

Faculty Senate Mini Retreat

September 24, 2015

102 McKenna Hall

Attendance: Matthew Capdevielle, Xavier Creary, John Gaski, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Michael Hemler, Michael Kirsch, Hai Lin, Adam Martin, Paul McDowell, Paul McGinn, Hildegund Muller, Walter Nicgorski, Christopher Pratt, Jeanne Romero-Severson, Christopher Shields, John Stamper, Marsha Stevenson, Cheri Smith, Bryant Vande Kolk, Sandra Vera-Muñoz ,

Greetings by Dr. Romero- Severson

Introductions

1. Dr. Mary Anne McDowell -Faculty Governance of the University of Notre Dame
 - Faculty Governance
 - Reporting structures
 - Who occupies the current administrative positions
 - The role of the Faculty Senate does have right of Agenda
 - Right of Agenda
 - Authority is suasory not legislative
 - Suasion requires time
 - Faculty Senate function
 - 21% of the University Budget is for Faculty salary
 - Lower than our peers
 - Comparative governance study
 - ND is Bicameral
 - Administrative, Financial
 - Academic
 - General discussion and suggestions
 - Invite JAG to meeting in order to discuss how the Budget works
 - Promote more effective communication of the budgeting process
2. Past Senate Accomplishments
 - Experienced members Nasir Ghiaseddin and John Gaski to shared past successes and why they succeeded
 - Nasir Ghiaseddin: summary salary-ND contribution to retirement
 - Why did this succeed?
 - ND Leadership change
 - Benefit Committee did three things
 - Persistence with the request
 - Consistency in the request

- Patience in pursuing the request
 - John Gaski: Student Affairs
 - Student evaluations of Courses
 - Multiple item evaluation
 - Similar message: persistence, persistence, persistence
- 3. Current Impressions of the Senate's role
- 4. Reimagining how we do things
 - Have every department represented
 - Repackage membership in a positive light
 - Discussion on tenured vs. nontenured faculty
 - Get closer to money decisions
 - Be less reactive and more proactive
 - - Get a Senator representative on major Ad committees
- 5. Suggested Agenda Items
 - CIFS – Ad Hoc Committee on the Evaluation of teaching already formed
 - Effects all faculty
 - Important for promotions
 - Someone from the Faculty Senate should be on the committee
 - Evaluations
 - Provost thought faculty had a problem with tool
 - People not stressed by tools
 - Problem is how the tool is used
 - There appears to be lack of understanding on how to interpret these numbers and what these numbers represent.
 - Insurance for Grad Students
 - Why does University not insure the graduate students in the same way as faculty and staff?
 - What is the basis for these decisions?
 - Is it true that “other universities” are not insuring their students?
 - Our current policy is not socially responsible
 - Faculty Indemnification-
 - Document is available on the Risk Management and Safety Website
 - Joyce award for excellence in undergraduate teaching
 - Would like the senate to develop better approach for selection
 - Faculty lecturers from the ACC exchange program
- 6. Core Curriculum Revision (Top priority)
 - What role do we want to have?
 - How do we accomplish this?
- 7. Web site content
 - Update and provide format similar to official university web sites

- Useful for senate and groups/committees
 - Pictures/ department/emails
 - Schedule
 - agenda
 - Meeting minutes
 - Links Proactive on Surveys for faculty
 - Find a collective voice instead of just the loudest
 - Stop guessing what faculty care about and find out

Minutes for Notre Dame Faculty Senate Meeting
October 6, 2015
Rm. 140 DeBartolo

Attendees: Matthew Capdevielle, Mark Caprio, Xavier Creary, Meredith Doellman, Mary Frandsen, David Galvin, John Gaski, David Gasperetti, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Michael Hemler, Byung-Joo Lee, Adam Martin, Mary Ann McDowell, Paul McDowell, , Paul McGinn, Michael Mogavero, Hildegun Müller, Walter Nicgorski, Chris Pratt, Joe Urbany, Sandra Vera-Muñoz, Jeanne Romero-Severson, Nidia Ruelas, Christopher Shields, Joshua Shrout, Anna Simon, Cheri Smith, Marsha Stevenson, Meng Wang, Sophie White, Richard Williams, Shauna Williams, Xiaoshan Yang

