

# notre dame report

---

## contents

### the university

- 55 President's Address  
to the Faculty
- 55 Committee on Teacher  
and Course Evaluation
- 55 Hesburgh Honored for  
Academic Leadership
- 55 Maritain House Available  
to Faculty
- 56 New Advisory Council Members
- 56 Medieval Institute  
Receives Kress Grant
- 56 New Dimension Telephone System

### faculty notes

- 57 Honors
- 57 Activities
- 58 Deaths

### documentation

- 59 University Academic Calendar  
for 1982-83
- 61 Faculty Senate Journal  
September 7, 1981
- 63 Recommendations of the University  
Teacher and Course Evaluation Committee
- 66 Faculty Senates in Peer Institutions
- 71 Faculty Survey on Tuition Benefits  
for Faculty Children, May 1981
- 76 Faculty Committee for University  
Libraries Minutes

### advanced studies

- 78 Information Circulars
- 78 Current Publications and Other  
Scholarly Works
- 79 Closing Dates for Selected Sponsored  
Programs

81-82

October 9, 1981

number 3

---

# the university

---

## president's address to the faculty

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., will deliver his annual address to the faculty on Monday, Oct. 12, at 4:30 p.m. in Washington Hall. The president will be introduced by Provost Timothy O'Meara.

## committee on teacher and course evaluation

In the spring of 1980, a University-wide committee, with representation from each of the colleges, the Faculty Senate and Student Government, was appointed by the provost to review the University Teacher and Course Evaluation (TCE). The committee worked intensively from May, 1980 to May, 1981 and presented its unanimously approved recommendations and proposed new TCE form to the provost in August, 1981.

The proposal and recommendations, which appear in the Documentation section of this publication, have been approved by the provost. The new form will be initiated at the end of the spring semester for a three-year trial period.

## hesburgh honored for academic leadership

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of the University since 1952, will be honored for academic leadership Oct. 15 during the annual meeting of the American Council on Education in Washington, D.C.

Notre Dame's president will be cited for his "outstanding lifetime contributions to higher education." The award was first given last year, and recipients were Edmund J. Gleazer, president of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, and Clark Kerr, former chancellor and president of the University of California and former president of the Carnegie Council for Policy Studies.

## maritain house available to faculty

The Princeton home of Jacques and Raissa Maritain, in which the couple lived for a decade and a half, was acquired by the University from the estate of Jacques Maritain in 1976. The spacious home, adjacent to Princeton University, has been used as a retreat by Notre Dame faculty on study leave. Faculty applications to rent Maritain House at a reduced rate may be made to the provost's office.

---

Vol. 11, No. 3

Oct. 9, 1981

Notre Dame Report (USPS 707-080) is an official publication published fortnightly during the school year, monthly in the summer, by the University of Notre Dame, Department of Information Services. Second-class postage paid at Notre Dame, Ind.

© 1981 by the University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind. 46556. All rights reserved.

---

## **new advisory council members**

David W. Fox, vice chairman of the Northern Trust Corporation, Barry F. Sullivan, chairman of the board of the First National Bank of Chicago, and Frank A. Potenziani, director of the Mountain States Financial Corporation, have been appointed to the College of Business Administration Advisory Council.

William P. Johnson, president of the Goshen Rubber Company, Christopher J. Murphy, III, president of the First Bank and Trust Company in South Bend, Ind., and James A. Morse, president of Holiday Inn, Spring Lake, Mich., have been appointed to the College of Arts and Letters Advisory Council.

Mr. and Mrs. Frank E. O'Brien of Albany, New York, have been appointed to the Center for Pastoral and Social Ministry Advisory Council.

Maury A. Bromsen, of Boston, Mass., Giles Constable, director of the Research Library and Collection at Dumbarton Oaks and a professor of history at Harvard University, and Ronald E. Renner, president of Renner's Express, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind., have been appointed to the Notre Dame University Libraries Advisory Council.

## **medieval institute receives kress grant**

The University's Medieval Institute, with an initial grant of \$50,000 from the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, has begun work on a catalogue of nearly 8000 drawings from the Ambrosiana, Library of Milan, Italy.

The Mary M. Davis Collection of Italian art, as the catalogue will be named, is composed primarily of Northern Italian drawings from the 15th and 16th centuries, but includes some works by German masters of the period as well as works of a much later vintage. Miss Davis is the retiring executive vice president of the Kress Foundation.

The Ambrosiana was established in 1609 by Cardinal Federico Borromeo and named after St. Ambrose, the patron saint of Milan. With encouragement from Pope Paul VI, the University in 1962 began to microfilm the enormous collection under the direction of medievalist A.L. Gabriel. The Davis Collection will be, according to institute director Dr. Ralph McInerny, "a useful complement" to the institute's catalogue of manuscripts from the Ambrosiana.

## **new dimension telephone system**

Indiana Bell started prewire activity for the installation of the new Dimension telephone system on Sept. 14 in anticipation of a cutover from the present Centrex system beginning on Dec. 28. All of this wiring and installation work will be based on the specifications obtained from the complete telephone review performed earlier this year. At this point in the project it is important that all non-essential telephone additions, deletions, moves and other changes be kept to an absolute minimum. All departments are asked to cooperate in this respect so that the installation work can proceed smoothly and with a minimum of delays.

# faculty notes

---

## honors

Donald Kline, associate professor of psychology, has been invited by the National Academy of Sciences Committee on Vision to help prepare the Vision Research White Paper for the National Institute on Aging.

Gilbert D. Loescher, assistant professor of government, was a Visiting Fellow at the Centre for International Studies at the London School of Economics and Political Science during the summer of 1981.

Joseph A. Russo, director of Financial Aid, was appointed to serve on the editorial board of the Journal of Student Financial Aid, the professional publication of the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators. Since 1971, Mr. Russo has contributed several articles to the Journal, which is based at Stanford University.

Ronald Weber, professor of American Studies, has been selected as a Fulbright Senior Lecturer in American Studies at the University of Coimbra, Portugal, from May through July of 1982. He will offer a graduate seminar in American literary non-fiction.

## activities

Joan Aldous, William R. Kenan professor of sociology, presented a discussion paper on "Politicalization of the American Family," at a session of the 1981 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Toronto, Canada, Aug. 27. She also attended meetings as an elected member of the Committee on Publications of the Association. She then presented a paper, "Further Societal Consequences of Divorce," at the opening session of the Seminar on Divorce and Remarriage, sponsored by the Committee on Family Research, International Sociological Association, Leuven, Belgium, on Aug. 31.

Peri E. Arnold, associate professor of government and international studies, chaired and was a discussant on a panel titled "The Political Economy of State Action and Inaction" at the 77th Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association held in New York City, Sept. 3-6.

Alan B. Cain, assistant professor of aerospace and mechanical engineering, presented a paper entitled "A Three-Dimensional Simulation of Transition and Early Turbulence in a Time Developing Mixing Layer," at the Third Symposium on Turbulent Shear Flow held in Davis, Calif., Sept. 8-11.

Wendy Carlton, assistant professor of sociology and anthropology, gave a presentation on "Patient-Physician Communication" at the Indiana Conference of Resolve, Inc., in Indianapolis, Ind., on Sept. 12.

Fred R. Dallmayr, Dee professor of government, presented a paper entitled "Is Critical Theory a Humanism?" at the 77th annual meeting of the American Political Science Association in New York, Sept. 3-6. He also delivered a paper entitled "Conversation, Discourse, and Politics" to the Foundations of Political Theory Group at the same meeting.

Fabio B. Dasilva, professor of sociology and anthropology, organized and directed a round table (with Jeffrey L. Crane, visiting assistant professor of sociology and anthropology) on "Development Strategies: Does Any Model Fit?" at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, held in Toronto, Aug. 24-28.

William G. Dwyer, associate professor of mathematics, gave an invited talk entitled "Etale K-theory," to the Mathematics Department of Ohio State University, Columbus, July 27-28.

Msgr. John J. Egan, special assistant to the president and director of the Center for Pastoral and Social Ministry, presented a talk on "The Challenge for CILA" at the CILA (Community for the International Lay Apostolate) Orientation Weekend, Camp Tamarack, Mich., on Sept. 19.

Michael J. Francis, chairman and professor of government and international studies, presented a co-authored paper titled "Military Messiahs and the Political Economy of the Body: The Case of Chile" at the 77th Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association in New York City, Sept. 3-6.

