

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Faculty Senate
University of Notre Dame
7 March 2017
216 DeBartolo Hall**

Attendees:

Adam Martin, Anna Simon, Annie Coleman, Ben Heller, Ben Radcliff, Bridgette Drummond, Chao-Shin Liu, Chuck Dittbenner, Dan Johnson, Bruce Huber, David Galvin, Dominic Chaloner, Guangjian Zhang, Hai Lin, Hannelore Weber, Howard Lanser, Jeanne Romero-Severson, Joe Urbany, John Gaski, Marsha Stevenson, Mary Frandsen, Matthew Capdevielle, Michael Hemler, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Paul McGinn, Phillip Sloan, Richard Pierce, Samir Younés, Sylwia Ptasinska, Xiaoshan Yang, Tarek Dika

Excused:

Aaron Striegel, Beyerlein Kraig, Byung-Joo Lee, Daniel Hopkinson, David Thomas, Marie Halvorsen-Ganepola, Matt Bloom, Meng Wang, Natalie Porter, Randy Kozel, Shauna Williams

Guest: Provost Thomas Burish

Faculty Senate Minutes 3/7/17

Senate Chair Jeanne Romero-Severson (JRS) called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

1. Opening Prayer (JRS).
2. Approval of minutes from 7 Feb 2017: JRS asked for corrections and emendations; were none. David Galvin moved to accept the minutes, seconded by Nasir Ghiaseddin; the minutes were approved unanimously.
3. Committee Reports
 - a. Academic Affairs – JRS
 - i. ACC scholar: the committee selected four scholars from the list: Keith Bybee (Syracuse), Neil F. Johnson (University of Miami), Stefan Duma (Virginia Tech), Eric Johnson (Clemson)*. Needs a sponsoring department, comes with a budget of \$2500.00 (note: the provost will not make up costs over budget). Scholar chosen by the senate needs a sponsoring department; will postpone vote until interest of departments can be determined.
 - ii. Report of the CIF committee will be issued to faculty on March 20 and has already been seen by administrators, deans, and chairs. Academic Affairs will discuss it; JRS would like the Senate to weigh in on the report in April. All should read it in detail, and can pose questions to the members of CIF committee. JRS also pointed out that Prof. James Brockmole and possibly Mark Gunty (Office of Strategic Planning) will attend the April meeting, as will Director of Athletics Jack Swarbrick. We will also have the election of officers that night.

* **The chair was incorrect here. She should have said “Kelsey Johnson (University of Virginia)**

b. Administrative Affairs: Dan Johnson

The committee heard from Judy Fox (Law School), chair of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance, as well as two members of that committee, Martin Haenggi (Engineering) and Hannelore Weber (German/Russian Language and Literature) on the SPF issue, which it seems will lead to revision of the Academic Articles. The committee will meet twice before the April meeting to

discuss how SPF are elected to the Senate, and develop a statement. The issue melds into larger issues of the purview, charge, etc. of the Faculty Senate. The committee solicits assistance from other members of the Senate; any can join the discussion. Will try to produce something for the April meeting.

c. Benefits: Nasir Ghiaseddin:

The committee met with Human Resources (HR) on February 10, and focused on questions related to the Affordable Care Act; the committee is gearing up to see what will come down and work accordingly. Other issues: all faculty should have received the IRS Form 1095-C, "Employer-Provided Health Insurance Offer and Coverage". If one is receiving any subsidies for health care, one must file this information with the IRS. HR is planning to have a University health program to increase the health of faculty and staff, and to help faculty and staff deal with the various emotional, environmental, social, and physical factors that affect overall health.

Q: Can you elaborate on subsidies with respect to Form 1095-C?

A: If one receives a subsidy for health care, one must submit Form 1095 to the IRS with one's tax return. Otherwise one need only state that one has health care from a provider. We will have more information on this when we know what will happen with the health care law.

d. Student affairs: John Gaski

The committee has learned of one new issue, the prospective re-purposing of Rolfs as a varsity facility, which the committee will look into. Prof. Gaski then offered the following resolution as a motion: "Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate should commend and thank the University Committee on the Evaluation of Teaching." The motion was seconded by Chuck Dittbenner, and approved by acclamation.