Excused: Christopher Chowrimootoo, Michael Kirsch, Hai Lin, Samir Younes

1. Opening Prayer
2. Minutes of the September 1, 2015 meeting were approved.
3. Chairs remarks—
 - a. Core curriculum committee draft recommendations – the core curriculum committee is almost done with a draft recommendation. It may be available before the end of the month. After it is available Jeanne Romero-Severson will invite John McGreevy to present the recommendations to the Senate.
 - b. CIFs process – no action on CIF revisions so far
 - c. Faculty Senate web page revisions update – The senate office had waded through site ownership issues and is now in a position to start revising the main components of the Senate site. This will be an ongoing effort throughout the semester.
 - d. Academic integrity - Jeanne Romero-Severson has been asked to be on an academic integrity committee. She has not been advised yet as to exactly what it involves.
 - e. ACC Scholars selection. – One of the ACC Scholars (Rob Dunn- NC State) was already invited by the biology department. Discussion ended with the Academic Affairs committee agreeing to recommend another invitee after their meeting this evening.
 - f. Board of Trustee meeting- Jeanne Romero-Severson will give a presentation at their mid-October meeting.
 - g. Follow-up on Mary Ann McDowell's presentation at Senate retreat – Senators were encouraged to discuss the leadership slides at their respective department meetings. A quick hand count revealed only a small number of department chairs have asked for a Faculty Senate update at their department meetings.
4. Old business—
 - a. Campus Life Council representatives were identified. David Galvin (Mathematics) will continue from last year. Cheri Smith (Library) will also represent the Senate on the CLC.
 - b. Marsha Stevenson and Walt Nicgorski are the Bookstore Committee representatives.
 - c. The subject of the provost coming to Senate meetings was discussed. There was general sentiment that we would welcome him, but it was thought that for delicate topics it would be better to not have the provost as some untenured faculty might be reluctant to

speak openly. The Senate will provide the provost's office with the dates of future meetings and he can choose when he might be able to attend. The senate will collect questions ahead of time to provide the provost the general topics which it is desired that he address. The offer was also made for the director of libraries to come to a meeting to update the faculty on changes in the libraries. The Senate will add her to the list of potential invitees.

5. Denise Murphy spoke about changes to the benefits program in the coming year. The handouts she provided cover all of the topics. The biggest changes are a new high deductible health plan, consolidation of the HMO plans, an increase in the orthodontia maximum, a shift to a new drug prescription benefit manager (Optum Rx), and the availability of an online health cost comparison tool (CastLight). She also reviewed the ND Wellness Center and the upcoming health care screenings. Questions were asked about the possibility of the 'cadillac tax' in 2018 (... probably won't happen as scheduled).
6. Committee Reports—
 - a. Academic Affairs – They nominated Robin Fleming, a medievalist from Boston College as the ACC scholar for the coming year. They will contact the Medieval Institute to handle the visit. They also began discussions on whether the honorary degree to Bill Cosby should be revoked. They also began discussions on the selection process for the Joyce teaching award.
 - b. Administrative Affairs – they discussed the website redesign. They are taking ideas for site content under consideration.
 - c. Benefits – they will look into whether there is a rumored freeze on the program to purchase parking spaces before going forward with a petition about the current parking situation.
 - d. Student Affairs – John Gaski presented a set of slides on how psychometric researchers try to validate unobservables, which is relevant to the topic of the validity of CIFs.
7. New Business—
 - a. Rich Williams agreed to serve on the committee looking into the viability of the Chicago shuttle bus.
 - b. The topic of CIFs will be assigned to a committee at the next meeting.
 - c. Jeanne Romero-Severson will collect comments on the Keough Master's proposal and forward them to the proposers to provide senate feedback.
 - d. After the Core curriculum committee provides its proposal draft she will invite Dean McGreevy to visit the Senate.

Adjournment was at 8:20pm

Respectfully submitted,

Paul McGinn
Chemical and Biomolecular Engr.
Co-Secretary

Minutes of Notre Dame Faculty Senate Meeting
November 3, 2015
DeBartolo Room 140

Attendees: Matthew Capdevielle, Mark Caprio, Dominic Chaloner, Christopher Chowrimootoo, Xavier Creary, Meredith Doellman, Mary Frandsen, David Galvin, John Gaski, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Michael Hemler, Michael Kirsch, Byung-Joo Lee, Hai Lin, Adam Martin, Mary Ann McDowell, Paul McDowell, Paul McGinn, Michael Mogavero, Hildegund Müller, Walter Nicgorski, Chris Pratt, Joe Urbany, Sandra Vera-Muñoz, Jeanne Romero-Severson, Nidia Ruelas, Christopher Shields, Joshua Shrout, Anna Simon, Cheri Smith, Marsha Stevenson, Meng Wang, Hannelore Weber, Sophie White, Shauna Williams, Xiaoshan Yang.

Excused: David Thomas, Richard Williams

Called to order at 6:02pm

1. Opening Prayer (Jeanne Romero-Severson, Chair)
2. The minutes of the October 6, 2015, meeting were approved
3. Chair's Remarks

- a. Core Curriculum

We will have a speaker at the next meeting.

- b. CIF Committee Process

The University's CIF Committee held its first meeting; a list of committee members was listed in the faculty senate agenda. The committee discussed the perceived purpose of CIFs; there was near unanimity that CIFs might not be measuring what we think they are measuring (e.g., quality of teaching); concern was expressed that CIFs are being used inappropriately.