Moira Geoffrion, assistant professor of art, is in a group exhibition of her lithographs and sculptures at the Kit Basquin Gallery, Milwaukee, Wisc., which started Sept. 25. Her work is also represented at the "Hand-made Paper" Show at Ball State University Gallery, Muncie, Ind., from Sept. 13 through Dec. 13. Prof. Geoffrion gave an artist-in-residence workshop at Northern Illinois University at Dekalb, Ill. from Sept. 22-26, where she also presented two talks to the public: "The Essence of Line in Recent Works by the Artist" and "Emerging Artists - Emerging Ideas."

Paul R. Grimstad, assistant professor of biology, appeared on the public affairs program "Studio 16" on July 4 and discussed the problems with mosquito-borne encephalitis and other diseases in Indiana.

Richard W. Hubbard, assistant professional specialist, assistant director of the Program in Gerontological Education Research and Services, gave invited lectures entitled "Geriatric Care and the Non-traditional Service Provider" at the Northern Indiana Dietician Association Meeting in South Bend, Ind., on Sept. 14, and at the annual meeting of the Indiana Hospital/Institutional Supervisors Meeting in Marion, Ind., on Sept. 21. He also gave an invited lecture on the "Pitfalls of Geriatric Drug Therapy" at a training conference on Gerontology and the Primary Care Physician sponsored by the St. Joseph Medical Center and CARES in South Bend, Ind., on Sept. 16.

Thomas M. Izbicki, assistant faculty fellow in the Medieval Institute, gave a lecture on "The Canon Law of Christian Burial in the Middle Ages," to the Medieval Association at the University of Kansas, Lawrence, on Sept. 17.

Ruey-wen Liu, professor of electrical engineering, organized a workshop on "Information and Decision" held in the Academia Sinica, Republic of China, on Aug. 22-23. The theme of the workshop was on the methodologies of abstraction of relevant information from raw data, with applications to socioeconomic systems as well as control systems. Prof. Liu also gave an invited lecture entitled "Design of Feedback Systems in an Algebraic Setting" at the University of California at Berkeley on Aug. 25.

Thomas V. Merluzzi, associate professor of psychology, presented a paper with Cheryl Brischetto entitled "Trustworthiness: Confidentiality, Counselor Experience and Seriousness of Client Problems," at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, Calif., Aug. 26.

Thomas J. Mueller, professor of aerospace and mechanical engineering, presented a series of lectures entitled "Flow Visualization by Direct Injection" at the University of Minnesota Short Course on Fluid Mechanic Measurements in Minneapolis, Minn., Sept. 13-17.

Sharon O'Brien, assistant professor of government, presented a paper, "A Comparison of the Federal Government's Legal Relationships with Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Trust Territories and Federally Recognized Indian Tribes" at the American Political Science Association meeting in Washington, D.C., Sept. 5.

Peggy Roach, assistant director of the Center for Pastoral and Social Ministry, presented a talk on "Reaching Out through Social Action" at the CILA (Community for International Lay Apostolate) Orientation Weekend, Camp Tamarack, Mich., on Sept. 19.

Ellen Bouchard Ryan, chairman and professor of psychology, presented a coauthored paper entitled "Two Dimensions in Conflict: Social Status vs. Ingroup Solidarity," at the Conference on Form and Function in Mexican-American (Chicano) English in El Paso, Tex., on Sept. 11.

Thomas J. Schlereth, associate professor of American Studies, delivered two papers, "Contemporary Collecting for Future Recollecting" and "Social and Local History in the College Curriculum" at the American Association for State and Local History National Meeting at William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va., Sept. 11-13. Schlereth also gave a research seminar on "Teaching Material Culture Studies" at the Historians/Artifacts/Learners Conference also held in Williamsburg, Sept. 14-15.

Andrew J. Sommese, associate professor of mathematics, presented a talk entitled "The Birational Theory of Hyperplane Sections of Projective Three-folds," at the CIME Conference on Algebraic Three-folds in Varenna, Italy, June 21. He also presented a talk on "Ample Divisors on Projective Three-folds" at the AMS Conference on Singularities held in Arcata, Calif., July 23.

Wilhelm Stoll, professor of mathematics, was appointed Visiting Professor at the University of Paris VI from May 11-23. During this time he participated at the "Colloque d'Analyse Complexe en l'honneur de Pierre Lelong," in Wimereux, France, May 12-15. He gave an invited address entitled "The Characterization of Strictly Parabolic Spaces." He also gave an invited lecture entitled "Defect Relations on Parabolic Manifolds," at the Institute Poincare, Paris, France, on May 19. Prof. Stoll also gave a series of ten lectures on "The Ahlfors-Weyl Theory of Meromorphic Maps on Parabolic Manifolds," at the Nordic Summer School, University of Joensuu, Finland, June 1-13. In addition he gave invited colloquium talks at the following German universities: "The Characterization of Affine Algebraic Cones" at Bochum on May 25, and at Göttingen on June 18; "The Lemma of the Logarithmic Derivative in Several Variables" at Freiburg on June 26; and "The Characterization of Strictly Parabolic Spaces" at Konstanz on June 29.

## deaths

Richard T. Sullivan, 72, nationally recognized novelist, short story writer and faculty member of the University's English Department since 1936, Sept. 13.

# documen- tation

## university academic calendar for 1982-83

### Fall Semester 1982

Aug. 28-30	Sat thru Mon	Orientation and counseling for new students
Aug. 30	Monday	Registration for all students
Aug. 31	Tuesday	Classes begin at 8 a.m.
Sept. 8	Wednesday	Latest date for all class changes
Sept. 12	Sunday	Formal opening of the school year at Notre Dame with concelebrated Mass. (Subject to change)
Oct. 21	Thursday	Midsemester reports of deficient students are due in Registrar's Office
Oct. 23-31	Sat thru Sun	Midsemester Vacation
Nov. 1	Monday	Classes resume at 8 a.m.
Nov. 5	Friday	Last day for course discontinuance at Notre Dame
Nov. 11-18	Th thru Th	Advance registration for spring semester 1983
Nov. 25-28	Th thru Sun	Thanksgiving holiday begins at 12:30 p.m. on Wed., Nov. 24
Nov. 29	Monday	Classes resume at 8 a.m.
Dec. 15	Wednesday	Last class day
Dec. 16	Thursday	Study day (no examinations)
Dec. 17-22	Fri thru Wed	Final examinations (no examinations on Sunday)
Dec. 28	Tuesday	<u>Absolute deadline</u> for delivery of grades to the Registrar

#### CLASS MEETINGS

MWF	42	MTuF	42
MW	29	MThF	40
MF	27	TT	28
MTuW	44	TWT	43
MTT	42	TTF	41
MWTh	42	TuF	28
MTh	27	TWF	43

#### NUMBER OF CLASS DAYS

	Mon	Tues	Wed	Thurs	Fri	Total
Aug.	0	1	0	0	0	1
Sept.	4	4	5	5	4	22
Oct.	3	3	3	3	4	16
Nov.	5	5	4	3	3	20
Dec.	2	2	3	2	2	11
Total	14	15	15	13	13	70

(N.B., Wed. P.M. classes have one less meeting than shown above due to Thanksgiving holiday.)

Home games: Michigan - Sept. 18; Purdue - Sept. 25; Miami - Oct. 9; Penn State - Nov. 13  
Home game affected by midterm break: None

## Spring Semester 1983

Jan. 10	Monday	Orientation for new students
Jan. 11	Tuesday	Registration Day
Jan. 12	Wednesday	Classes begin at 8 a.m.
Jan. 20	Thursday	Latest date for all class changes
Feb. 7-11	Mon thru Fri	Enrollment reservations for the fall semester 1983-84
Mar. 3	Thursday	Midsemester reports of deficient students are due in Registrar's Office
Mar. 12-20	Sat thru Sun	Midsemester Vacation
Mar. 21	Monday	Classes resume at 8 a.m.
Mar. 25	Friday	Last day for course discontinuance at Notre Dame
Apr. 1- 4	Fri thru Mon	Easter holiday begins at 4 p.m. on Thurs., March 31
Apr. 5	Tuesday	Classes resume at 8 a.m.
Apr. 14-21	Th thru Th	Advance registration for the fall semester 1983-84 and for the summer session 1983
Apr. 27,28,29	Wed thru Fri	Room reservations for the fall semester 1983-84
May 2	Monday	Last class day
May 3- 4	Tues & Wed	Study days (no examinations)
May 5-10	Thur thru Tu	Final examinations (no examinations on Sunday)
May 12	Thursday	<u>Absolute deadline</u> for delivery of grades to the Registrar
May 13-15	Fri thru Sun	Commencement Weekend

### CLASS MEETINGS

MWF	43	MTuF	42
MW	29	MThF	43
MF	28	TT	29
MTuW	43	TWT	44
MTT	43	TTF	43
MWTh	44	TuF	28
MTh	29	TWF	43

### NUMBER OF CLASS DAYS

	Mon	Tues	Wed	Thurs	Fri	Total
Jan.	3	2	3	3	3	14
Feb.	4	4	4	4	4	20
Mar.	3	4	4	4	3	18
Apr.	3	4	4	4	4	19
May	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	14	14	15	15	14	72

### U.N.D. SUMMER SESSION CALENDAR DATES

	1982	1983
Registration	June 21	June 20
Commencement	Aug. 6	Aug. 5

# faculty senate journal september 7, 1981

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. in Room 202 of the Center for Continuing Education by the chairman, Prof. Robert Vacca, who led the senate in prayer. The minutes of the journal for May 4, 1981 were approved without change.

