

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Room 136 DeBartolo
November 6, 2018

Signed in as Present: Adam Martin, Annie Coleman, Ben Heller, Caroline Cloonan, Chao-Shin Liu, Corey Gayheart, Dan Johnson, David Gasperetti, Emma Planinc, Joe Urbany, Lira Yoon, Marsha Stevenson, Mary Frandsen, Matthew Capdevielle, Matyas Abel Tsegaye, Mei-Chi Shaw, Meng Wang, Molly Walsh, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Paul McGinn, Phillip Sloan, Richard Pierce, Richard Williams, Samir Younés, Shauna Williams, Tom Nowak, Tom Stober, Xiaoshan Yang

Not Signed in as Present: Aaron Striegel, Anna Simon, Ben Radcliff (e-mailed; excused), Catherine Schlegel (excused for fall semester), Cody Brockelmeyer, David O'Connor, David Thomas, Eric Sims (e-mailed; excused), Jimmy Gurulé (e-mailed; excused), La Donna Forsgren, Marie Halvorsen-Ganepola, Matt Bloom, Patrick Deneen, Richard Sheehan (e-mailed; excused), Sergei Rouvimov, Shahriar Mobashery, Shaun Lee, Sylwia Ptasinska (e-mailed; excused)

- Chair, Ben Heller (BH) called the meeting to order at 6:05pm

1) Opening prayer

- a) BH offered a prayer

2) Approval of Minutes of the March 6, 2018 meeting

- a) Minutes approved as distributed

3) Erin Hoffmann-Harding, VP of Student affairs

- a) Erin's responsibilities include: (i) Residential life, (ii) Student development, (iii) Center for Career Development, (iv) Campus Ministry, and (v) Student Services

b) 4 areas for updates

- i) Residential life

(1) Undergrad residency

- (a) New 3 year requirement on campus, made possible by new dorm capacity.

- (b) Over the last 20 years, the off-campus undergraduate student population has been about 20% of all undergrads, that number skewed heavily by seniors (67% of whom currently live off-campus).

- (c) Seeking intentional, pastoral campus life for our undergrads

(2) Grad student housing and support

- (i) New facility just north of the old university village – Aug 2020 new complex opening 192 units, operated by a partner with military housing expertise

- (ii) Recently launched the Family Resource Center for married students, with the mission:

1. the FRC is dedicated to building community for Notre Dame's married, parenting, and/or pregnant students and their families and to working with established partners throughout the University to connect these students with resources to enhance their intellectual, emotional, social, and spiritual formation.

(3) Campus Climate Survey

- (a) All enrolled students at all levels, 52% response rate
- (b) Raw survey response data and verbatims are available at Diversity.nd.edu
- (c) Selected results
 1. Feel a sense of belonging. 85% overall, but significant variance across different groups.
 2. Forty seven percent report experiencing adverse treatment based on identity. Most frequent sources: peer to peer, verbal
 - a. 90% unreported
 - i. Did not merit reporting
 - ii. Did not know how
 - iii. Believed University wouldn't take action
 3. ND genuinely welcoming 79%
 4. Authentic commitment to diversity 50%
 5. 94% indicate they want to learn from others

(4) Student counseling / psychiatric needs

- (i) Increasing demand
 1. 2008-09 1,015 grew to 2017-18 1,729 (23% psychiatry)
 2. Proportion of students needing care very consistent with national trends at universities
 3. Students with disabilities – accommodations for students with disabilities students registered with disability services
 - a. 2010-11 279 (mental health = 30)
 - b. 2017-18 957 (mental health = 268)
 4. Care and wellness consultants
 - a. Referrals to these consultants:
 - i. In 2015-16 647
 - ii. In 2017-18 729

(5) Questions from the faculty

- (a) university unable to meet accommodation requests and the published article

that has resulted in significant publicity

(b) Health insurance for spouses of graduate students

1. Student health advisory committee does an annual review

4) Committee reports

a) Student rep introductions

i) Corey Gayhart, Undergraduate Student Government Vice President

ii) Caroline Cloonan, Undergraduate Student Government Director of Academic Affairs

iii) Matyas Tsegaye, President of Graduate Student Union

b) Exec committee (BH)

i) BH gave report to board of trustees

ii) JAG asked for a recommendation of a senator to participate on a committee on licensing-Eric Sims now serving

c) Executive Committee and Ad hoc Committee on Dean Search Transparency (Annie Coleman)

i) Current practice for deans' searches at Notre Dame: candidates are given confidentiality to support a model that allows ND to pursue top prospects who would not otherwise put themselves forward as candidates.

ii) Concern raised by the ad-hoc committee that faculty who are not on the search committee won't have input at the later stages of the selection process

iii) Provost Burish, Lisa Prigohzy-Milius (Managing Director of Presidio Executive Search who leads the search processes) were interviewed

(1) Provost Burish, Ms. Prigohzy-Milius explained that the search model Notre Dame follows is to pursue top candidates who we proactively identify rather than await responses to job postings. These candidates generally do not consider themselves to be "on the market." As such, it is essential to offer strict confidentiality as a minimum condition to provide those who ultimately decide to participate assurance that the process will not affect them in their current positions. In this model, confidentiality has to extend throughout and can't be lifted at a later stage.