4. New business (JRS):

a. Will have the election of officers at the April meeting, which is required by the bylaws. JRS is currently in her 2nd year as chair and will not run for re-election, but will continue to represent her department. Need a slate of five officers: chair, vice-chair, treasurer, two co-secretaries. JRS asked for volunteers to serve on the nominating committee: David Galvin, Matthew Capdevielle, and Nasir Ghiaseddin volunteered. JRS gave them their charge, to develop a slate of five names.

b. JRS introduced the new administrative assistant for the Senate: Lauren Fiedler.

c. JRS: Jack Swarbrick, Director of Athletics, will be a guest at the April meeting, has 30 minutes. JRS will solicit potential questions ahead of the meeting via e-mail, and develop a list of topics and concerns. Scheduling and space could be one topic.

5. Guest: Provost Tom Burish (TB)

TB received a list of questions from JRS that senators had submitted; he also had issues to discuss, and noted that three of these topics overlapped. He decided to begin with these three, and then address other questions, and then some initiatives that are in the nascent stage and still under discussion.

Three faculty committees have been working on important topics, and their reports will guide behavior for several years to come.

1. The Ad hoc Committee on the Evaluation of Teaching. JRS already answered some of the questions on this topic. This was one of the hardest working committees and dealt with a very sensitive topic. TB has seen several drafts of their report, which is a superb document, and looked

broadly at the literature. Not all will agree. Five committees have looked at this over the last 15 years. The previous committee determined that the Teaching and Course Evaluation (TCE) was not an ideal instrument, and created the Course Instructor Feedback (CIF), to be evaluated after data could be collected. The current committee has evaluated this data. JRS announced when it would be made public. Next steps: the draft report has next steps, including when to implement changes. TB hopes this will take place next year; the limiting factor is that much of the CIF has to be reprogrammed by OIT, and TB doesn't know how long this will take, but will give OIT funds if needed.

Implementation: CIF committee has recommended another ad hoc committee for implementation. The CIF committee will have intense conversations with faculty and Faculty Senate, hold town halls, etc. Will rewrite the report in May based on feedback and submit a final report to TB for approval; he hopes for general agreement so the recommendations can be implemented. Will have period in which faculty can still disagree. Must move fairly quickly to be able to implement changes in fall.

JRS: Would like to commend Prof. Sarah Mustillo (Sociology), who did a statistical analysis of all CIF data points, which was a huge job.

NG: Will the changes be internally implemented by OIT?

TB: Yes, OIT does this every year; creates the form.

JRS: The committee had been concerned about serious push-back, and has been astonished that this has not materialized.

2. Transition Committee on the Core Curriculum

Tasked with implementing the move from the old to the new core curriculum. Also, doing a terrific job. Also, the Core Curriculum Committee worked very hard for several years.

With respect to the question of when the recommendations will be implemented, TB met with Michael Hildreth, chair of the committee; the latter feels that the target date of Fall 2018 is aggressive but doable. The committee will work in the summer to meet this deadline, and aim to be ready for registration in spring 2018. Courses must be developed and proposed so that they may be listed for registration. Now are addressing technical and policy issues, some of which need approval of Faculty Senate and Academic Council. Timeline will vary. Particularly important are modifications to the Academic Articles describing the Core Curriculum; this will be discussed in May by Academic Council, and will be sent to Faculty Senate before this. JRS should get together with Mike Hildreth on this.

On the question of how the recommendations will be resourced, TB doesn't know the answer to this yet, as there haven't been any specific requests made. Predicts will need (1) money for course development; (2) additional faculty support in some areas offering courses for the first time (for example, the Student Senate has asked Computer Science to offer Introduction to Programming for non-majors, and the department would need help with this); and (3) one department says it needs 25 faculty if one particular change is put into place; if true, we may have to get to same end another way, over time, that is economic.

3. Ad hoc Committee on Faculty Governance

As this committee has had no interaction with the provost's office, TB sent the questions to Judy Fox (chair of committee). TB added that in his view, this is one of the most important committees on campus; he recommended that it be constituted for 2 reasons: (1) the strongest universities have the strongest systems of governance; (2) when he came to ND from the outside, he found the governance system here odd and misunderstood, and that many people questioned its effectiveness. It is not viewed as strong as the University itself.

From Judy Fox (JF):

Question on when the committee's report or recommendations be complete? JF hopes by the end of this semester. The only thing left now is a survey of faculty, which she hopes will be distributed the

week after break; it was planned for January, but complications ensued.

Question on next steps: JF hope that the recommendations will be included in the revision of the Academic Articles; hopes for discussion and feedback if not accepted. The committee has not yet reached a consensus yet.

JRS (to TB): When you asked to have the committee formed, what problem was it formed to address?