Members of the Faculty Senate expressed a number of concerns regarding the CIF Committee, including

- why are only 3 of 12 committee members female, given the concerns raised in the faculty survey? Jeanne said that wasn't explicitly discussed at the first meeting.
- why is there only 1 committee member from Science and Engineering? Jeanne said she was surprised, too, give the purported importance of quantitative skills for this committee.

- are there any underrepresented minorities on the Committee? Jeanne said she is not certain, but doesn't think so.

Paul McGinn (the past Chair of the Faculty Senate) mentioned that 4 of the 5 individuals recommended by Paul last year were put on the committee; it was suggested that future recommendations by the Faculty Senate regarding University committees should take into consideration appropriate gender and minority representation.

Jeanne mentioned concern about the lack of actual CIF data provided at the 1st meeting.

It was suggested that the committee should examine the extensive literature and research in the course evaluation field.

c. Trustee Meeting Report

Jeanne previously distributed via email the Power Point slides she presented to the University Trustees.

d. Policy on Reimbursement of Flight Bookings Before a Trip Occurs

Jeanne explained the new University policy (which reverts to the pre-2008 policy) to not provide pre-trip advance reimbursements for self-paid University travel (individuals wishing to avoid personal advances can use Anthony Travel); this is consistent with what most other universities do; the Executive Committee did not have objections to the change.

e. Consolidated Appeals Process

This process is nearing conclusion. Only one original class member remains. The Women's committee has offered suggestions. Kathleen Brickley plans to discuss the issue with that committee one more time, and plans to attend the December Faculty Senate meeting to make a presentation on this topic.

f. Academic Honor Code Revision

VP and Associate Provost Hugh Page asked to meet with Jeanne regarding a University committee considering possible Honor Code revisions. Hugh is not asking for a Faculty Senate representative on the committee, but merely wants to solicit the senate's "perspective". There appears to be widespread concerns about effectiveness of the honor code

Xavier Creary, who serves on the committee (although not as a representative

of the Faculty Senate), noted that there appear to be two main issues: how do we write a code that covers all cases (e.g., if the involved students or faculty are no longer at the university) and how do we get students to buy into it (e.g. concerns about students not upholding their obligation to report knowing violations).

A comment was made that faculty reluctance to confront students might be tied to CIF score concerns; Jeanne said this concern was raised at the CIF committee meeting

4. Old Business

Faculty Senate members were reminded to update their departments on faculty senate proceedings.

5. Committee Meetings

Faculty Senate committees met in break-out sessions.

6. Committee Reports

a. Administrative Affairs (Josh Shrout)

The committee is working on updating the Faculty Senate website (there have been problems obtaining access to the old site, which is run through OIT; the new site will be run through the Provost's office and will be easier to update). The committee is considering what should be on site.

b. Academic Affairs (Paul McDowell)

There has been a positive response to the choice of ACC Scholar. The committee discussed last year's proposal for a new emeritus rank. The Provost and deans rejected the proposal on the basis that it should be addressed college by college (given the significant differences in retirement cultures, space resources, etc., among colleges); Dean McGreevy of Arts & Letters showed receptiveness to addressing the underlying concerns for productive scholars.

c. Benefits (Nasir Ghiaseddin)

As of the last report, only 49% of eligible participants have enrolled in open season, with only 3 days remaining; HR plans to track people down who don't enroll to make certain they understand that affirmative re-enrollment is required to maintain health insurance. Voluntary plans (e.g., accident plan) are available for an additional fee; other plans might be approved in the future (e.g., parental leave with pay).

There may be some problems with the open season confirmation page; Nassir will discuss this with HR.

d. Student Affairs (John Gaski)

The committee discussed the possibility of the Faculty Senate offering feedback regarding the Honor Code. Tentative thoughts involved the importance of not only increased student awareness, but also student engagement; perhaps the penalties should be reviewed (whether the penalties may not be severe enough, or whether they may be too severe and thereby discouraging student reporting).

7. New Business

The University's REEL Committee addresses the Royal Excursion Express Line Chicago shuttle (which transports people who live in Chicago to and from the ND campus). The shuttle is underutilized, but it is very important to those who use it. Rich Williams agreed last month to represent the Faculty Senate on that committee.

8. Next Meeting – December 1, 2015, 6:00pm

Kathleen Brickley will address the Faculty Senate; Jeanne will also invite John McGreevy.

9. The meeting adjourned at 7:48pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Kirsch
Professor of Law
Co-Secretary

Minutes of Notre Dame Faculty Senate Meeting
December 1, 2015
DeBartolo Room 140

Attendees: Matthew Capdevielle, Dominic Chaloner, Christopher Chowrimootoo, Xavier Creary, Matthew Devine, Meredith Doellman, Mary Frandsen, David Galvin, John Gaski, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Michael Hemler, Michael Kirsch, Byung-Joo Lee, Hai Lin, Adam Martin, Mary Ann McDowell, Paul McDowell, Paul McGinn, Hildegund Müller, Walter Nicgorski, Chris Pratt, Joe Urbany, Sandra Vera-Muñoz, Jeanne Romero-Severson, Nidia Ruelas, Christopher Shields, Joshua Shrout, Anna Simon, Cheri Smith, Marsha Stevenson, David Thomas, Meng Wang, Hannelore Weber, Sophie White, Shauna Williams, Richard Williams, Xiaoshan Yang,

