

# notre dame report

---

## contents

### the university

- 289 New Development Director for New York Office
- 289 Name Change for University Counseling Center
- 290 Commencement Exercises - Faculty Instructions
- 290 Campus Telephone Directory Notice

### faculty notes

- 291 Honors
- 291 Activities

### documentation

- 295 Academic Council Minutes
  - March 17, 1986
- 297 --Appendix 1. University Honesty Committee
  - Revised Version of Final Recommendations
  - (March 1986)
- 300 --Appendix 2. Results of Student Body Survey
  - by University Honesty Committee
- 301 --Appendix 3. Results of Faculty and
  - Department Honesty Committee Survey
- 304 --Appendix 4. Honor Code Report
- 305 --Appendix 5. Membership of University
  - Honesty Committee
- 306 Faculty Senate Journal
  - January 28, 1986
- 309 --February 10, 1986
- 310 --March 3, 1986

### advanced studies

- 315 Current Publications and Other Scholarly Works

85-86

May 2, 1986

number 16

---

# the university

---

## new development director for new york office

Henry A. McCormack, a 1952 Notre Dame graduate with a cum laude degree in political science, has been named director of the University's development office in New York. As one of six such directors, he will oversee development activities in nine Middle-Atlantic and New England states.

McCormack has completed more than 30 years' service with Phelps Dodge Corp. in New York, where he was engaged in all phases of sales, marketing and operations. In recent years he has served as vice president of operations, as well as sales and marketing.

## name change for university counseling center

The University's Counseling and Psychological Services Center will change its name to University Counseling Center, effective July 1. In addition to the name change, the center will begin a predoctoral internship program in counseling and clinical psychology Aug. 1.

According to center director Patrick Utz, the name change has been considered for the past two years and reflects the preference of students and staff for a less clinical title. Although the center will continue to offer individual counseling sessions only to students, Utz reminded faculty and staff that the agency's personnel are available as consultants.

The internships, Utz said, are intended to enhance the center's student training program and diversify its specialty services by attracting counselors who have a wide area of expertise. Susan Steibe, a clinical psychologist with the center, will direct the intern program.

---

Vol. 15, No. 16

May 2, 1986

Notre Dame Report (USPS 7070-8000) is an official publication published fortnightly during the school year, monthly in the summer, by the University of Notre Dame, Department of Public Relations and Information. Second-class postage paid at Notre Dame, Ind. Postmaster: Please send address corrections to: Editor, Notre Dame Report, c/o Rm. 212, Administration Building, Notre Dame, IN 46556

© 1986 by the University of Notre Dame, Ind. 46556. All rights reserved.

---

## commencement exercises— faculty instructions

### BACCALAUREATE MASS -- SATURDAY, MAY 17, 1986

4:00 p.m. FACULTY ASSEMBLY. Enter Gate 1 or 2 of the A.C.C. and go to the Auxiliary Gymnasium. Academic robes MUST be worn by all those in the academic procession, including members of the clergy who are not concelebrating the Mass.

4:20 p.m. ACADEMIC PROCESSION STARTS.

5:00 p.m. BACCALAUREATE MASS. Father Hesburgh will be the Presiding Celebrant and Homilist. Except for the Ministers of the Mass, there will be no recessional of the procession participants.

### COMMENCEMENT AND CONFERRING OF DEGREES -- SUNDAY, MAY 18, 1986

12:30 p.m. DISTRIBUTION OF BACHELOR'S AND MASTER'S DIPLOMAS. Those faculty assisting with the distribution of diplomas should enter Gate 3 of the A.C.C. and go directly to the departmental tables set up in the center of the North Dome.

FACULTY ASSEMBLY. All other faculty should enter Gate 3 of the A.C.C. and assemble along the south perimeter of the hockey rink. Faculty who are advisors of doctoral degree recipients will receive additional instructions.

1:15 p.m. ACADEMIC PROCESSION STARTS. The faculty will follow the graduates into the South Dome of the A.C.C. and will go to the seats behind the stage.

2:00 p.m. COMMENCEMENT AND CONFERRING OF DEGREES CEREMONY.

## campus telephone directory notice

The Department of Publications and Graphic Services is currently compiling information from staff, faculty and departments for the 1986-87 University of Notre Dame/Saint Mary's College temporary telephone directory, scheduled for distribution sometime in August. Instructions from their office will be mailed out campuswide shortly, along with directory change cards for use in reporting any additions, deletions or changes that should be made in the listing of staff and faculty members in the Staff/Faculty Listing and Departmental Listing sections of the directory. There are four different color-coded cards and instructions are included on each. If this notification is not received, please call their office at 239-5337 to request a set of instructions and the appropriate card(s) for the type of change being made.