TB: Did not identify specific problems, but asked the committee to look at faculty governance in general, is it understood, etc. He had the sense that people wondered if the Faculty Senate is effective, and wondered what was its purpose; most universities do not have an Academic Council. He did not know if faculty felt they participated adequately in faculty governance. Must be interactive with the administration to be effective. A process that is fair and transparent is important.

TB: Question on the revision of the Academic Articles - my letter of today (circulated to faculty via e-mail) answered those questions.

TB: Question on the Idea Center and the new Vice President and Associate Provost for Innovation, Bryan Ritchie.

TB: Why did we create this position? If ND is to be a force for good in world, when faculty or alumni create something that can help the world, we need to take it to the world. We were not doing this, and did not have a mechanism for it. This includes social programs, etc. One example: ND had a technology transfer office that was not meeting faculty needs, had little money to help faculty with business plans, models, etc. Created Innovation Park, now adding a second building. With respect to the new Idea Center, the University needed a strong leader who had done this many times and understood university culture. Convened a search committee of 12-15 members, all from outside the university; this committee submitted a report with 23-24 recommendations: start with a leader, create an Idea Center (Innovation, Discovery, Enterprise, Acceleration). In the search, Bryan Ritchie was the number one choice, had been a tenured full professor at Michigan State, then went into the entrepreneurial world and started companies; knows both worlds. In February, he began at Notre Dame on a part-time basis, and will be full-time in the fall.

TB: Question - what are expectations of the Idea Center?

TB: Will create a system, process to help faculty, students, alumni and friends of ND determine whether their intellectual property is commercializable, and if so, how to do it. Brian Ritchie has developed a set of five steps to reveal whether the property will be commercializable, and finds funds to prove each step. Looking for whatever is the appropriate end to have impact on the world. He has a model for faculty to be involved with this process, or not involved (it is their choice). Then he looks for resources to help faculty, must raise \$250,000 to \$500,000 per year; these funds need to come as gifts as these are the riskiest dollars.

Question: How will the Idea Center interface with individual professors and departments?

TB: In two ways; faculty may take the lead and make an appointment to see someone if they have a project, would like to apply for patent, etc. But Dr. Ritchie is also thinking of hiring people to walk halls and have look at projects, see what faculty are doing, suggest the potential for commercialization, etc. In other words, wants to do more active mining or prospecting around the University. In this his office takes lead; both ways have to work. The office has been budgeted to break even. Some universities look upon these as centers of profit, but ND is not planning on this, sees it as a break-even operation. Robert Bernhard (Vice President for Research) might get half a million to a million in revenue each year. Will also have additional rent from the second building at Innovation Park. Bryan Ritchie is happy to meet with anyone, including the Faculty Senate, departments, etc. at any time.

Question from the floor: Will the Idea Center interface with students?

TB: Yes, his office will help faculty with instruction on entrepreneurship, president of the student senate ran on a five-point platform including this. Richard Gray (chair of Art, Art History, and Design) is working on a minor in this area, as are other institutes and departments. Brian Ritchie will try to help, networking with alumni, etc.

JRS: For faculty in the sciences, the relationship is obvious. What is the relevance to faculty in Arts & Letters?

TB: Engineering has the most intellectual property that goes to market, then business, science, then other departments. Intellectual property is intended to make money. But social entrepreneurship is also very important at ND. A design professor created a washing machine costing \$5 that would revolutionize the way women wash clothes in third-world countries. Such a product won't make money. Another example: Corey Robinson (PLS major and member of the football team) started a company focused on giving student athletes' clothes (worn once or twice) to kids, use this to build relationships with them, encourage them to go to college. Went to the Robinson Center; first the ACC adopted this as a policy, then the NCAA also.

Question from the floor?: The Office of Technology Transfer is currently in the Office of Research; will this change?

TB: Yes, it will go over to the Idea Center.

Campus Crossroads Project (TB turned to John Affleck-Graves, Executive Vice President, for help answering the questions).

Question: When will the departments actually move in?

TB: Still working on the exteriors; should finish some interiors by mid-July, with move-in after Aug 1; the move-in to some other spaces at Christmas break. Anthropology, Music, and Sacred Music will move in in December 2017, psychology in 2018. ND is currently competing for workers with a casino under construction in the area, must pay extra to get workers, but the project is still on schedule.

Question: Now there will be two O'Neill halls on campus; will this cause confusion?