In the chairman's report, Vacca reminded all that the first Faculty Forum is to be held Sept. 24. The budget of the senate has been increased by about \$1,000 for the year by the University to allow distribution of notices and cover other expenses of the forum. Vacca also announced that Fr. Hesburgh will attend a senate meeting on Oct. 12 following his annual address to the faculty. This meeting will be in addition to the meeting scheduled for Oct. 6. Finally, Vacca noted that the donation of a faculty office building has just been announced. The design and use of this building is of great importance to the future of the faculty, the students and the intellectual life of the University. In its role of formulating and expressing faculty views the senate should make itself heard before the building design is frozen.

The activities of the Committee on Administration of the University were reported by Vacca as the committee chairman could not be present. The largest project for the committee is the preparation of a report on faculty governance. This project is divided into four parts. One, examination of the historical development of faculty participation in the governance of Notre Dame. Two, examination of the corresponding activities at peer institutions. Three, an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the current forms of faculty participation at Notre Dame. Finally, by the end of the academic year, the development of recommendations for actions designed to reduce the dissatisfaction expressed in past senate surveys of faculty attitudes. The committee also has a self-imposed obligation to review the workings of appeals procedure.

Prof. Robert Wegs reported that the Committee on Faculty Affairs had set up subcommittees during the summer to consider four topics. First, a subcommittee on endowed chairs to review the successes, strengths and weakness of the current policies and to seek possible improvements. Second, a subcommittee to review the compensation package, particularly the fringe benefits. Third, to finish work on the children's tuition benefits proposal. Fourth, to continue discussions on the problems of the library.

Prof. Alexander Hahn reported that the Committee on Student Affairs is working on two areas. First, on teacher-course evaluations, the provost's committee has completed its work and submitted its findings to the provost. Although the senate was represented on the committee, feelings were expressed that it would be improper for a radically new form or procedure to be delivered to the faculty without further opportunity for comment. Second, the examination of admissions policies will be expanded to include the intellectual and social climate for students at Notre Dame. Of particular concern are a perceived homogeneity of the student body, insufficient value placed on intellectual achievement, and inadequate space for faculty-student contact outside of the classroom.

Prof. Vaughn McKim said that he and two other professors had been invited to attend a meeting of the admissions advisory committee and he offered to convey any special concerns that might be discussed. Immediately expressed concerns were a lack of knowledge as to specifics of the admissions policy, for example, is there an explicit formula for weighting S.A.T. scores, athletic participation, holding of class offices, etc.? Mentioned as a symptom of the problems in this sector was the departure of some of the intellectually best students who did not feel that the Notre Dame atmosphere was supportive. It was also pointed out that both the Academic and Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees and the P.A.C.E. committee had been considering admissions policy and its importance to the future of Notre Dame.

Prof. Michael Francis initiated an extensive discussion of faculty participation in the governance of the University by summarizing information collected during the summer from ten peer institutions. A copy of this material is appended to these minutes. The ten are Brown, Duke, Fordham, Indiana (Bloomington campus), Johns Hopkins, Northwestern, Princeton, Tulane, Southern California and Vanderbilt. In general, there is a body on each campus composed preponderately of faculty but including high-ranking administrators. These bodies provide direct and frequent contact and dialogue between the faculty and administration on important university problems. At Notre Dame the Academic Council formally fills such a role but in fact meets infrequently, offers little dialogue and is perceived as being a body of mainly administrators which also includes some faculty. Francis suggested three possible courses of action for the senate on governance: (1) do nothing, (2) propose changes, (3) urge the provost to act on his own.

An extensive discussion followed on what changes might lead to a greater and more timely faculty voice in the making of University decisions, the object of such changes being an



enhanced sharing of ideas and discussions of policies at formative stages between administrators and faculty. Such dialogue should continue throughout the development of policy.

Most of the discussion concerned what changes in the Faculty Senate or Academic Council would be conducive to such dialogue. These changes included the selection of the presiding officer, the ratio of administration to faculty membership, frequency of meetings, and formation of a faculty caucus in the Academic Council. It was also pointed out that such dialogue could occur without change to any organization.

Vacca halted discussion on governance, which may be resumed at the October meeting, at 8:40 p.m. and the senate recessed for 10 minutes.

Vacca brought up the subject of the Notre Dame Faculty Children's Tuition Grant Plan (NDCTG). For over a decade the maximum grant has been \$1,000, and last year the Faculty Senate began collecting data to support the argument that the amount should be increased and the benefit extended to faculties other than the Teaching-and-Research Faculty. A final document on this matter will be presented at the October meeting.

McKim described the results of the Faculty Survey on Tuition Benefits for Faculty Children. A copy of the survey is appended to these minutes. The survey of all full-time members of the Teaching-and-Research Faculty was under the joint auspices of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Subcommittee of the University Committee on Budget Priorities. A parallel survey of all full-time non-teaching faculties was conducted by the Committee on Faculty Affairs of the senate. These surveys provide the only hard data on the number of faculty children who may be expected to reach college age in the next 20 years, the expected preferences for Notre Dame or other colleges, and the likelihood of attending Notre Dame rather than another college. The survey projects a decline of about one half in the number of faculty children of college age over the next 20 years. The survey finds about 15% of students expect to attend Notre Dame/St. Mary's but prefer another college.

McKim estimated that the present policies of educational grants and fixed freshman class size cost the University about \$3500 for each faculty child here per year. This cost coupled with the preference of some students to attend other colleges may permit increasing the grant in a way that will be of mutual benefit to the University and the individual faculty children.

During the discussion which followed several related points were raised. One point was that a higher benefit might be coupled with a higher standard for admission, as it has often been said that some faculty children have been admitted to Notre Dame who would not have been admitted under the general selection process. This might increase the pool of 15% of faculty children who expect to attend Notre Dame but prefer another college, as well as reduce the feeling that "faculty kids" can get in/through on lower standards. Another point was that some could view this benefit as discriminating against faculty who do not have children. It was also pointed out that one of the main beneficiaries of the policy is the University, which can, and has successfully in the past, used this fringe benefit to attract good candidates to the faculty.

Some questions were raised as to how "real" the money is that is transferred from endowments or other funds to pay for tuition and student jobs. It was suggested that the amount of some grants be tied to scholarship. The projection of declining numbers of faculty children was questioned as not reflecting faculty that will be hired in coming years. The decline appears to be due to smaller family sizes for individuals below age 40, which is a national trend, and the new faculty who will "replace" those who do not gain tenure will generally have children who will not enter college until after the year 2000. It was also pointed out that many faculty children do get good grades but do not apply for and may not even be told of other scholarships because of the "automatic" grant.

Under new business the senate asked chairman Vacca to send a note of thanks to the University for increasing the life insurance coverage.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Those absent but not excused: Dino S. Cervigni, modern and classical languages; James Deffenbaugh, library; William F. Eagan, management; James E. Houghton, aerospace and mechanical engineering; Steven W. Hurtt, architecture; Eugene R. Marshalek, physics; Alven M. Neiman, CORE courses; William E. Slowey, accountancy; J. Eric Smithburn, law; Joseph A. Tihen, biology.