(2) Three current female deans have indicated they would not have participated in the search process without confidentiality

iv) Professor Eric Sims (outside member of the search committee for the current Mendoza Dean's search committee) sent email comments concurring with the need for confidentiality.

v) The ad-hoc committee proposed a resolution that seeks:

(1) Information about the candidate pool characteristics shared with the faculty,

(2) Open presentations by final candidates to the faculty of the college.

- (3) The opportunity for college faculty to provide feedback about the candidate to the search committee.

vi) Discussion

- (1) Arguments for the resolution

- (a) Concerns about lack of faculty input, lack of understanding of the process
- (b) At public universities, search processes are usually open
- (c) It's unclear why an open process wouldn't produce candidates as good; lack of hard data on this
- (d) 2015 AAUP issued statement against confidential searches for administrators
- (e) logical inconsistency with general move toward CAPS of the whole and transparency of faculty hiring process, especially given that Deans become faculty members of a department

- (2) Arguments against the resolution

- (a) A more traditional open process produces candidates from a pool that is job-hunting, not as strong (mistakes have been made)
- (b) No concerns raised about dissatisfaction with deans hired through the current process.
- (c) The "targeted" approach has produced some impactful leaders (e.g., Carolyn Woo).
- (d) Rather than benchmarking other universities, we should execute a process that will produce the strongest leaders.
- (3) A suggestion was made to split the resolution so that it focused only on the first point (sharing of candidate pool aggregate information). Ultimately the full resolution was called for a vote.

- (4) Resolution passes 12-5 (full text appended to these minutes)

d) Academic Affairs: update (Matthew Capdevielle)

- i) Ccommittee agreed to make an addition to undergrad academic code

- (1) ,, be revised to include internships as university excused absences

- (2) The current policy is 2 absences per semester

- (3) Discussion

- (a) Against: concerns about more reasons to allow students to be excused from class
- (b) For: students may be disadvantaged in the job market

- (4) Vote called on a verbal resolution to change the academic code to include internship-related excused absences

- (a) Resolution passes 14-2 with 1 abstention

- e) Administrative Affairs: update (Dan Johnson)
 - i) Bringing someone in to talk about the cost of venues – possibly John Affleck-Graves
 - ii) Granting / rescinding honorary degrees
 - (1) what provisions would we like to see for granting / rescinding on honorary degrees
 - (2) a potential advisory role for the faculty
 - (3) Discussion
 - (a) Recision: can we apply the same criteria for which faculty would lose position / tenure?
 - (b) What are the criteria for choosing honorary degree recipients and is there an advisory role?
 - (c) BH asked that senators separately share other point / concerns with DJ or him
 - f) Benefits: update (Nasir Ghiaseddin)
 - i) Parking concerns, particularly during athletic events.
 - ii) University exercise facilities – concerns about availability – hours at Duncan and Rockne.
 - g) Student Affairs: update (BH, Richard Pierce in absentia)
 - i) Consideration of proposal to restructure FYS and authorize
 - (1) Restructure First Year of Studies from an independent college to an Office of First Year Advising reporting to the Assistant Provost for Academic Advising and embed, as appropriate, first year advisors in the colleges and schools of the first year intents they serve.
 - (2) Authorize the implementation committee to begin their work to accomplish this, including suggesting changes to the Academic Articles as necessary.
- 5) New Business
- a) Concern about author of the article criticizing ND for its decision about accommodation for an accepted freshman student with epilepsy; author continues to criticize the university on Twitter and has over 400,000 followers.
- 6) Meeting adjourned at 7:55

Respectfully submitted,

Joe Urbany
Co-Secretary

Appendix A
Resolution on Transparency of Dean Searches
Approved by Faculty Senate November 6, 2018

Developed by Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Deans Searches
Annie G. Coleman, Chair, October 31, 2018

Given concern among the faculty regarding lack of transparency in the process by which the university hires new deans the committee offers the following resolution:

To further foster a community of trust and cooperation among faculty and the administration, to increase transparency of and faculty investment in the dean search process, and to maximize faculty support for newly hired deans, the Faculty Senate proposes the following changes to the dean search process, applicable to all future searches (not those currently underway):

1. The search committee and consultants should communicate to the faculty of the appropriate college early in the process to
 - a. Solicit faculty input on characteristics desired in the new dean,
 - b. Share the job description and prospectus they have developed,
 - c. Identify and explain the steps of the search process, and
 - d. Report demographic statistics of the resulting candidate pool (race, gender, Catholic identity, current position, administrative experience).
2. When the committee has narrowed the pool to the finalists, the candidates should be asked to make an open presentation to the faculty of the college regarding where they stand on issues designated as important to the faculty and what their goals and priorities are for the college.
3. Afterwards, the search committee should solicit feedback from the faculty and take that into consideration during their final deliberations.