

Faculty Senate Minutes 5 March 2019

Signed in as Present: Annie Coleman, Ben Heller, Ben Radcliff, Cody Brockelmeyer, Dan Johnson, David Gasperetti, Emma Planinc, Eric Sims, Jimmy Gurulé, Joe Urbany, Lira Yoon, Marsha Stevenson, Mary Frandsen, Matyas Abel Tsegaye, Meng Wang, Molly Walsh, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Paul McGinn, Sergei Rouvimov, Phillip Sloan, Richard Sheehan, Richard Williams, Samir Younés, Tom Nowak, Tom Stober, Xiaoshan Yang

Not Signed in as Present: Aaron Striegel, Adam Martin (e-mailed; excused), Anna Simon (e-mailed; excused), Caroline Cloonan, Catherine Schlegel, Chao-Shin Liu, Corey Gayheart, David O'Connor, David Thomas, John Lubker (e-mailed; excused), La Donna Forsgren, Marie Halvorsen-Ganepola, Matt Bloom, Matthew Capdevielle (e-mailed; excused), Mei-Chi Shaw (e-mailed; excused), Patrick Deneen, Richard Pierce (e-mailed; excused), Shahriar Mobashery, Shaun Lee, Shauna Williams (e-mailed; excused), Sylwia Ptasinska

1. Opening prayer: Matthew Capdevielle (read by Phil Sloan)
2. Approval of minutes of Senate meeting of 5 February 2019: motion made by Nasir Ghiaseddin, seconded by Tom Stober. Approved.
3. Provost's Annual Address to the Faculty Senate.
Thomas G. Burish (TB), Professor of Psychology and Charles and Jill Fischer Provost
Topic: "University Rankings: A Look Behind the Numbers," a presentation TB made to the Board of Trustees (BOT)
First TB asked senators to list the 3-5 metrics or criteria that are the most important in evaluating the success of Notre Dame.
Gave some history on the development of ways to evaluate universities. First rankings done by *U. S. News and World Report (USNWR)* appeared in 1983, followed by many others.
Question: should we pay attention to rankings, or be concerned about them? If so, why? If not, why not?
On the Pros and Cons of University Rankings
Selected strengths:
1. Meet the needs of many college-bound students and their parents. 2. Meet the demands of those who oversee universities. 3. Measure important outcomes and provide valuable comparative data. 4. Lead universities to conduct their own assessments.
Selected Weaknesses:
1. Flawed logic – can't meaningfully evaluate a university on just one or two criteria. 2. Wasteful competition (trying to improve in rankings in ways that are not aligned with your priorities). 3. Missing essential metrics (do not rank quality of teaching, student learning and intellectual growth, quality of curriculum, residential life, sense of community, character and moral development, service to community, nation, church.) 4. Rankings become your reputation, and may not reflect your defining values. 5. Can lead to unethical behavior (cheating to rise in rankings).
TB's conclusions: 1. Rankings are here to stay, cannot be ignored. 2. When rankings focus on important metrics, we should value those metrics. 3. The state of the art in measuring "best universities" is messy. No single group of data can ever be adequate. Some combo of quantitative qualitative, etc. weighted in imprecise manner. Bad strategy, best we have at present. 4. We must be creative and rigorous in designing our own self-evaluation, being true to our mission; will be criticized. TB will put a report together, consult deans, faculty, etc.

Q: Have we ever felt we were doing something to humor USN?

TB: Yes; as an example, we noticed that our rankings were considerably off for classes for under 20. Other institutions counted independent studies in that category, so we started to do so as well, which changed our numbers in USN.

Q: Are you happy with ND's ranking?

TB: I think we are under ranked, particularly in science. Schools that aren't heavily weighted toward the sciences and that do not receive many large grants are at a disadvantage. In international rankings, we are down in the 300s. These must have variables that apply world-wide. We are better than the rankings suggest; how do we get that message across?

Analysis of rankings by David Bailey (DB), Vice President of Strategic Planning and Institutional
Explored three additional questions on role of rankings: (1) How does one make sense of them? (2) What are the ranking criteria? (3) What are the risks?

1. Today there are many rankings (*Money*, *Forbes*, *USNWR*, *Wall Street Journal* (WSJ), etc. as well as international rankings)

2. Three broad categories of rankings: university as a whole; program or discipline; specialty or experience. Results for ND: *USNWR*: 18; *WSJ*: 26; *THE*: 173 (56 in U.S.); Academic Ranking: 201-300 (70-95 in US).