Respectfully submitted,

W. Phillip Helman

---

# recommendations of the university teacher and course evaluation committee

In view of the University's strong commitment to excellence in teaching, we offer the following recommendations:

1. That the use of the Teacher and Course Evaluation (TCE) be expected of all instructors throughout the University for both diagnostic and evaluative purposes.
2. That the attached, revised form of the TCE be adopted as soon as implementation is possible.
3. That the results of the individual instructor's TCE, together with the department, college and University profiles, be sent routinely to the individual instructor and to his or her department chairman.
4. That all faculty members, not only the untenured, be expected to discuss regularly their teacher and course evaluations with their department chairmen. TCE items 4-14 are especially designed for diagnostic purposes and provide a basis for discussion aimed at teaching improvement.
5. That the results of the TCE, interpreted at the department level, be used for purposes of evaluation by administrators. That department interpretation include the relation of the TCE results to such variables as the size of class; whether the course is required or not; in the student's major or not; is a lecture course, a laboratory or a seminar; grading patterns, and so forth.
6. That while the TCE (interpreted by the department) is an essential help to administrators for evaluation purposes regarding reappointment, tenure, promotion and salary determinations, it should not be the exclusive means of evaluating the quality of teaching. Other complementary means are strongly recommended, for example, classroom visitation; examination of course syllabi, bibliographies, exam samples, grading patterns; evaluation of department presentations and lectures to the faculty; assessment of impact on students outside the classroom and/or department; the judicious use of informally reported student opinion (perhaps from advisees, advisors or assistant deans); evaluations of former students (particularly in graduate courses), and so forth.
7. That department chairmen and Committees on Appointments and Promotions, in presenting tenure and promotion files to the deans, provide the raw data from the TCE together with the departmental context and interpretation (as described above). That if this information is not adequately documented, the deans return the file to the department for completion before advancing it to the University administration.
8. That individual instructors, departments and colleges be encouraged to develop essay-type and/or computer-scored diagnostic questions to allow elaboration on the University TCE form.
9. That the item "What grade do you expect to receive in this course?" be included in the student information section on the computer answer sheet in addition to the information requested at present.
10. That the TCE be administered during a designated week ("TCE Week") toward the end of each semester. That the administration of the TCE be at the beginning of the chosen class period in order to highlight its importance and allow sufficient time.
11. That students be educated to the seriousness of the evaluation process at University and/or college orientation sessions. That just prior to "TCE Week" each semester the editors of student publications be encouraged to attend to the upcoming evaluation process in announcement and article or editorial form. That the student handbook DuLac include a section on the importance and role of the TCE.
12. That the new form and these recommendations be distributed to the deans and department chairmen with a letter from the provost announcing and encouraging the adoption of the recommendations. That department chairmen call attention to and discuss these recommendations with their faculties, in particular with the departmental Committees on Appointments and Promotions.

13. That the provost's letter, together with the new form and recommendations, be published in Notre Dame Report.
14. That the pertinent section of The Faculty Handbook be rewritten in accord with these recommendations.

The committee's recommendations build upon and are in general accord with the sense of the Faculty Senate in this regard (as stated in the April 10, 1980 letter from the chairman of the senate to the provost) and of the Student Government (as stated in the Jan. 25, 1980 letter from the academic commissioner to the provost). The registrar, coordinator of Analytical Studies, and the assistant director of the Social Science Training and Research Laboratory have been consulted in the preparation of this report.

Respectfully submitted,

The University TCE Committee

Prof. Joseph Bauer (Law School)  
Prof. William Burke (Faculty Senate)  
Prof. Walter Gajda (College of Engineering)  
Assoc. Dean Edward Jerger (College of Engineering)  
Prof. Gerald Jones (College of Science)  
Prof. David Legee (Center for the Study of Man)  
Mr. Donald Schmid (Student Government)  
Prof. William Sexton (College of Engineering)  
Asst. Dean Kathleen Weigert (College of Arts and Letters)  
Prof. Katherine Tillman (Provost's Office and Chair of Committee)

## Teacher Course Evaluation

(To be initiated on a computerized form, Spring, 1982)

1. In evaluating any course, you can consider the course content alone or what the instructor does with the material. Please evaluate the course content alone.
  - 1) excellent
  - 2) good
  - 3) average
  - 4) poor
  - 5) terrible
2. Now please evaluate only the instructor's teaching.
  - 1) excellent
  - 2) good
  - 3) average
  - 4) poor
  - 5) terrible
3. In general, did you find this course rewarding or disappointing? Why?  
(Choose the statement which best describes your attitude.)
  - 1) This course was rewarding because of both the subject matter and the teacher.
  - 2) This course was rewarding primarily because of the subject matter.
  - 3) This course was rewarding primarily because of the teacher.
  - 4) This course was disappointing primarily because of the subject matter.
  - 5) This course was disappointing because of the teacher.
  - 6) This course was disappointing because of both the subject matter and the teacher.
4. The instructor is well-prepared for each class.
  - 1) No improvement is needed.
  - 2) A little improvement is needed.
  - 3) A fair amount of improvement is needed.
  - 4) Major improvements are called for.
  - 5) Not applicable.

- 
5. The course is well-organized and its goals clearly established.
    - 1) No improvement is needed.
    - 2) A little improvement is needed.
    - 3) A fair amount of improvement is needed.
    - 4) Major improvements are called for.
    - 5) Not applicable.
  6. The class material is clearly presented.
    - 1) No improvement is needed.
    - 2) A little improvement is needed.
    - 3) A fair amount of improvement is needed.
    - 4) Major improvements are called for.
    - 5) Not applicable.
  7. The course assignments are well-chosen in relation to course objectives.
    - 1) No improvement is needed.
    - 2) A little improvement is needed.
    - 3) A fair amount of improvement is needed.
    - 4) Major improvements are called for.
    - 5) Not applicable.
  8. The examinations appropriately test my knowledge of the course material.
    - 1) No improvement is needed.
    - 2) A little improvement is needed.
    - 3) A fair amount of improvement is needed.
    - 4) Major improvements are called for.
    - 5) Not applicable.
  9. In dealing with students the instructor is helpful and patient.
    - 1) No improvement is needed.
    - 2) A little improvement is needed.
    - 3) A fair amount of improvement is needed.
    - 4) Major improvements are called for.
    - 5) Not applicable.
  10. When asked questions the instructor satisfies the students.
    - 1) No improvement is needed.
    - 2) A little improvement is needed.
    - 3) A fair amount of improvement is needed.
    - 4) Major improvements are called for.
    - 5) Not applicable.
  11. The instructor is accessible to students outside of class.
    - 1) No improvement is needed.
    - 2) A little improvement is needed.
    - 3) A fair amount of improvement is needed.
    - 4) Major improvements are called for.
    - 5) Not applicable.
  12. The instructor's explanations or criticisms of my work are helpful.
    - 1) No improvement is needed.
    - 2) A little improvement is needed.
    - 3) A fair amount of improvement is needed.
    - 4) Major improvements are called for.
    - 5) Not applicable.
  13. The instructor's dealings with students have been fair and impartial.
    - 1) No improvement is needed.
    - 2) A little improvement is needed.
    - 3) A fair amount of improvement is needed.
    - 4) Major improvements are called for.
    - 5) Not applicable.
-

14. In comparison with other courses I have taken at Notre Dame, the amount of time I spend on this course is

- 1) much more than average.
- 2) more than average.
- 3) average.
- 4) less than average.
- 5) not applicable.

## faculty senates in peer institutions

It has become standard operating procedure for the Notre Dame Faculty Senate to use the "peer institution" list to compare benefit structure and salary. However, it also seems potentially helpful to review the role of the faculty in University governance in our peers as a way of understanding our own position in Notre Dame's governance system. Such an understanding potentially could be useful in discussing possible changes or modifications. To that end, information was gathered on the peer schools. The bulk of the report is simply a listing of the universities with information as to the size of the body, who presides, membership and responsibilities.

What is clear from this cataloging is that the primary function of the faculty senates (or their equivalents) in our peer institutions is to provide direct contact between the faculty and the highest ranking members of the administration. The faculty bodies serve to structure the faculty/administration dialogue in the sense that administrators participate in debates and listen to important university problems being analyzed from the faculty's point of view. In a few of the stronger structures, the senates (sometimes through committees) have the final say in certain spheres (for example, tenure decisions or appeals) or have responsibility for selecting the membership of important university committees that have the final say in some matters. However, the actual decisions on most important questions at our peer institutions is in the hands of the president and the Board of Trustees with the faculty having a formal advisory role.

