

Faculty Senate Meeting Notes
Feb 7, 2017
De Bartolo 217

SIGNED IN AS PRESENT:

Matthew Capdevielle, Dominic Chaloner, Annie Coleman, Tarek Dika, Chuck Dittbenner, Mary Frandsen, David Galvin, John Gaski, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Ben Heller, Michael Hemler, Daniel Hopkinson, Bruce Huber, Daniel Johnson, Beyerlein Kraig, Byung-Joo Lee, Hai Lin, Chao-Shin Liu, Adam Martin, Richard Pierce, Sylwia Ptasinska, Ben Radcliff, Jeanne Romero-Severson, Phillip Sloan, Marsha Stevenson, Joe Urbany, Meng Wang, Hannelore Weber, Xiaoshan Yang, Samir Younes, Guagjian Zhang

NOT SIGNED IN AS PRESENT:

Matt Bloom, Bridgette Drummond, Marie Halvorsen-Ganapola, Randy Kozel (on leave), Howard Lanser, Paul McGinn, Natalie Porter, Anna Simon, Aaron Striegel, David Thomas, Shauna Williams

Meeting called to order at 6:05

Jeanne Romero Severson (JRS) started with opening prayer.

JRS then shared Father Jenkins response to senate sanctuary resolution. Gave the gist of the content that Jenkins wants to wait and see, and that energy should be directed to creating a bridge. JRS asked that everyone think about the response and then let her know their thoughts, and then she offered to begin to communicate with Father Jenkins.

JRS next brought up recent communication with Phil Sloan with respect to the executive order on immigrants. Felt that we should not speak to this politically. However, JRS did want to highlight her personal experience of the impact on the college of science given the many international collaborations.

JRS sought approval of the last set of minutes from the December meeting and from the special meeting in January. Asked for corrections, and both December and January needed corrections on the spelling of names of attendees, and who was present. No other corrections were requested. After asking for a motion to approve the minutes, the motion was given and seconded. The minutes from both the Dec and Jan meetings were then approved with no abstentions or disapprovals.

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs

JRS highlighted that every 10 yrs. the academic articles of the University, under which the senate operates, are reviewed, and so there are real consequences from its content. JRS asked how many people had read the academic articles and the response was very few. JRS highlighted the importance for such things as tenure, etc. We have been requested to review the process the

administration would like to use, which is the same process used in the last review. An ad hoc group will be appointed to represent the stakeholders, and then a working group similar to core curriculum committee will then work on the various revisions and drafts that gets discussed and then have proposed revisions. Committee wording will be included to ensure that there is representation across colleges and schools, including engineering, science, and architecture. JRS emphasize that this is not trivial and needs broad representation. JRS shared that the CIF committee draft report has been shared with deans and the provost office. Feedback has been friendly, and there have been no substantive requests for changes. There will be a meeting soon to address any revisions. The committee has been asked to not discuss specifics until the process has been completed, but would like to be transparent.

Admin Affairs

Daniel Johnson explained that Admin Affairs had not met but will be taking up the SPF issue soon. Had followed up with the SPF group on campus, and through those interactions had been made aware of the various concerns about issues that had been expressed before, such as the date of notification of non-renewal; no consultation in the appointment of new deans; and fear of excessive service requests. Also, reminded him that the bylaws of the senate are in violation of the academic articles with respect to the number of SPFs being represented that is not proportional. In the future, will be meeting with the ad hoc committee of faculty governance to discuss these issues because they are also working on them, so they do not want to be at odds and duplicate effort.

JRS emphasized that academic articles can sometimes have the feel of a document from another period, while SPF is an evolving issue, and will take time to work out. Moreover, SPF issues may take some revision of the academic articles to address. But she also recognized that the issues had been considered before.

Benefits

Nasir Ghiaseddin (NG) explained that Benefits had not met this month but will be meeting with Human Resources to discuss changes that will happen after repeal of Obamacare.

JRS mentioned concerns about graduate students.

NG responded that graduate students are the responsibility of the graduate school not HR.

Matthew Capdevielle asked about Arts and Letter postdoc who will need to be switched to new program when they are no longer graduate students.

NG responded that pay will not be reduced because it's not determined by Obamacare but by the Department of Labor.

Student Affairs

John Gaski shared that business was conducted by email. May have resolution in a month but won't spring it on senate. Shared new business about the new reserve parking proposal because Gaski is the faculty representative on the parking committee and happy to receive any concerns or feedback about parking.

JRS introduced Bruce Huber from Law School as a new senator. Area of expertise is natural resources law.

JRS also highlighted that the Senate needed a new representative on student life campus council. Student representative shared examples of what they were doing. Also, shared that since Vice President for Student Affairs Erin Hoffmann Harding's Chief of Staff sits on the council, any resolution has to be responded to within seven days. JRS explained that need to make a commitment but will get back to this issue.