Excused: Mark Caprio

Absentees: Michael Mogavero, Samir Younes

Called to order at 6:02 pm

1. Opening prayer offered by Jeanne Romero-Severson, Chair
2. The minutes of the November 3, 2015 meeting were approved
3. Chair's Remarks (Jeanne Romero-Severson)

- a. CIF Process

The University committee reviewing course evaluations is looking for academic papers on how best to evaluate teaching. If anyone knows of some good studies on this issue, please send them to Jeanne. The next committee meeting is this Thursday morning.

- b. University's Traffic & Parking Appeals Committee

The University committee asked if the Faculty Senate would like to send a representative (which is optional). Jeanne asked if any representative would like to sit on this committee and, if so, to let her know.

4. Proposed Consolidated Appeal Procedures

Kathleen Brickley, Associate General Counsel, and Michael Desch, Chair of the Department of Political Sciences, made a presentation on the proposed procedures. A letter from Kathleen Brickley to the Faculty Senate was circulated via email prior to the meeting, discussing the historical development of the two appeals

procedures currently relevant to sex discrimination: (i) the “Frese” appeals procedure, resulting from the settlement of lawsuit filed in 1981, which is contained in Appendix A of the Academic Articles, and (ii) the more general appeals procedure. The letter also discussed the practical problems (redundancy, confusion, burden on faculty reviewers, etc.) these multiple procedures create. The Faculty Affairs Committee of the Academic Council has created a draft proposal to consolidate the two procedures into a single appeals procedure, which is intended to be more administrable while also protecting appellants’ rights. Various stakeholders (including the remaining member of the Frese class) have agreed to the proposed revision.

The floor was opened to questions, as follows:

Q: What are major changes under the proposed procedure?

Kathleen Brickley (KB): The standard of review will be “preponderance of evidence” (*i.e.*, more than 50%, as in civil cases). The proposed procedure will have three members, unlike the Appendix A procedure, which only has one member. (also, in the case of a discrimination complaint, at the request of the Provost or appellant, a member can be added for diversity). The remedies under the proposal are also more flexible—under the Appendix A procedure there is only a limited remedy of sending the case back to PAC, regardless of where the error occurred; in contrast, under the general procedure, as revised in 2009, the President or Provost (depending on where the process previously stopped) can fashion a more immediate and appropriate remedy (*e.g.*, promotion, reappointment, etc.).

Q: Could the President or Provost go against the recommendation of committee?

KB: The President or provost could reject the committee’s finding only if there is a very strong reason for doing so; as with the Appendix A procedure, the appellant would still have the option of filing a lawsuit.

Q: How does sexual orientation fit into the reference to discrimination based on “sex”?

KB: Dan Myers previously said he would direct such a complainant to file under a personal bias claim (because sexual orientation is not itself a protected class under federal law).

Q: Why don't Special Professional Faculty (SPF) have the opportunity to be reviewed by SPFs?

KB: We didn’t add a special requirement that SPFs must be on the committee; but existing general procedures allows SPFs to elect members to the committee

Q: Since the Frese settlement, have there been any lawsuits by people unhappy with internal procedures?

KB: Yes, there have been some; the internal appeals process happens with some regularity when promotion, etc. is denied

Q: What is the anticipated effect on the number or outcomes of appeals under the revised process?

KB: This wasn't considered, as it wasn't a driving reason for consolidating the procedures.

Q: Was there any discussion of allowing a person who was denied based on sexual discrimination to change the package reviewed by PAC to reflect additional information?

KB: Under new consolidated procedure, the Provost or President would make the determination of remedy without necessarily having to involve PAC. He might send it back to the department or PAC, as he deems appropriate, in a manner intended to eliminate the discriminatory factors

Q: Does anyone ever win appeals currently, or is this just going to just be a more streamlined way of rejecting appeals?

Michael said he doesn't know, but VP and Associate Provost Laura Carlson should be asked for data. Paul McGinn mentioned that he previously had asked Dan Myers, who said there had been no successful appeals during the time of Dan's involvement.

Q: Does the court need to approve this change?

KB: No; the court did not retain jurisdiction over such a change; however, the one remaining Frese class member agrees with the proposed change.

Kathleen Brickley noted that the plan is to put this proposal on the Academic Council's agenda for the first meeting in spring; if approved, it could become effective 7/1/16.

Q: If effective July 1, would it be optional for those denied this year?

KB: We'll have to look into this.

The Chair noted that there does not seem to be any strong Faculty Senate opposition to the proposal, but we won't be giving a formal opinion tonight; if anyone does have concerns, they should email Michael

(Michael.Desch.4@nd.edu). Senators should let their department/colleges know about this and seek input from other faculty.