Although there is considerable diversity among the ten faculty bodies, there are some obvious similarities. In every body except one (U.S.C.), high-ranking administrators are on the body. In the U.S.C. case the eight administrative spokespersons are of a middle-level standing. In five of the ten bodies the president of the university presides. In four the senate elects its own presiding officer and at IU/Bloomington the vice president for the Bloomington campus presides. In all the bodies the number of faculty is far larger than the number of administrators. In two cases the administrators participate but cannot vote. Most of the bodies must meet at least monthly.

No other university had Notre Dame's two-tiered system with a Faculty Senate's formal powers being limited to developing a consensus and placing items on the agenda of a body that meets less than monthly and is half composed of administrators (the Academic Council). In fact, as one looks at the powers of the various faculty organizations at peer institutions, the responsibilities of Notre Dame's Academic Council most closely resembles the mandate given to most faculty senates. (See attached section of 1981-2 Faculty Handbook). The only other two-tiered system was U.S.C. which has a Faculty Senate with broadly defined powers existing alongside a President's Advisory Council. The council is charged with directly communicating with the administration, and faculty members have a two-to-one pre-dominance in terms of numbers.

Finally, it needs to be observed that this review concentrates simply on the structural side of the faculty/administration relationship. We all realize that in the case of the Notre Dame faculty our influence varies a great deal according to who holds the various administrative positions and according to the kind of issue that is being discussed. On the other hand, looking at the structural side of the question suggests that Notre Dame's Faculty Senate has far less formal access to the administration than any of the other bodies studied.

Michael J. Francis

### BROWN UNIVERSITY

Name of body: The Faculty

Membership of body: All faculty members plus six top administrators including president and provost. Quorum: 100

---

Voting rights: Faculty and administrators can vote.

Frequency of meetings: Monthly with special meetings if necessary.

Presiding officer: President of the University.

Powers: There is no clear deliniation of power between the faculty and the president although it is clear that (1) nothing is out of bounds and that (2) the final power is in the hands of the president and the trustees. There is also a Faculty Policy Group which has 18 faculty members (elected by the faculty) who, along with five non-voting ex officio administrators (including the provost) which functions as a steering committee for the faculty body and has direct responsibility for advising the president. This group can serve as a grievance committee in some cases and can see confidential materials relating to tenure and hiring cases.

#### DUKE

Name of body: Academic Council

Membership of body: 82 elected faculty plus president, provost, and chancellor.

Voting rights: Faculty and three administrators all have votes.

Frequency of meetings: Monthly with special meetings if necessary.

Presiding officer: Elected by the Academic Council.

Powers: "The Academic Council serves as a forum for the expression of faculty views and thus performs a watchdog function." (Quoting from 1972 report). There is a seven-member Executive Committee composed of the three Academic Council officers plus four other faculty from the council (elected by the council). "The Executive Committee oversees the operations of the council, and plays a central role in advising the upper-level administration on a wide variety of issues. There is a regular monthly meeting between the Executive Committee and top-level administrators, and other consultation occurs when appropriate." (Quoting from March 23, 1981 letter from Chairman of the Council). The situation at Duke is also characterized by a strong set of rules which gives the power to the faculty and Academic Council to elect faculty membership to any University committee rather than allowing the administration to select faculty members of its own choosing to count as faculty representation on committees.

#### FORDHAM

Name of body: Faculty Senate

Membership of body: 24 elected faculty and president of the University.

Voting rights: Everyone can vote.

Frequency of meetings: At least monthly.

Presiding officer: Elected by the Faculty Senate.

Powers: It has the right and duty to advise the president and Board of Trustees and initiate recommendations "in all areas of University activity." Minutes of the meeting seem to indicate a good deal of advance consultation of the body by the president.

#### INDIANA UNIVERSITY (Bloomington campus)

Name of the body: Faculty Council

Membership of the body: 40 elected faculty plus five administrators (including the president) and two students and three associate instructors.

Voting rights: All members vote.

Frequency of meetings: At least twice monthly.

Presiding officer: Vice President for Bloomington.

---

Powers: According to the Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty, the faculty has authority in the following areas:

1. Standards of admission and retention of students.
2. Determination of curriculum.
3. Class scheduling and calendar.
4. Determination of faculty status.
5. Standards and procedures for faculty appointments.
6. Creation of faculty governing bodies and determination of their powers.
7. Standards and procedures concerning faculty promotion and tenure.
8. Standards and procedures concerning faculty conduct and discipline.
9. Standards and procedures for the appointment of academic and administrative officials.
10. Standards and procedures concerning athletics.
11. Standards and procedures concerning student conduct and discipline.
12. Conferring of degrees.
13. Such other authority that may be subsequently delegated by the trustees.
14. Other educational policies of the University.

#### JOHNS HOPKINS

Name of body: Academic Council

Membership of body: 10 elected faculty members and two faculty members chosen by the elected 10. Also the president is a member. The provost, vice provost, dean of arts and sciences and dean of engineering are members without a vote.

Voting rights: Only the 12 faculty and the president.

Frequency of meetings: Twice a month normally.

Presiding officer: President of the University.

Powers: Has virtually absolute power in regard to matters of promotion and tenure. In regard to all other matters it is advisory only. However, according to a March 20, 1981 letter from the dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies, "its advice is almost always heeded by the administration. For that reason, its power is considerable." He adds that "Johns Hopkins has a very strong tradition of faculty independence and departmental autonomy. Many issues that would be matters of concern to a faculty senate at another institution are matters of departmental concern at Hopkins."

#### NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Name of body: University Senate

Membership of body: Professors, associate professors who have been reappointed after five years in that rank, members of senate-elected university committees, various other faculty that can be elected under certain circumstances. Additionally there are about 20 administrators and all the chairpersons. The president and provost are among the administrators.

Voting rights: Everyone can vote although the quorum of 50 must include 40 faculty.

Frequency of meetings: Not clear.

Presiding officer: President of the University

Powers: (a.) To consider matters of general University interest; (b.) To make recommendations on matters of educational policy; (c.) To approve or disapprove every action of a faculty involving the interest of another college or school, or of the Summer Session; (d.) To recommend candidates for Honorary Degrees to be transmitted through the president to the Board of Trustees; (e.) To provide for the election of special and standing committees of faculty members to consider matters within the powers of the senate.

#### PRINCETON

Name of body: The Faculty

Membership of body: All professors, associate professors, assistant professors and full-time lecturers and instructors. Also the president and academic officers.

Voting rights: All members can vote.

Frequency of meetings: Monthly.

Presiding officer: President of the University.

Powers: Apparently the general meetings of the faculty deal with a general dialogue between members of the faculty and the president and other administrators. However, much of the business of the faculty is transacted through a complex system of standing committees. The membership of committees are often elected by the faculty. There also is an important Committee on Committees which is appointed by the Advisory Committee on Appointments and Advancements which is elected by the faculty from a ballot listing deans and chairpersons of departments.

#### TULANE

Name of body: University Senate

Membership of the body: 27 faculty members elected from various colleges or schools, 15 administrators including the provost, the president and the various deans; and 10 elected student representatives.

Voting rights: All members can vote.

Frequency of meetings: Monthly.

Presiding officer: President of the University

Powers: (a.) To make recommendations on all matters of general University concern; (b.) To review any actions of the various divisions which affect the University as a whole; (c.) To consider new academic policies of general University concern or changes in current academic policies; (d.) To request necessary budget information in order to implement its jurisdictional responsibilities. The senate selects a three-person faculty delegation to attend, without the right to vote, regularly scheduled meetings of administrators.

There also is a President's Faculty Advisory Committee which has six faculty members chosen by the senate. "Its purpose shall be to advise the president of the University upon matters of University policy, particularly when subjects of great urgency or delicacy require immediate consultation." (quote from Faculty Handbook, 1979)

#### UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Name of body: Faculty Senate

Membership of body: One member for each eight faculty plus about eight middle-level administrators.

Voting rights: All members can vote.

Frequency of meetings: Monthly.

Presiding officer: Elected by the Faculty Senate

Powers: According to the Faculty Handbook, 1979, the Senate "is the official forum for faculty decision-making and is the voice of the collective faculty. The senate is organized specifically to determine positions on issues directly related to faculty status, responsibilities, and welfare within the University. It is the first place where such issues will be investigated and solutions or policies proposed." The senate's preamble calls it "a fact-finding, deliberative, and consultative body, with authority to make studies, reports, and recommendations on all matters which have significant bearing upon the work of the faculty."