3. Criteria used in rankings: 23 most commonly used, fall into 7 categories: Admissions (test scores, yield); Access (how much debt incurred, price of attendance); Student experience (climate on campus, how students relate, diversity); Outcomes (graduation rate, earnings after graduation, social mobility, alumni awards); Research and Scholarship (publications, citations, research income, faculty awards); Resources (student-faculty ratio, class size, cost per student); Reputation (impressions of academic peers, employers, HS counselors).

Percentage that comes from the above categories varies from one ranking to another. Examples: *Forbes* derives 85% of ranking from outcomes; *USNWR*: 30% from resources, 20% from reputation, drawn from surveys of university presidents and provosts.

Major international rankings (from publicly available data). Examples: Research/schol: Shanghai 88% from research and scholarship, 12% from outcomes.

Risks associated with using rankings to measure success: *USNWR* methodology changes 2018-19. Have to shake it up. Big changes: lowered weighting on some, raised others. Removed selectivity. Added 5% grad rates of Pell grant students (6-year grad rates). ND dropped from 85 to 83. Many schools changed in rankings. Public schools went higher (more Pell grant recipients). One would think there were major changes in what schools did, not the case.

Conclusions: rankings matter; monitor so aligned with what we feel is important; don't put too much emphasis on a single ranking.

Q: Common complaint about *USNWR* is that it doesn't measure learning. What criteria actually measure learning, how much more students learn here?

DB: Most important question. Would love to do better on this. Faculty can help administration understand how to do this. No surveys measure this.

TB announced the results of the survey of ranking priorities of faculty senators: 1. Faculty research and scholarship; 2. Student outcomes; 3. Resources; 4. Reputation; 5. Faith and moral development, affordability, etc. all small numbers.

4. ND Staff of International Descent (NDSID): Presentation by Gabrielle Mercurio, Student Training and Development Specialist, and Audra Byers. Both on communication and outreach cmte for NDSID, one of 7 employee resources, for both faculty and staff. Hosts cultural, social, and

intellectual activities for faculty and staff of international descent. Creates opportunities for members to share customs, traditions, etc. with one another, organizes social activities, etc. NDSID has committees: Events, Professional Development, and Communications & Outreach, all related to things beneficial to NDSID members. Have a monthly newsletter. List of upcoming events at <http://internationalerg.nd.edu>. Flyers left. Anyone interested in international culture may attend.

5. Implementing Sustainability Education in the Moreau Lesson Plan (Annie Coleman)

Representatives from Student Senate: Ragan Sernel, Alexa Longstaff, and Bridget Carmody, introduced by Annie Coleman.

Currently the financial literacy part of the course includes a sustainability module, but this is optional. Student plan: implement a Moreau First Year Experience lesson plan on sustainability to increase environmental awareness on campus by sparking undergraduate engagement from the moment students step on campus. Clear that such is needed from survey conducted by students.

Student Senate passed a resolution supporting adding a sustainability module to Moreau First Year Experience, and pushing for more sustainability education on campus.

Q: Is there any history on opportunities for students to revamp the curriculum?

AC: We met with various people involved with Moreau. The student push should be a priority, given the nature and goals of the Moreau First Year Experience course. The week-long focus on cultural competency, "Show Some Skin," may have come from a student initiative.

Q: Are there any trips that could be associated with this?

AC: We are working on a number of tours around campus, looking at trees, sustainability initiatives, etc.

Q: Are you going to define the module for them?

AC: We have developed two models with a structure for each weekly class with readings, an activity, and reflection.

Q: I'm uneasy about the Faculty Senate getting behind mandating this; other language could be used to introduce this awareness. The Catholic Church is heavily involved in the issue, encyclical *Laudato si* can be good way to get into it, avoid political splits. Hesitant to say "mandate," rather say "encourage," etc.

Ben Heller (BH): is a mandate what you are asking for?

AC: We have several models.

BH: With respect to procedure, we can either come up with a motion now, or remand it to committee to develop a motion, such as: "Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate supports the motion that every Notre Dame student should be exposed to some curriculum relating to sustainability."

AC offered to develop the motion.

6. Committee Reports

a. Administrative Affairs: Dan Johnson (DJ): bylaw changes to be in accord with revised Academic Articles (AA). DJ then introduced committee member Phil Sloan (PS), who presented a proposal for developing an Emeriti Association at Notre Dame.

Why needed? PS listed the following: nature of faculty retirement years; creating attractive conditions for transition to emeriti status; need for greater communications between emeriti, and emeriti with home departments and university; notice of scholarly and professional activity by emeriti; dissemination of University information in a timely fashion to retirees generally (HR, benefits, etc.); recognition of service contributions of emeriti to the University and community; rapid communication of death notices and obituaries.