5. Decennial Core Curriculum Review (Michael Hildreth)

Michael Hildreth is co-chair of the University's Decennial Core Curriculum Review Committee.

Michael provided a brief summary. The committee's charge was to lead a campus-wide conversation and deliberation. A draft report was released on Monday. There will be many opportunities for discussion across campus; Michael presented slides summarizing the committee's charge, procedures, outreach to a wide range of stakeholders, and the proposed changes. The plan is to frame the core curriculum around "ways of knowing"

The floor was opened to questions, as follows:

Q: How did they decide to eliminate AP courses to test out of the core requirements, and what do peers institutions do?

Michael Hildreth (MH): Peer institutions have a wide variety of policies. We'd like to see AP used for placement, but not used to place out of core requirements; even currently, given the variations among ND colleges, there aren't a wide swath of core courses of which you can test out. The committee thought that, because you can't test out of many of the courses, you shouldn't be able to test out of any core courses.

Q: How are courses designated as writing courses?

MH: The committee would like to see greater uniformity in writing designations. Regarding AP courses and the writing requirement, AP would be very relevant for placement (e.g., allow to skip lower level class and start in higher class), but might not be appropriate to satisfy the requirement that a student has met a core type of class. Another possibility might be to allow only AP Language, not AP Lit, to count as writing, and perhaps to raise the required score to 5.

Q: IB needs to be considered along with AP, along with SAT 2 subject tests; also we need to consider the needs and expectations of students -- testing out of core courses allows students to pursue additional interests

MH: The number of core courses that students can place out of isn't very big, so eliminating them wouldn't have a big effect on students' ability to pursue their interests. Also, the Director of Admissions doesn't think these changes regarding AP and Core requirements would have a significant impact on applicants' decisions.

MH then showed slides summarizing the proposed new core requirements, explaining how they fit into a “ways of knowing” approach

Q: Is it possible that someone could go through Engineering and not take a literature course?

MH: Yes

Q: It seems like many new courses would need to be created.

MH: We received many good proposals to be put into the core; by setting up options, it will create space to create these new courses (*e.g.*, integration courses), but will not necessarily require specific new courses.

Q: Why not require a diversity course, instead of just offering it as an option as, say, an integration course?

MH: We received many very good ideas, but ultimately decided we couldn't select a few to require or the required number of courses could get overwhelming, and instead decided to offer them as options within the categories.

Q: Would significant numbers of existing core courses need to be revised to fit within the revised requirements?

MH: No, but it will be useful to periodically review courses (consciousness raising) and reflect on whether they're meeting the requirements. We hope that University-wide ownership of core courses increases.

Q: Can core courses be double-counted?

MH: We'd like them to not double-count within core requirements (but they could simultaneously satisfy a major's requirements).

Q: To what extent were results of student surveys incorporated, particularly with respect to philosophy/theology requirements?

MH: We didn't specifically ask about philosophy/theology or other specific requirements; we merely asked about general experiences and thoughts regarding the core. Ultimately, it's a faculty decision as to what specific core areas are part of an appropriate college education.

Q: Might it be a disservice to students to not thoroughly review the theology requirement?

MH: Extensive discussions were undertaken by the committee regarding the requirement; we didn't take it lightly.

Q: Did the committee take into consideration concerns that eliminating requirements would have adverse consequences for those who teach particular courses? Is that a factor in keeping theology or other requirements?

MH: No, we looked at what was important for students to learn (including what is important at a Catholic university), and tried to give them options.

Q: Won't the recommendation that each department require at least 3 free electives cause some departments to make significant changes to their requirements (e.g., engineering)?

MH: 3 is just a number for discussion; maybe it should be 2; but 0 seems too low.

Q: Will the proposal for more teaching by distinguished professors reduce teaching opportunities for graduate students?

MH: Not necessarily; there are many ways to structure a course – e.g. you could have graduate students teach sections.

Q: But that would limit the number of chances for our graduate students to be the instructor of record.

MH: That's a good point; we'll need to consider this (and it might not involve significant numbers of classes).

Q: How would integration courses be determined, and will they count as a course for each instructor if interdisciplinary?

MH: Our hope is they will count as 1 class for each instructor, and the University will support the creation of effective courses, given that the University would be saying it's of core importance.

Q: What if an integration course doesn't draw many people from your department; might your department chair object?

MH: You might need to adapt the course in the future to better draw your students; over time, the appropriateness of a course as integrative might need to be reconsidered.

MH concluded by summarizing the next steps. The committee plans to spend the rest of this academic year soliciting feedback. After assessing feedback, the committee will create a final report. The committee plans to submit a final report

to the Academic Council in Fall 2016.