U.S.C. also has a President's Advisory Council. It includes 50 members of the Faculty Senate, plus six deans, nine from the University staff, and 15 students. It is referred to as the chief advisory body to the president on matters of University-wide



concern. "As a deliberative and consultative body it has power to make studies, reports, and recommendations to the president in any and all matters pertinent to the well-being of the University."

#### VANDERBILT

Name of body: Faculty Senate

Membership of body: 45 elected faculty plus about 12 administrators including the chancellor, president and provost.

Voting rights: Only faculty may vote. Administrators do not vote.

Frequency of meetings: At least four times a year.

Presiding officer: Elected by the Faculty Senate.

Powers: It can discuss any matter affecting the University. Has the power to review and evaluate the educational policies and practices of the University and may make recommendations concerning them to any individual, faculty, or group. It may provide appropriate discussion of any educational policy or practice. It may advise and consult with the chief administrative officers and inform them of faculty opinions about such matters. Senate actions that require affirmative implementation by the president or the chancellor shall be either accepted or rejected. If rejected, there is a procedure for notifying and giving reasons. There is a consultative committee of the elected senate officers and those members in the third year of their term which is charged with consulting and advising the chancellor, the president, and assisting officers on matters of general University concern. It meets with the chancellor or president upon its request, by the direction of the senate, or at the request of an administrator.

#### NOTRE DAME'S FACULTY GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENT

##### Section 3 Committees of the University

##### Subsection (a) The Academic Council

The Academic Council is composed of the President, who is Chairman ex officio, the Provost, the Executive Vice President, all other Vice Presidents, the Associate Provost, the Assistant Provost, the Chairman of the Faculty Senate, the Deans, the Directors of University Institutes, the Director of the Summer Session, the Director of Libraries, the University Registrar and the Director of Admissions, all of whom are members ex officio, and of 32 elected faculty members. In addition there are seven student members, including the Academic Commissioner of the Student Government ex officio, one from the Graduate School, one from the other programs of advanced studies, and one undergraduate from each of the four Colleges. These student members are selected according to procedures approved by the Academic Council.

The faculty members are elected by and from the Faculty of the respective Colleges and the Law School, as well as the Library and Special Professional Faculty, in number proportional to the size of the faculty involved, except that each category of faculty shall elect at least one member. Members of the Graduate Faculty vote as members of their respective Colleges. Faculty members are elected for a term of three years and may be reelected, in such a manner that one third of the elected membership is elected each year.

The principal functions of the Council are to determine general academic policies and regulations of the University; to consider the recommendations of the Graduate Council; to approve major changes in the requirements for admission to and graduation from the Colleges and Schools and in the programs of study offered by Colleges, Schools, and Departments; to authorize the establishment, modification, or discontinuance of any academic organization of the University; and to provide the review, amendment, and final interpretation of the Academic Manual, without prejudice to Article V. The decisions of the Council are reached by majority vote and are subject to the approval of the President.

The Council meets regularly at least once each semester. Meetings are called by the President. The President may call a meeting if a member of the Council so requests, and does call a meeting at the earliest possible time if it is petitioned by ten members of the Council. Any member of the Council may propose an item to the President for the agenda, and any ten members may place an item on the agenda.

The Council has an Executive Committee composed of the Provost, who shall be chairman, and the Associate Provost, both ex officio, five members elected annually by the Council and three members appointed annually by the President from the membership of the Council.

#### Subsection (b) The Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate is an organization composed of fifty-three members of the Faculty. Fifty-one members are elected by and from the Faculties of the Colleges, the Law School, the Library, the ROTC staff and the Special Professional Faculty, the number from each proportional to the size of the faculty involved, provided each of these groups be represented by at least one senator. Two members are elected by and from the retired emeritus faculty. Senators are elected for a term of three years in such a manner that one-third of the membership is elected each year. Four senators shall serve as ex officio; each College Council shall so designate one of the Faculty members elected from the College to the Academic Council.

The range of concern of the Faculty Senate extends to matters affecting the Faculty as a whole. The Senate seeks to formulate faculty opinion and for this purpose may, at its discretion, conduct Faculty meetings and referenda. The Senate also receives from other groups in the University items requiring consideration by the Faculty. With respect to matters of academic concern, the recommendations of the Senate are referred to the Executive Committee of the Academic Council, which shall place the recommendations on the agenda of the Council.

Consistent with the foregoing, the Senate may adopt rules and bylaws relating to the determination and election of members and officers, the establishment of committees, and the conduct of its business.

## faculty survey on tuition benefits for faculty children, may 1981

Two groups of Notre Dame faculty members participated in the survey during January and February of 1981. One questionnaire was sent to all full-time members of the Teaching and Research faculty under the joint auspices of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Subcommittee of the University Committee on Budget Priorities. A second, very similar, questionnaire was sent to all full-time members of the non-teaching and research faculties by the Senate's Committee on Faculty Affairs.

Selected information from the survey is presented below under four headings: I) Information on the Survey, II) Information on Faculty Member Respondents, III) Faculty Opinion on Tuition Benefits, and IV) Information on Faculty Children.

### I. Information on the Survey

	<u>T&amp;R Faculty</u>	<u>Non-T&amp;R Faculty</u>	<u>Totals</u>
1) Total number of full-time faculty (all were sent questionnaires)	557	117	674
2) Total number of "full-time" returns	406	101	507
3) Return Rate	73%	86%	75%

### II. Information on Faculty Members

#### A. Respondents to Teaching and Research Faculty Survey

##### 1. University Affiliation

Arts and Letters:	45.1% (183)
Business:	10.8% (44)
Engineering:	16.7% (68)
Science:	21.7% (88)
Law:	4.7% (19)
Other:	0.9% (4)

2. Tenured: 70.2% (285)      Untenured: 29.1% (118).

(The proportion of tenured to non-tenured faculty in the T&R Faculty as a whole is 66% - 34%.)

3. Median Age of Respondents:  $\bar{X}$  = 44      Range: 26-64

4. Age Distribution of Respondents compared with Age Distribution of Total Notre Dame Faculty (N = 786):

<u>Ages</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	<u>Total Faculty</u>
26-30	6.5% (26)	9.3%
31-35	17.5% (70)	18.3%
36-40	16.3% (65)	16.8%
41-45	13.5% (54)	14.5%
46-50	17.3% (69)	13.7%
51-55	14.3% (57)	10.8%
56-60	11.0% (44)	10.2%
61-65	3.8% (15)	6.2%

5. Total Number of Children Reported: 994
6. Total Number of Children for Tenured Faculty: 862
7. Total Number of Children for Untenured Faculty: 132
8. Average Number of Children for Tenured Faculty: 3.0246
9. Average Number of Children for Untenured Faculty: 1.1186
10. Correlation of Number of Children per Faculty Member as a Function of Faculty Members' Age:

<u>Faculty Ages</u>	<u>Mean Number of Children</u>	<u>Total Children Reported</u>
26-30	0.3077	8
31-35	1.2714	89
36-40	1.9692	128
41-45	3.1296	169
46-50	3.2464	224
51-55	3.3333	190
56-60	3.0682	135
61-65	3.4667	52

For Entire Population      2.4875      995

(Total Cases = 406; Missing Cases = 6 or 1.5%)

#### B. Respondents to Non-Teaching and Research Faculty Survey

1. University Affiliation

	<u>Respondents</u>	<u>Total Non-T&amp;R Faculty</u>
Library/Law Library	32.7% (32)	30.5%
Special Professional Faculty	34.7% (34)	42.1%
Special Research Faculty	14.3% (14)	14.0%
R.O.T.C.	15.3% (15)	13.2%
Other	3.0% (3)	---

2. Respondents' Years of Continuous Service at Notre Dame:

More than six years: 39% (39)  
Fewer than six years: 61% (62)

Median = 6.922      Range: 1 to 31

3. Median Age of Respondents:  $\bar{X}$  = 40      Range: 23-65

4. Age Distribution of Respondents compared with Age Distribution of Total Notre Dame Faculty (N = 786):

<u>Ages</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	<u>Total Faculty</u>
26-30	13.7% (13)	9.3%
31-35	24.2% (23)	18.3%
36-40	21.1% (20)	16.8%
41-45	17.9% (17)	14.5%
46-50	9.5% ( 9)	13.7%
51-55	6.3% ( 6)	10.8%
56-60	4.2% ( 4)	10.2%
61-65	3.2% ( 3)	6.2%

