

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

5 February 2019

131 DeBartolo Hall

Signed in as Present: Anna Simon, Annie Coleman, Ben Heller, Ben Radcliff, Caroline Cloonan, Catherine Schlegel, Corey Gayheart, Dan Johnson, David Gasperetti, Emma Planinc, Eric Sims, Jimmy Gurulé, 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 Sheehan, Richard Williams, Shauna Williams, Tom Nowak, Tom Stober

Not Signed in as Present: Aaron Striegel (e-mailed; excused), Adam Martin (e-mailed; excused), Chao-Shin Liu, Cody Brockelmeyer, David O'Connor, David Thomas, (e-mailed; excused), John Lubker, La Donna Forsgren, Marie Halvorsen-Ganepola, Matt Bloom, Patrick Deneen, Samir Younés, Sergei Rouvimov, Shahriar Mobashery, Shaun Lee, Sylwia Ptasinska, Xiaoshan Yang (e-mailed; excused)

- Chair Ben Heller (BH) called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm
 1. Opening prayer offered by Eric Sims
 2. Approval of minutes from meeting of December 4, 2018.
 3. Annual Report on Classified Research and Research Visioning Committee / Q&A: Robert J. Bernhard, Vice President for Research
 - a. CLASSIFIED RESEARCH. Provost announced March 2018 acceptance of classified research and the policy statement was approved in early Fall 2018. (https://policy.nd.edu/assets/271748/classified_research.pdf)
 - i. Research review board has been appointed, Jerry McKenny, Chair.
 - ii. Applied in spring for Secret Clearance and received clearance in Nov. 2018, so now able to start accepting classified research.
 - iii. Current potential research projects: 3 from AME, one from EE, one from Physics in various stages of submission / discussion.
 1. Research review board questions investigators re: potential ethical concerns, methods, etc.
 2. Investigator provides self-assessment (e.g., publication potential, potential ethical issues)
 - iv. Discussion.
 1. Make-up of the review board, who do not themselves need to have security clearance. Prof. Bernhard is open to the idea of having a Faculty Senate representative on the review board
 2. Proposals themselves are unclassified
 3. Data are stored in systems separate from the university system.
 - b. RESEARCH VISION COMMITTEE. Planning for ND Research Vision.

- i. Highlighted the benefits of a high level unifying vision of being a “force for good”
- ii. Committee reps: Accounting/business, Chem/Biochem, Physics, History, Law, Architecture, Chem / Biomolecular Engineering, Computer Science, Engineering, English, Keough School, Philosophy.
- iii. Timeline

3. Feb-March 2019, writing draft narrative
 4. March 2019, discussion with Deans / Provost
 5. March 2019, draft posted for faculty comment
 6. April 2019 –discussion draft vetted with faculty
 7. May 2019 finalize narrative
- iv. Illustrative findings to date – external perceptions of Notre Dame:
1. You're in the major leagues, just the early innings
 2. Already distinctive, well-respected for mission (rooted in personal ethics)
 3. Typical suggestions
 - a. Your mission is your great gift
 - b. Future is interdisciplinary / convergence / untraditional
 - c. Find 6 enduring research themes that are fundamental human challenges

4. Committee Reports

- a. Executive Committee and Ad Hoc Committee on Dean Search Transparency
 - i. BH represents the Faculty Senate on the FARS (Faculty Affairs, Research and Scholarship) committee of the Board of Trustees. Recent meeting included reports from Laura Carlson (Graduate School), Bob Bernhard (Research Vision Committee), and Maura Ryan (Faculty Affairs). BH gives regular report to the FARS at fall and spring meetings.
 - ii. Forming a nominations committee. Seeking to build a slate of candidates – Annie Coleman has agreed to lead the committee
 - iii. Ad hoc committee on Dean Search Transparency. Report from Annie Coleman:
 1. Better understanding of the need for transparency
 2. Group is working on a document to explain the process, spelling out some new suggested policies, provides a rationale for confidentiality (draft underway).
 3. Also collecting data from peer institutions
- b. Academic Affairs: update (Chair: Matthew Capdevielle)
 - i. Update on resolution passed re: excused absences (attached)
 1. Committee member Tom Stober will be presenting the resolution further up the committee chain

2. The committee voted to endorse the proposal, with minor edits
 3. Will be going to the full Academic Council later this month
- c. Administrative Affairs: update (Chair: Dan Johnson)
- i. New report from Ad-hoc Committee on Faculty Governance
 1. Senate responses to issues raised in the document
 - a. Item 1. Desire for more faculty input on non-academic issues – e.g., campus crossroads. Suggest the faculty be consulted early on
 - b. Item 2. Regular structure and protocols to facilitate regular consultation
 - c. Item 3. Incentivising participation in shared governance.
 - i. Should be encouraged by Deans and department chairs (e.g., considered in merit raises)
 - d. Item 4. Aligning committees between Senate and Academic Council– postpone
 - e. Item 5. Provost Advisory Committee (PAC). Designing a template for evaluating service activities in T&P
 - f. Item 6. Need to clarify policy about whether to permit SPFs to represent departments at the Faculty Senate. This has been done, reflected in the revised Academic Articles.
 - g. Item 7. Senate should have dedicated admin assistance, set meeting rooms.
 - h. Item 8. Accommodating Faculty Senators with families – i.e., not meeting after hours. (But difficult to schedule during regular hours)
 - i. Item 9. Ad-hoc and standing committees – there may be overlap. Need coordination.
 - j. Item 10. Forming a committee on committees – establishing fairness in principles in forming committees – e.g., so people don't get over or under-used
 - k. Item 11. Concurrence report. Suggested creation of a faculty advisory committee on university mission. Beyond the senate purview.
- d. Benefits: update (Chair: Nasir Ghiaseddin)
- i. No major issues to report
 - ii. Change to the new healthcare administrator seems to be going smoothly – please share any issues or concerns.

incidences of “adverse treatment” in academic settings. The committee is looking for more data and will consider this topic in future meetings.

5. New Business

a. No new business

6. Meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joe Urbany
Mendoza College of Business