6. Adjournment

Because of the length of time taken for discussion of the proposed consolidated appeals procedure and the core curriculum review, the Chair asked if there was any pressing committee business or other new business that needed to be addressed tonight. None was mentioned, so the meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

7. Next Regular Meeting, 6:00 pm, Tuesday, February 2, 2016; Room 141

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Kirsch
Professor of Law
Co-Secretary

Minutes of Notre Dame Faculty Senate Meeting
February 2, 2016
DeBartolo Room 141

Attended: Matthew Capdevielle, Mark Caprio, Dominic Chaloner, Xavier Creary, Meredith Doellman, Mary Frandsen, David Galvin, John Gaski, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Michael Hemler, Michael Kirsch, Byung-Joo Lee, Hai Lin, Adam Martin, Mary Ann McDowell, Paul McDowell, Paul McGinn, Hildegund Müller, Walter Nicgorski, Chris Pratt, Jeanne Romero-Severson, Nidia Ruelas, Christopher Shields, Joshua Shrout, Anna Simon, Cheri Smith, Marsha Stevenson, Joe Urbany, Sandra Vera-Muñoz, Meng Wang, Hannelore Weber, Sophie White, Richard Williams, Shauna Williams, Xiaoshan Yang.

Excused: Christopher Chowrimootoo, Samir Younes

Absent:, David Thomas

Called to order at 6:00 pm

1. Opening prayer offered by Jeanne Romero-Severson, Chair
2. The minutes of the December 1, 2015 meeting were approved
3. Chair's remarks (Jeanne Romero-Severson)
 - a. Consolidated Appeals process update

Jeanne received lots of comments. She brought these to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Academic Council. Based upon this input they will seek further information from the Associate provost (Maura Ryan) to answer several questions. These include, "What is the frequency of the frese appeal being used?", "How many times did it result in a tenure decision reversal?" Maura Ryan will report back with answers.

- b. CIF committee update (Teaching Effectiveness Committee)

The committee will meet approximately every 2 weeks until the end of the year. They have had active discussions about how to make effective use of CIF numbers. Discussions will continue and Jeanne will keep the Senate apprised.

- c. University's Traffic & Parking Appeals Board- we have a Faculty representative from the library

2. Mary Ann McDowell presented a preliminary view of the new faculty senate website. Log-in information will be sent to senators to preview it and provide suggestions for additional content, help correct errors, etc. She has already shown print-outs to individuals in the provost's office. It will probably go live in 2-3 weeks.

3. Judith Fox presented on the Ad hoc Committee on Faculty Governance. The Faculty Affairs committee of the Academic council proposed that the committee consist of nine members, to be elected from Arts and Letters, Architecture, Business, Engineering, Law, Libraries, Research, Science, and Special Professional faculty. Some of the committee members were in attendance, including some who are also members of the faculty senate. A full list of the committee membership is here:
http://provost.nd.edu/assets/189606/ad_hoc_committee_on_faculty_governance_members.pdf

4. The committee's charge is "to survey systematically faculty opinion on the state of faculty governance at Notre Dame; outline and clarify current mechanisms of faculty governance; establish criteria to determine those issues that fall under the purview of faculty governance; ascertain whether there are any areas of disagreement between senior administrators and faculty members on the role of the faculty governance; and, based upon all its findings, offer recommendations for enhancing faculty governance. The focus of the committee will be on faculty governance at the central university level rather than at the college or department level

The website related to the committee is here:

<http://provost.nd.edu/committees/ad-hoc-committee-on-faculty-governance/>

The committee is planning a survey and town hall meetings to get an idea of faculty concerns. She asked if it would be useful to show up at departmental faculty meetings for discussion. Questions asked whether the committee "has teeth" - it appears they will only make recommendations. It is recognized the committee has to convince people this process will lead somewhere. It was remarked that faculty hope to get some feedback on what will happen to their

recommendations. It was suggested the committee find a way to probe faculty feelings on the “secrecy” of decision making. Other topics included whether it would be useful to get institutional accountability of major academic officers, e.g. have the provost address the faculty once a year. Can the faculty get a representative to sit in on discussions concerning university budgeting? The issue was raised on whether we want/need two faculty bodies (Academic Council and Faculty Senate).

5. Old business

6. Committee Reports

- a. Academic Affairs – there is a resolution from the A&L college council asking for more participation in ND International (NDI). The resolution from the college council wants more input on policies and structure of NDI. They have agreed to solicit questions concerning the resolution from committee members. These will be forwarded to the A&L College Council. The resolution will be sent out to the full Senate. It was also reported that the Academic Council is discussing who can serve as a thesis advisor/ director. The idea is to better formalize the use of non-ND people as co-directors/advisors.
- b. Administrative Affairs – discussed new web site; submitted suggestions to Mary Ann McDowell
- c. Benefits – discussed feedback on the new drug Rx company (OptumRx). Some glitches have been reported in transitioning from the old system to the new one. HR knows of the issues and is working on correcting the problems. The committee will meet with HR in the next couple of weeks.
- d. Student Affairs – discussed CIF’s and honor code. In one month they may have ready a resolution for the full senate.

7. New Business

- a. New website – see point 2 above
- b. There will be a request to follow that a faculty senate representative come from the faculty of the new Keough School of Global Affairs

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 pm.