5. Total Number of Children Reported: 169
6. Average Number of Children per Faculty Member: 1.6733
7. Correlation of Number of Children per Faculty Member as a Function of Faculty Members' Age:

<u>Faculty Ages</u>	<u>Mean Number of Children</u>	<u>Total Children Reported</u>
26-30	1.5385	7
31-35	1.0435	24
36-40	1.8000	36
41-45	2.4118	41
46-50	2.0000	18
51-55	3.0000	18
56-60	2.0000	8
61-65	2.0000	6
For Entire Population	1.6458	158

(Total Cases = 101; Missing Cases = 5 or 4.9%)

### III. Survey of Faculty Opinion on Tuition Benefits

Questions	T & R Faculty			Non-T & R Faculty		
	be increased	remain unchanged	be eliminated	be increased	remain unchanged	be eliminated
1. The \$1000 per year university tuition benefit for children of qualified faculty attending colleges other than Notre Dame should:	79.5%	10.8%	5.1%	63.8%	22.9%	3.8%
2. In order to receive full tuition scholarships at Notre Dame, faculty children must accept 12-hour per week student jobs after their freshmen year. This is a reasonable and appropriate requirement for receiving free tuition.	Agree 68.2%	Disagree 30.3%	No Opinion 1.5%	Agree 81.0%	Disagree 17.2%	No Opinion 1.9%
3(a). Non-tenured members of the Teaching and Research Faculty should be made eligible to receive tuition benefits for children attending colleges other than Notre Dame.	51.1%	46.5%	2.4%	----	----	----
3(b). Members of the Library and Special Faculties with fewer than six full years of continuous service should be made eligible to receive tuition benefits for children attending colleges other than Notre Dame.	-----	-----	-----	60%	37.1%	2.9%
4. A uniform tuition benefit policy fixed at some specific fraction of Notre Dame tuition (e.g. 60% or 70%) but available equally to children of qualified faculty attending either Notre Dame or some other college would be preferable to the present policy.	47.9%	47.9%	4.2%	48.6%	46.7%	4.8%
5. A tuition aid plan should be made available for faculty children who choose to pursue post-secondary education in accredited institutions with vocational rather than academic orientations (e.g. nursing schools).	76.8%	20.6%	2.7%	76.2%	20.0%	3.8%

#### IV. Information on Faculty Children

	<u>T &amp; R Faculty</u>	<u>Non-T &amp; R Faculty</u>		
1. Total Number of Children Reported.	994	159*		
(*169 were reported but 10 belong to faculty who have spouses on the T & R Faculty. They are eliminated to avoid double counting.)				
Number of children who are college graduates or not seeking further education.	254	34		
Number of children presently enrolled in college.	177	20		
Number of children not yet of college age or not yet enrolled.	563	105		
2. College Preferences of Faculty Surveyed for Children Who Have Not Entered College				
<u>Full-time T &amp; R Faculty (406 responses)</u>	<u>Full-time Non-T &amp; R Faculty(101 responses)</u>			
Preferences were indicated for 526 children (93% of those reported as not having entered college).	Preferences were indicated for 87 children (83% of those reported as not having entered college).			
Prefer Notre Dame/St. Mary's:	54% (286)	61% (53)		
Prefer another college:	46% (240)	39% (34)		
Most likely to attend Notre Dame/St. Mary's:	69% (363)	53% (46)		
Most likely to attend another college:	31% (163)	47% (41)		
Combination preferences expressed for individual children				
Prefer ND/SMC & likely ND/SMC	50% (264)	47% (41)		
Prefer "Other" & likely "Other"	27% (141)	33% (29)		
Prefer "Other" but likely ND/SMC	19% ( 99)	6% ( 5)		
Prefer ND/SMC but likely "Other"	4% ( 22)	14% (12)		
3. Future College Attendance Patterns of Faculty Children				
(Based on Projections from Present Ages as listed on Survey Returns)				
(Columns below represent total numbers of children attending college in the years indicated.)				
	(1) Children of <u>T&amp;R Faculty</u>	(2) Children of Non- <u>T&amp;R Faculty</u>	(3) Total reported <u>Children (1+2)</u>	(4) Total projected <u>Enrollments<sup>1</sup></u>
1980-81	177	20	197	240 (actual)
1981-82	168	19	187	234
1982-83	160	18	178	223
1983-84	155	19	174	218
1984-85	147	18	165	206
1985-86	139	20	159	199
1986-87	136	18	154	193
1987-88	133	20	153	191
1988-89	136	20	156	195
1989-90	145	24	169	211

	(1) Children of T & R Faculty	(2) Children of Non- T & R Faculty	(3) Total reported Children (1+2)	(4) Total projected Enrollment
1990-91	144	28	172	215
1991-92	136	24	160	200
1992-93	119	23	142	178
1993-94	102	17	119	149
1994-95	93	18	111	139
1995-96	82	17	99	124
1996-97	72	21	93	116
1997-98	72	25	97	121
1998-99	71	25	96	120
1999-2000	70	24	94	118

<sup>1</sup>Figures in Column (4) represent a best estimate of the actual enrollment of faculty children over the next twenty years. It is based on the assumption that the 75% of faculty members who participated in the survey reported 85% of the children not yet in college in the total pool of full-time faculty families. The error factor should be no more than  $\pm 10$  children per year.

4. Average number of children attending college each year 1981-90 = 213.
5. Average number of children attending college each year 1991-2000 = 148.
6. Average number of children attending college each year for the 20-year period 1981-2000 = 180.

Vaughn McKim, Chairman  
Faculty Affairs Committee

## faculty committee for university libraries minutes august 24, 1981

Present: James L. Cullather, Vincent P. DeSantis, Gerald L. Jones, John R. Malone (retiring chairperson), Robert C. Miller, James E. Robinson, Andrew J. Sommes.

Election of a new chairperson was deferred until the September 14th meeting since Lloyd H. Ketchum was not notified of this meeting.

A schedule of meetings for the 1981-82 academic year was tentatively established as follows:

August 24, 1981	January 18, 1982
September 14, 1981	February 8, 1982
October 12, 1981	March 8, 1982
November 9, 1981	April 12, 1982
December 14, 1981	May 10, 1982

All meetings will be held at 4:00 p.m. in the 221 Conference Room of the Memorial Library.

A meeting of the Committee with the Advisory Council for University Libraries will be held on Saturday, Oct. 10, at 9:00 a.m. in the Faculty Lounge, 1st floor of the Memorial Library.

Agenda items were suggested as follows: (1) circulation policy; (2) new physical rearrangement of the Memorial Library; (3) report of the Collection Analysis Project; (4) use of endowment and management thereof; (5) funds for the Libraries and the endowment itself; (6) building support among all constituents, including donors; (7) noise and other environmental distractions; (8) 1981-82 budget and the ongoing process; (9) review of the Five-Year Development Plan; (10) review of the serials cancellations and new subscriptions; (11) data base searching; (12) PACE recommendations; (13) space problems in Memorial Library; (14) automation of chargeout facilities; (15) endowment income return.

The Summary Report of the Collection Analysis Project was distributed to committee members for discussion at a later date.

The 1981-82 acquisitions budget was presented to the committee. Miller commented that size

---

of enrollment, level of instruction, number of graduate students and faculty, materials costs within the discipline, external needs not met by the approval plan, and special considerations were among the factors used in determining the unit allocations. He also explained the use of subject-specific endowment income: one-half being used to underwrite general support of the unit(s) and one-half being used for selected purchasing.

Miller also indicated that if substantial additional endowment income became available before Jan. 1, 1982, consideration would be given to beginning an approval program for German language materials in selected subject areas.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.



# advanced studies

## information circulars

Additional information on all circulars listed below may be obtained by calling the following extensions:

Extension 4487, for information on federal government programs.

Extension 7433, for information on private foundations, corporations and state agencies.

### National Science Foundation Mathematical Sciences Postdoctoral Research Fellowships

No. FY82-80

#### Program:

The foundation plans to select in February 1982 approximately 25 applicants for fellowships for postdoctoral research in the mathematical sciences. The fellowships, which must be held at U.S. institutions, are designed to permit recipients to choose research environments that will have maximal impact on their future scientific development.

Awards of these fellowships will be made for appropriate research in pure mathematics, applied mathematics, and statistics.

