

A Faculty Senate retreat is under consideration, perhaps on the Friday before fall term begins; it could be ½ day, with the agenda to be determined (for new, and possibly continuing, senators).

5. Resolution Concerning Role of Senate (from Administrative Affairs)

Jeanne Romero-Severson (Chair, Administrative Affairs Committee) led the discussion.

This proposed resolution had been discussed, in various forms, at prior Faculty Senate meetings. The Committee circulated a revised draft of the resolution via email before this meeting. Two main points were addressed in this draft: the

relevance of references to the Bylaws, and the specific wording of the last paragraph.

Walter Nicgorski emphasized the importance of faculty having a voice in major developments at the University. The concern isn't necessarily with the final results of new policies, although the results might have been better had faculty as a whole (as reflected in Faculty Senate) been brought into discussions earlier.

John Gaski proposed minor grammatical changes, which were accepted (in the 3rd paragraph, 2d line, change "to matters on which" to "on matters on which"; also, change en dashes to em dashes)

Nasir Ghiaseddin noted that the administration has selectively involved faculty of the administration's choosing. Faculty input should be solicited from the Faculty Senate, which reflects a broader representation of faculty.

A motion was made to approve the resolution.

Concerning the Role of the Faculty Senate in the University in the Light of the Experience of Past Year Respecting 403b Retirement Plans and Crossroads Project

Whereas the Academic Articles of the University of Notre Dame specify in Article I, Section 2 that "ordinarily, the President is guided in setting policy and making decisions by consultation with the other senior administrators, by the deliberations of the Academic Council, and by the recommendations of the Faculty Senate," and those Articles later speak of the Senate's range of concern extending "to matters affecting the faculty as a whole and to matters on which a faculty perspective is appropriate,"

Whereas the Senate's own Bylaws, authorized by the Academic Articles and long abided in by the Administration, describe the Senate as an "assembly elected to represent the faculty as a whole in the formulation of policy affecting the entire life of the University" and as one "through which the faculty can exercise a collective and independent voice in the governance of the University,"

Whereas the last year has witnessed the failure of the central Administration to consult the Senate on significant matters affecting the faculty as a whole and on matters on which a faculty perspective is appropriate – most notably, changes in the 403b retirement plan and the development of the Crossroads Project– and this in the light of the serious concern of the entire faculty about their lack of participation in the governance of the University, a concern emphatically present in the recently reported Faculty Experience Survey reported to the Senate, Therefore, the Faculty Senate asks the central Administration to respect the advisory responsibilities given the Faculty Senate and the long-standing aim of the Senate to exercise a collective and independent voice in the governance of the University, by providing the Faculty Senate with the necessary information and

adequate notice on important policies affecting the "faculty as a whole" or "on which a faculty perspective is important" before such policies are finalized.

The resolution was approved (26 in favor; 0 opposed; 1 abstention)

6. Proposal for New Rank of "University Emeritus Professor"

The Chair explained a proposal prepared by Emeritus Prof. Phil Sloan, which would create a new rank tentatively titled "University Emeritus Professor" in order to address the circumstances of emeriti professors who maintain ongoing involvement in the academic life of the University (primarily regarding research).

Prof. Sloan's proposal lists the potential advantages to the University and faculty, along with the financial implications.

It is not clear how this would impact concerns regarding graduate student teaching opportunities.

The Chair opened the floor for questions:

Jeanne Romero-Severson: Would the new status enable someone to apply for NSF grants?

Chair: The proposal mentions unspecified advantages in applying for grants, but we would need more information on this specific question.

Walter Nicgorski: This proposal is a win-win. It would eliminate a potential barrier to early retirement for those faculty members who are mainly interested in doing continued research, and could bring ongoing benefits to the University.

Nasir Ghiaseddin: An ongoing issue is the availability of offices, which are a limited resource.

Michael Kirsch: How would this proposal relate to what currently happens?

Chair: There would still be normal Emeriti faculty; this proposal would just create a new category for those interested in ongoing research.

Alexandra Guisinger: The proposal's 5-year term for the new status seems too long. Department chairs might balk at that length.

Walter: We're just putting forward the general idea to Academic Council; they will certainly examine the details and possibly reconsider specifics such as this.

Chair: We wouldn't come up with details; we would only express our interest that Academic Council consider this type of approach

David Gasperetti: Suggested that some specific requirements should be clarified.

Chair: We might need more information on the number of faculty expected to utilize this proposed new status.

Rich Williams: Perhaps we should just vote to support this possibility in principle, rather than trying to address every detail (which would probably be changed during the Academic Council's approval process anyway).

The Administrative Affairs Committee agreed to draft language for a resolution approving the proposal in principle.

7. Committee Meetings

8. Committee Reports

The Administrative Affairs Committee presented proposed language for a resolution approving the Sloan proposal in principle.

Minor editing changes were suggested from the floor and approved.

The Chair reiterated that we are not necessarily approving the details of the Sloan proposal (e.g., the specific proposed title of "University Emeritus Professor"), but instead are merely approving the concept in principle.

A motion was made to approve the resolution presented by the Administrative Affairs Committee, as modified.

Proposal for Supporting Emeriti/ae Professors Who Remain Actively Involved in Research, Teaching or Scholarship

The Faculty Senate has reviewed a proposal (attached) prepared by Emeritus Professor Phil Sloan that would create a new rank of "University Emeritus Professor" to provide limited additional support for emeriti/ae professors who intend to remain actively involved in research, teaching or scholarship. Without endorsing the details of that proposal, the Faculty Senate expresses support for addressing the concerns raised in the proposal, and requests that the Academic Council consider these concerns and potential solutions.

The resolution was unanimously approved (26 in favor; 0 opposed; 0

abstaining)

9. New Business

None

10. Next Meeting: Tuesday, May 5, 7:00pm, in 140 DeBartolo

11. Adjournment at 7:33pm

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Kirsch
Professor of Law
Co-Secretary