9. The Next Regular Meeting will be at 6:00 pm, Tuesday, March 1, 2016 ; 141
DBRT

Respectfully submitted,

Paul McGinn
Professor of Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering
Co-Secretary

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

Minutes of Notre Dame Faculty Senate Meeting
April 5, 2016
DeBartolo Room 141

Attended: Rebecca Blais, Mark Caprio, Dominic Chaloner, Christopher Chowrimootoo, Xavier Creary, Meredith Doellman, Mary Frandsen, David Galvin, John Gaski, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Michael Hemler, Michael Kirsch, Howard Lanser, Byung-Joo Lee, Hai Lin, Adam Martin, Mary Ann McDowell, Paul McDowell, Paul McGinn, Walter Nicgorski, Chris Pratt, Joe Urbany, Sandra Vera-Muñoz, Nidia Ruelas, Christopher Shields, Anna Simon, Cheri Smith, Marsha Stevenson, Aaron Striegel, Meng Wang, Hannelore Weber, Richard Williams, Shauna Williams, Xiaoshan Yang, Guangjian Zhang

Excused: Matthew Capdevielle, Matthew Devine, Hildegund Müller, Natalie Porter, Jeanne Romero-Severson, Joshua Shrou, David Thomas, Sophie White, Samir Younes

Called to order at 6:00 pm

1. Opening prayer offered by Rich Williams, Vice-Chair
2. The minutes of the March 1, 2016 meeting were approved
3. Chair's remarks (from Jeanne Romero-Severson, read by Rich Williams)
 - a. CIF committee update : The results of the survey are in and the comments were not as negative as anticipated. The preliminary impression is that ~30% of the faculty have no use at all for CIFs for two reasons: they do not measure learning and they are misused by administrators. The rest of the opinions may be classified as "meh" or "sometimes useful".
 - b. Circumstances under which SPF can be the faculty senate representative for his/her department –this will be left as a topic for next year. For SPF's to be a department's faculty senator, or for more at-large SPF senators the bylaws will have to be changed by the Academic Council.
 - c. Webpage update; Mary Ann McDowell presented new changes to the webpage. She also repeated her earlier request for any items people would like to see added to make the site more useful.
4. Chuck Hurley (registrar) - provided an update on Federal Regulations. Most of them concern financial aid. For example, faculty members should update their Dean's office and the registrar if a student is not showing up for class. The University has to keep federal agencies updated on class withdrawals as this impacts student loan pay back. In this regard, the university also has to report students' pace towards graduation (150% rule – student may not receive

Direct Subsidized Loans for more than 150 percent of the published length of their enrolled program). Federal agencies continue to ask for more data. For example, has a student taken a class more than two times? The government will only pay for two times. All data is reported to the National Student Clearinghouse. It is important that faculty check the enrollment in their class to be sure all students are on the list, and to make sure students have officially dropped a class.

5. Prof. Robert F. Easley (Management Dept.) – reviewed the request submitted to their Dean to split the management department into two departments. The rationale is to make it easier to manage a large (30 tenure track; 20 SPF) department that covers a wide range of topics. By all accounts this is supported by all the tenure track and SPF faculty. He answered questions from the audience. The undergraduate majors in the program now will be unaffected. At the close of his presentation the Senate unanimously approved an expression of support for this split.
6. Old business – John Gaski presented a resolution on CIF's. After much discussion and wordsmithing a resolution (attached) was passed with 30 voting in favor, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
7. Committee Reports – committee meetings were not held due to time constraints. Instead there was discussion concerning the Academic Affairs resolution on internationalization. Gretchen Reydam-Schils presented a document being discussed by the Academic Affairs committee. It was noted that there has been non-use of the University Committee on Internationalization in evaluating the global gateways. An animated discussion between Prof. Reydam-Schils and Prof. Christopher Shields followed. The Academic Affairs committee will try to produce a refined version of their document for review by the full senate at the next meeting.
8. New Business –
 - a. Mary Ann McDowell asked senators to please think about whether we should continue to have a president's dinner.
 - b. Elections Nominating Committee – a nominating committee was formed from volunteers. Marsha Stevenson will chair the committee. Other members include Nasir Ghiaseddin, John Gaski, Paul McGinn, and Nidia Ruelas.
9. Adjournment - The meeting adjourned at 8:16 pm.

The Next Regular Meeting will be at 6:00 pm, Tuesday, May 3, 2016 ; 136 DBRT

Respectfully submitted,

Paul McGinn
Professor of Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering
Co-Secretary

Motion approved by the ND Faculty Senate 30-1 on April 5, 2016

The Course/Instructor Feedback (CIF) instrument the University has created appears to be mainstream by student evaluation measurement standards. The problem is that those industry norms, represented by the entire history of validation of such instruments as reported in the Educational Psychology literature, are weak.