The format of this fellowship program has recently been modified to provide the recipient with increased flexibility in the manner in which he or she can perform as a fellow. In particular, stipend portion of the awards will consist of support for nine academic-year months and four summer months over two summers. The awardee will have two options for the nine-month stipend: as full-time support for any nine academic-year months in a two-year period (the Research Fellowship option), or as half-time support over eighteen academic-year months (the Research Instructorship option).

#### Eligibility:

National Science Foundation Mathematical Sciences Postdoctoral Research Fellowships will be offered only to persons who (1) are citizens or nationals of the U.S., as of Jan. 1, 1982, (2) will have earned by the beginning of their fellowship tenure a doctoral degree in one of the mathematical sciences listed above or have had research training and experience equivalent to that represented by a Ph.D. degree in one of those

fields, (3) will have held the doctorate for no more than five years as of Jan. 1, 1982, and (4) will not previously have held any other NSF Postdoctoral Fellowship.

#### Stipend:

The stipend will be paid at the rate of \$2,000 per full-time month or \$1,000 per half-time month, for a total of \$26,000 for the nine academic-year months and four summer months.

#### Deadline:

The deadline for complete applications is Dec. 11, 1981.

#### For Further Information and Applications:

Mathematical Sciences Postdoctoral Research  
Fellowships  
Mathematical Sciences Section  
National Science Foundation  
Washington, D.C. 20550

## current publications and other scholarly works

### COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS

#### General Program of Liberal Studies

Schindler, David L.

D.L. Schindler. 1981. Review-essay. The Philosophical Approach to God: A Neo-Thomistic Perspective, by W. Norris Clarke, S.J. Process Studies 11(1):40-46.

#### Government and International Studies

Arnold, Peri E.

P.E. Arnold. 1981. Executive reorganization and the origin of the managerial presidency. Policy 13:568-599.

#### Psychology

Santos, John F.

R.W. Hubbard and J.F. Santos. 1981. Empathy training as an instructional tool for geriatric health professionals. Educational Gerontology: An International Quarterly 22:191-194.

J.F. Santos and R.W. Hubbard. 1981. One model for

graduate training in Gerontology. Gerontology and Geriatrics Education 1(3):185-189.

#### Theology

- Malloy, CSC, Edward A.  
E.A. Malloy, CSC. 1981. Homosexuality and the Christian way of life. University Press of America, Washington, D.C. 363 pages.

#### COLLEGE OF SCIENCE

#### Chemistry

- Kozak, John J.  
\*K.A. Green, K.D. Luks and J.J. Kozak. 1981. Solutions of the Yvon-Born-Green equation for hard discs at very high densities. Molecular Physics 43(3):685-696.
- Winicur, Daniel H.  
\*D.H. Winicur, J. Hurst, C.A. Becker and L. Wharton. 1981. CO desorption and adsorption on Pt(III). Surface Science 109:263-275.

-----  
\*Under the Radiation Laboratory  
-----

#### Mathematics

- Sommese, Andrew J.  
A.J. Sommese. 1981. Hyperplane sections. Pages 232-234 in, Proceedings of the 1st Midwest Algebraic Geometry Conference at Chicago Circle, May 1980, Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, New York.

#### COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

#### Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering

- Kanury, A. Murty  
A.M. Kanury. 1981. Liquid pool burning. Volume 73, pages 195-243 in, T.H. Cochran, ed., Combustion Experiments in a Zero-Gravity Laboratory. Progress in Astronautics and Aeronautics. Princeton Combustion Research Laboratories, Incorporated, Princeton, New Jersey.

#### COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

#### Accountancy

- Campbell, David R.  
D.R. Campbell, J.F. Gaertner and R.P. Vecchio. 1981. The importance of professional activities for promotion and tenure: Accounting faculty perceptions. Proceedings of the 1981 National Meeting of the American Accounting Association Pages 33-34.
- Gaertner, James F.  
D.R. Campbell, J.F. Gaertner and R.P. Vecchio. 1981. The importance of professional activities for promotion and tenure: Accounting faculty perceptions. Proceedings of the 1981 National Meeting of the American Accounting Association Pages 33-34.

#### Management

- Vecchio, Robert P.  
R.P. Vecchio. 1981. An individual difference resolution of the conflicting predictions generated by equity theory and expectancy theory. Journal of Applied Psychology 66(4):470-481.
- D.R. Campbell, J.F. Gaertner and R.P. Vecchio. 1981. The importance of professional activities for promotion and tenure: Accounting faculty perceptions. Proceedings of the 1981 National Meeting of the American Accounting Association Pages 33-34.

#### RADIATION LABORATORY

- Bobrowski, Krzysztof  
N.V. Raghavan, P.K. Das and K. Bobrowski. 1981. Transient phenomena in the pulse radiolysis of retinyl polyenes. 1. Radical anions. Journal of the American Chemical Society 103(15):4569-4573.
- Das, Paritosh K.  
N.V. Raghavan, P.K. Das and K. Bobrowski. 1981. Transient phenomena in the pulse radiolysis of retinyl polyenes. 1. Radical anions. Journal of the American Chemical Society 103(15):4569-4573.
- Raghavan, N.V.  
N.V. Raghavan, P.K. Das and K. Bobrowski. 1981. Transient phenomena in the pulse radiolysis of retinyl polyenes. 1. Radical anions. Journal of the American Chemical Society 103(15):4569-4573.

## closing dates for selected sponsored programs

Proposals must be submitted to the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs seven calendar days prior to the deadline dates listed below.

Agency	Programs	Application Closing Dates
American Council of Learned Societies	Study Fellowships	Nov. 15, 1981
American Council of Learned Societies	Travel Grants for Humanists to International Scholarly Meetings Abroad	Nov. 1, 1981
The American Lung Association	Research Grants	Nov. 1, 1981
American Research Institute in Turkey	Fellowship Program	Nov. 15, 1981
Dumbarton Oaks Center	Fellowships	Nov. 15, 1981
German Academic Exchange Program	Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD) Research Programs - Study and Research	Nov. 1, 1981

Agency	Programs	Application Closing Dates
International Research and Exchanges Board	Exchange of Senior Scholars in All Fields with the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education of the USSR	Nov. 1, 1981
International Research and Exchanges Board	Academic Exchange Programs With Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and Yugoslavia	Nov. 1, 1981
International Research and Exchanges Board	Exchange of Graduate Students and Young Faculty in All Fields with the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education of the USSR	Nov. 1, 1981
International Research and Exchanges Board	Exchange of Senior Scholars in the Social Sciences and Humanities Between the American Council of Learned Societies and the USSR Academy of Sciences	Nov. 1, 1981
The Japan Foundation	Professional Fellowship Program	Nov. 15, 1981
National Academy of Sciences	National Program for Advanced Study and Research in China	Nov. 6, 1981
National Endowment for the Humanities	Research Conferences	Nov. 15, 1981
National Endowment for the Humanities	Research Publications	Nov. 1, 1981
National Endowment for the Humanities	Youth Grants	Nov. 15, 1981
National Institute on Aging	Special Research Awards	Nov. 1, 1981
National Institute of Justice	Visiting Fellowship Program	Nov. 15, 1981
National Institutes of Health	New Investigator Research Award	Nov. 1, 1981
National Science Foundation	NATO Postdoctoral Fellowship in Science	Nov. 2, 1981
Sigma XI, The Scientific Research Society	Grants-in-Aid for Research	Nov. 1, 1981
The Charles A. Lindbergh Fund, Inc.	1982 Grants	Nov. 16, 1981
The German Marshall Fund	Fellowship Program	Nov. 30, 1981
The National Council for Soviet and East European Research	Postdoctoral Award	Nov. 1, 1981
The Lady Davis Fellowship Trust	Postdoctoral Award	Nov. 30, 1981
Weizmann Institute of Science	Postdoctoral Fellowships	Nov. 15, 1981

DR. WILLIAM B. BERRY  
ASSISTANT DEAN  
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING  
NOTRE DAME IN 46556

---

267

---

## notre dame report

An official publication of the University of Notre Dame, Department of Information Services. Individual copies are available in the Notre Dame Hammes Bookstore at 50 cents each. Mail subscriptions are \$10 per year. Back copies are available through the mail at 70 cents each.

Marianne Murphy, Editor  
Printing and Publications Office  
415 Administration Building  
Notre Dame, Ind. 46556  
(219) 283-1234

---