Looked at various models for Emeriti Associations. Best model: Yale University, Henry Koerner

Center for Emeritus Faculty (<https://emeritus.yale.edu>). Each member has his or her own web page; have activities, social events, etc. Clemson has emeritus college, has some attractive points. Components needed: good mission statement, membership list and criteria; contact information with web page links with “migration” of departmental web pages of interested members with links. Elected officers. Social space for meetings and dining. Issues: General faculty support (FS approval). Currently 89 signed in support. 382 emeritus out there. University support and encouragement. Financial support to develop website and maintain this with part-time administrative assistant support. Designated social space. Development Office support.

PS would like a resolution of support from the Faculty Senate.

Q: How can an emeritus society make a connection with students?

PS: One way is more engagement of active emeriti faculty in teaching. We teach now as adjuncts; Greater recognition of the contributions of this group could involve them in First Year Seminars, for example. An active emeriti group with some recognized University status could also have logical connections with the provost’s Inspired Leadership Initiative (ILI). Emeriti could teach USEMs, etc. There is also the issue of generational justice.

Comment: Faculty are nearly entirely cut off from the university upon retirement. Many retirees want to stay connected, but instead feel isolated.

Comment: Emeriti have to be active also; they have not followed up on offers of space.

PS: “University affiliate status” would give the group rights to reserve rooms, etc.

Q: What is the process for establishing such an association?

PS: After FS approval, PS will go back to Associate provost, and make formal request for funding.

Q: Try to sell it as what is in it for them (the Univ).

PS: This can be one way of encouraging people to retire in a timely fashion. At present the University can hire 2 junior faculty for 1 senior position in some cases. We need more ways to open up space for younger faculty. This can assist in this.

BH asked for a motion.

Dan Johnson moved that the Senate vote in support of establishing a Notre Dame emeritus faculty association. Seconded by Nasir Ghiaseddin, approved unanimously.

b. Academic Affairs: Tom Stober (TS). 1. Looking at proposal for master’s in civil engineering. 2. On extending UG Academic Code policy on excused absences for employment interviews to sophomores and juniors. Last week Prof. Stober presented the Senate resolution on this matter to the Advisory Committee on the Academic Code and Policy (ACACP); the members were supportive, and expressed general agreement that the policy should be extended to all students, including first-year students. The committee also supported expanding the policy’s language to include other professional development opportunities, such as presenting research at national conferences or participating in unique service activities. The committee also pointed out that the language of section 3.1.3.7 of the Academic Code should be clarified to indicate that the two-absence policy applies at the individual course level, rather than at the university level. Members also discussed whether instructors or deans should be responsible for excusing absences under section 3.1.3.7. with the ACACP favoring decisions by individual instructors. Members generally agreed that the introductory paragraph to section 3.1.3. implied that a student could appeal an individual instructor’s decision not to excuse an absence under section 3.1.3.7. to the dean. The ACACP agreed to draft language for amendment of the UG Academic Code at its next meeting, and hopes to present the amended language to the Academic Council (AC) this year.

c. Benefits: Nasir Ghiaseddin (NG): met February 8 to discuss the change to Anthem, which is going smoothly. A few issues that arose have been resolved. HR is implementing a retirement package for staff this summer; eligibility: 55 yrs w/15 yrs service or 62 yrs and 10 yrs service. 754 employees are eligible. Will receive 4% of years served multiplied by salary.

d. Student Affairs: David Gasperetti (DG): last year worked on UG-introduced initiative on mental health resources, to make these more apparent to students on campus. Resolution passed by Senate in April, encourage, make brief statement to faculty. Passed. Current student government would like at least the option for something longer; the Student Affairs committee rejected it again. Some members were not present; will take the matter up again at the next meeting. Can see a different compromise solution.

7. New Business: Tom [emer] Flanner Hall: retirees there do not get campus mail. Reported to Denise of HR, said would look into it. Had to send from O'Shag. Benefits issue: one benefit (at rumor level): wants to do away with Joyce Center Gym for faculty and staff. Many use facility. Swarbrick wants to do this. Hopes FS would keep this benefit. Benefits cmte will look into. David Gasperetti supportive.

David Gasperetti: benefits: can take 3-credit class tuition free. Many language classes are 4-credit, and a colleague received a bill for \$2700.00. Took a while to get it resolved. Chris Maziar sympathetic to increasing the benefit to 4- and 5-credit courses.

Ben Heller announcement: 2 Senate meetings in April (early and late), none in May (exam week).

Adjourned 8:04.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary E. Frandsen
Associate Professor of Music
Faculty Senate Co-Secretary