The presumed validity evidence developed by the Notre Dame Advisory Committee to the Provost on Evaluation of Teaching in its 2007 creation of the present CIF instrument is primarily reliability evidence, which is insufficient for a conclusion of construct validity. So, across higher education as well as within Notre Dame, it should be recognized that the true validity of conventional student evaluation measures of teaching is unknown at best.

For any university to treat student ratings such as the CIF as embodying stronger evidence than merited intrinsically is dangerously simplistic. Moreover, the University's non-nuanced use of the CIF results may create other specific dysfunctional consequences, such as a stifling effect on pedagogic innovation. Junior faculty, in particular, may be reluctant to experiment with teaching innovations or new ideas for fear of jeopardizing high-stakes semester evaluations.

The present CIF instrument and its use may have contributed positively in some ways to our educational environment. Yet in view of the methodological questionability of extant student evaluation technology, we urge the University to be more cautious in applying such an approach to professional assessment decisions, to avoid unjustified career-damaging outcomes. For instance, better adherence to the University's own stated emphasis on a portfolio approach in promotion decisions, instead of rigid over-interpretation of inherently *ordinal* data, would seem to serve this just aim.

Accordingly, we support the efforts of the University Committee on the Evaluation of Teaching to improve the state of measurement practice for faculty evaluation purposes.

Minutes of Notre Dame Faculty Senate Meeting
May 3, 2016
DeBartolo Room 136

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm

1. The opening prayer was offered by Jeanne Romero-Severson
2. The minutes of the April 5, 2016 meeting were approved. Several attendance errors were corrected
3. Elections – Marsha Stevenson presented a slate of candidates for election:

Chair-	Nominee	Jeanne Romero-Severson
Vice Chair-	Nominees	Paul McGinn
Co-Secretaries (2)	Nominees	Dominic Chaloner and Mary Frandsen
Treasurer-	Nominees	Marsha Stevenson

The slate of nominees was elected as a whole.

An email will be sent to all Senators see what subcommittees people want to be on. This information will be used to populate the Senate webpage.

There was also discussion about whether it is preferable to have subcommittee meetings outside of the regular meeting. People can express sentiments at the retreat in August;

4. Committee reports – NONE

Abbreviated chairs remarks: There is a proposal for an applied math MS degree to be funded by AT&T. It will involve development of on-line courses. AT&T will likely fill up the available slots. It is aiming for a startup in Fall, 2017. There will be a beta test of the first 2 online courses in Spring of 2017. The proposal hasn't yet been presented to the CSE department.

5. Guest: Nick Entrikin – ND International

Gave a lengthy presentation (see slides on the Senate website). He also brought along Tom Guinan VP for administrative operations; Robert Norton – Assoc VP for academic affairs and research.

Among the highlights, he stated that there is no prioritization of the program pillars. The 5 pillars don't all get equal amounts of funding. Approximately 70% goes to education abroad. If the cost of faculty who are at the gateways is included, education abroad accounts for ~80% of the expenditures.

He discussed the education abroad program. It is “a right of every student who qualifies”. Funds for study abroad have increased. Efforts have been made to bring students in to fill slots of those [programs with vacancies and to build programs for science and engineering students and student athletes. Summer programs are now increasing. As the program grows risks go up. More effort is focused on risk management than ever before. There is/was a have a university wide summit

for student health and safety abroad. The Global Gateways allow for holding conferences in London and Rome. They are now bringing more international students here. For example, there are 80 non-degree seeking international students here in the summer; in some cases these are exchange students (we send 1, get 1).

Faculty engagement has come by way of the University committee on internationalization (UCI) – the Academic Council’s committee. ND International (NDI) created a new committee(s) – committee on integrated international responsibilities.

Q&A – There was a question about examples of interdisciplinary programs

There were many questions about faculty governance, NDI being an area of dissatisfaction. One example is the Latin America committee. Entekin contended “there are faculty that have agendas” .In response to a question about the cause of the discontent of the A&L faculty, Entekin suggested that NDI has been misrepresented;

Entekin was displeased with senate process. He asked why he wasn’t invited earlier. He thinks some people have axes to grind. Jeanne Romero-Severson expressed a desire to invite the new director to the Senate.

6. New business – Senate NDI resolution; timing of committee meetings for next year;

Discussion centered on whether the Senate should wait until a new Director is in place. An interest was expressed in having him/her come to the first meeting. It was also suggested that there be a letter from A&L to him/her. Paul McDowell suggested deferring makes sense with a new director coming in. He summarized that a resolution started in the A&L college council and passed with 41 for, 0 against and 1 abstention. In the Senate the academic affairs committee passed it unanimously; 10-0, but 2 or 3 members did not vote. The senate agreed to defer action on the resohn until we can hear from the new NDI director

Jeanne Romero-Severson was directed to invite the new person;

7. announcements and updates

a. Senate retreat-1/2 day

b. Website update

8 . The meeting was adjourned at 8:07 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul McGinn
Professor of Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering
Co-Secretary