JRS shared that Provost Tom Burish will be addressing the senate next time and so if there are any items then need to be addressed then to pass these items to either Jeanne or Mary Ann so Burish can prepare ahead of time. JRS will encourage him to address those questions that are shared with him.

JRS mentioned that in Academic Affairs she discussed how the review of the academic articles might take place, and how to share that process. Decided to post it to the senate website.

Question: asked whether to invite Burish to stay for the whole meeting, whether this is anticipated or not.

JRS: he will be the only person on the agenda for that week. Small room will facilitate discussions. In the past, there has been standing invitation to the provost.

Question: can he come to any meeting if he wants?

MAM: he does not believe that it is the case. He would not come to any meeting because he believes that some individuals would prefer to have a conversation without him being present.

JRS then introduced Mark McKenna (MM), Professor in the Law School and Provost Fellow.

MM explained that being a provost fellow includes taking on a project.

Highlighted the need for diversity in all committees. Because diverse committees generally make better decisions. However, also reminded the senate that Notre Dame faculty is low in diversity overall, and thus there is a disproportionate load on those faculty that are minorities and/or women. Thus, he is working on making recommendations to address this problem. For example, could hire more women and minorities. MM emphasized that he is here to listen to suggestions and comments.

MM shared examples of things that have already been suggested include maybe the university puts too much emphasis on representation over consultation. Also, provide advice to dept. chairs and deans about mentorship, especially in terms of service. Notre Dame also has a retention problem so that as people leave, service falls disproportionately on those faculty that remain. Thus, partly it is a matter of making good choices on which committees faculty volunteer to work on. Also, methodology for choosing individuals to serve varies a lot across the university. How to be consistent. Another example would be rebalancing credit for service with respect to tenure but that is unlikely to go anywhere.

Question: Why do you think that giving more credit for service would not go anywhere?

Response: That would require a shift of focus away from research which would be unlikely. However, such a suggestion would go into report.

JRS: Why not try because of the value of service? How many people have voted on tenure – serving on a committee that votes on tenure has no value with respect to service. So, it is contrary to your best interest when you should be focusing on other things. Service has no perceived value even though it is important. There needs to be people to do this. Intent is to spread responsibility with respect to faculty governance. Women or minorities are expected to serve because administrators are looking for representation from particular groups, not for what one can bring to the table – i.e., experience. The whole process is therefore undermined. The institution wants participation but is not willing reward those that provide it.

MM: Another issue is protecting untenured from service. For example, in the Law School. But the consequence is that once you get tenure then the service burden goes way up, which in turn leads to stagnation of associate professors. The fact that it is not valued also means that people will opt out. Some units are much better about service but that's not universal.

Annie Coleman: Asked to speak to that issue. Part of the problem is language – service has no value but at junior level research is regarded as being more important. The administration could express its service expectations better and more uniformly. Each person has mentorship, should be able to decide “what kind of service do I care about” and it should have nothing to do with gender or ethnicity. In some depts a class system exists -- some scholars that have been successful do not have to do service – it is reserved for less productive faculty. Successful scholars get rewarded and recognition but the same is not there for other kinds of work that matters (i.e., service).

MM: Dept. chairs have used a tool that allows faculty to self-identify as to how they want to be evaluated.

Annie Coleman: the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters wanted to get more senior theses written – that became a category of evaluation but also it was communicated that you were expected to advise at least two senior theses; everyone is supposed to do some. Would like some language from administration above.

JRS: There is a perception that women do more service than male faculty. Is that true?

MM: women are serving disproportionately more on committees. But also work by women is disproportionate within those committees. What is the right proportion? Hard to figure out what is the right balance. Again, women and minorities are overrepresented compared to their numbers on the faculty.

JRS: This is conundrum. If doing too much service hurts tenure then that serves to reinforce not doing service.

MM: Arguably, it comes down to mentorship. Some people feel free to say no to requests while others do not. More education is needed about who is asking rather than the burden on people to say no in the first place.

JRS: Issue of faculty governance. We need more but that means if you want more faculty governance and that would require serious time commitment, and hence the need for more service.

MM: Especially if there is not a tight relationship between those that want it and those that would do it.

JRS: how do you get to be a provost fellow?

MM: The provost asks you and you can't say no. Interesting window into the process. You do get a teaching reduction.

Question: What is the most interesting thing you have learned?

MM: That the Provost's Office is interested in what faculty say.

JRS: Reminder that when provost comes: we can have pointed questions, but we should have those in advance. We can expect him to respond to those questions.

Questions: What questions can Provost address? What questions have already been received?

JRS: University budget and how the rumored cost overruns of Crossroads going to be addressed? Issues of academic freedom would be relevant. How will budget of academic initiatives be affected?

JRS asked for a motion to adjourn, seconded, and approved.

Meeting ended at 7:03 pm.