TB: Thinks not; one is a dorm, other is the Music building.

Question: Is there a plan for vacated space?

TB: For the most part, not at this time. The Department of Applied and Computational Mathematics and Statistics (ACMS) will move into Crowley; a committee has been formed to receive requests for vacated space, but has received none so far.

Question: Are there funds to help renovate vacated spaces?

TB: Right now the college pays for renovation, if desired. The University also has some money available.

Question: Are there new programs associated with the Crossroads project?

TB: For the most part, programs are expansions of existing programs, have claimed they can do new things in the new space. Two exceptions: digital media center is new; also, Sacred Music at Notre Dame had no space of its own.

Question (late submission): A Master of Science in patent law was started a few years ago, then put on hiatus; why go through a long approval process and then let it be suspended by three administrators?

TB (did not like the tone and manner of question): Here are the facts: three deans (Law, Science and Engineering) did market research which suggested that the degree program would be successful and would not take resources. We ran the program for two or three years, and it lost a lot of money. We

did more market research, including asking law firms, and saw no sign that the program would make money or break even. A decision was then made to end the program.

JRS: Do you think with the presence of the Idea Center and more effective interfaces with faculty that the idea may bubble up again for a master program in patent law?

TB: Doesn't think so; is there a need and can we fulfill that need? Situation may change over time.

JRS: Are professional master's programs subject to periodic review?

TB: Yes, to see that they are paying for themselves, filling intended niche, etc.

Once he had finished addressing the submitted questions, Provost Burish spoke about several other initiatives that might be of interest to the Senate; he pointed out that none of these may happen.

1. Inspired Leadership Institute: Harvard, Stanford, and some other universities have developed programs for people in retirement, one year, pay tuition, can audit any classes that interest them; also include lectures for the group and sessions in which members tell their own stories; wonders if Notre Dame should have such a program, could focus on spirituality. Connections of these people could open doors for faculty. A group has visited Stanford to look at the program there, and will also visit Harvard. Notre Dame's goal would be to break even. One senator pointed out that a related issue to address is incentivizing retirement; faculty often keep teaching into their mid-70s; more might be willing to retire earlier if they didn't feel cut off entirely from the university – would like to have contact, teach courses for freshmen, etc. He mentioned the Henry Koerner Center for Emeritus Faculty at Yale as another model.

2. Veterans' Initiatives: TB feels that Notre Dame should do more for veterans than it currently does; has welcomed the military and ROTC to campus. Has already agreed to do one thing: the Warrior-Scholar project devised by veterans – help those leaving the military back into university, a one-week program. A dozen universities now run such programs. Program costs about \$25,000 annually. Major Regan Jones will run the program. Brady Quinn, former Notre Dame quarterback, recently pledged \$100,000 to fund the program for four years. Currently Notre Dame has 40 veterans in the Mendoza College of Business who are on financial aid, which is a good start; also 12-15 in the Law School. Could recruit more, and will raise money for financial aid.

3. New endowment to support new endowed chairs: anonymous donors have pledged a gift of 50 million dollars; 42.5 million of which has already been received, the interest from which will fund new endowed chairs each year. The major donors wish to remain anonymous, and wish the chairs to be named for individuals who have never been adequately thanked for their contributions to Notre Dame. Will also support mission and minority hires. Will take five or more years to build up, and will take decades to become really big. Department chairs have been apprised of this fund, should let TB know when they have "stars" that they would like to hire.

Question from the floor: Could you talk about what you would like us to aim for with respect to diversity and Catholic hires?

TB: We now have great support for diversity hires all the way up to the trustees, but we can be more successful than in the past. One problem is that the pool is very small in some disciplines, and thus universities end up stealing faculty from each other. As a goal, department agreed on a target: the median of the actual number in AAUP; will aim for the middle. TB has resources to help departments; will pay salary for five years if a department finds a candidate and has no funds. Currently is paying out several million each year in such bridge payments. TB will also pay the

difference in salary if a department searches for an assistant professor but finds a qualified diversity candidate at a higher rank; will also pay up to 5 years. Suggests searching with rank open to help find such candidates. The deans have submitted diversity hiring plans so that we can measure annual success. TB is also open to other suggestions. Suggested that chairs ask their faculty to create wish lists, such as “10 women we would like to have on our faculty,” and work from there.

Motion to adjourn made by Phil Sloane, seconded by Tarek Dika, all in favor; meeting adjourned at 7:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary E. Frandsen, Co-Secretary
Senator from Music