Please Note: The deadline for receipt of all cards at the Publications and Graphic Services office for inclusion in the temporary directory is June 13, 1986. A correctly completed card must be on file there in order for necessary changes to be made. Cards received after this date will be held for publication in the permanent directory. (No card is necessary if the current entry is correct.) All information must be on a card (no other form of written changes or telephone calls will be accepted) and should be typed or printed legibly.

# faculty notes

---

## honors

James J. Carberry, professor of chemical engineering, has been elected a Fellow of the American Institute of Chemists. He is also a Fellow of the New York Academy of Sciences, The Royal Society of Arts (London) and the Yale Science and Engineering Association.

Edward A. Kline, professor and chairman of English and director of the Freshman Writing Program, has been selected for the third consecutive year as judge for the Expository Writing Contest, Midwest Region of Secondary Schools, by the National Council of Teachers of English.

Michael J. Madigan, speaker of the Illinois House of Representatives, has authorized a resolution honoring Robert F. O'Brien, associate professor of music, on his 34 years as director of the Notre Dame Bands. A copy of a proclamation designating April 2 as Robert F. O'Brien Day in Illinois has been received on campus. The veteran director, a native of Breese, Illinois, will spend the next year updating records of the band, acclaimed as the oldest in continuous existence on any college or university campus.

Leonard M. Savoie, chairman and professor of accountancy, has been appointed chairman of the finance committee of the 1987 International Summer Special Olympics, which will be held at Notre Dame July 31-August 9, 1987.

## activities

Rev. Nicholas R. Ayo, C.S.C., assistant professor in the Program of Liberal Studies, was an invited participant in a Colloquium on Poetry and Freedom held at St. John's College, Annapolis, Md., March 13-14.

James O. Bellis, associate professor of anthropology, delivered a guest lecture, "Archaeological Materials from the Gold Fields of Ghana: Possibilities for Further Salvage," for the Charles Darwin Society of Purdue University, West Lafayette, Ind., March 18.

Joseph Blenkinsopp, John A. O'Brien professor of Biblical Studies, gave the inaugural lecture for the O'Brien Chair April 10. His topic was "Old Testament Studies and the Jewish-Christian Connection."

Paul F. Bradshaw, associate professor of theology, gave a lecture, "Ancient Church Orders: A Literary Jigsaw Puzzle," at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, April 1.

Robert R. Coleman, staff faculty fellow in the Medieval Institute and assistant professor in the department of art, art history and design, participated in a lecture series sponsored by the Department of Art History, State University College of New York at New Paltz, titled "Art and Art History in the Real World." On April 11, he presented a lecture, "The Pitfalls and Pleasures of an Exhibition Curator."

Adela Yarbro Collins, professor of theology, participated as a Fellow in the Winter Meeting of the national Jesus Seminar, held at the University of Redlands, Calif., March 6-9. She also participated in the editorial board meeting of the New Testament Apocrypha project sponsored by the Westar Institute at the University of Redlands March 9.

M.I. Chaudhry, graduate student in electrical and computer engineering, gave a talk titled "Characterization of MOS Structures on Cubic SiC" at Clarkson University, Potsdam, N.Y., March 21. He also presented a paper, co-authored by William B. Berry, professor of electrical and computer engineering, titled "Auger Electron Spectroscopy and Capacitance Studies of MOS Structures on Beta-SiC" at the 1986 Colorado Microelectronics Conference held at Colorado Springs March 25.

Daniel J. Costello, Jr., professor of electrical and computer engineering, gave a talk on "Capacity and Cutoff Rate for Concatenated Codes" for the Northern Virginia and Washington Section of the IEEE Information Theory Society at Gaithersburg, Md., March 31.

George B. Craig, Jr., Clark professor of biological sciences, served as program chairman at the American Mosquito Control Association annual meeting, held in New Orleans, La., April 20-24.

Fabio B. Dasilva, professor of sociology, was a discussant for a research session on "Critical Theory" held at the annual meeting of the Midwest Sociological Society in Des Moines, Iowa, March 24-27.

Keith J. Egan, adjunct professor of theology, presented the St. Bernard Institute's Twelfth Annual Otto A. Schults Lectures on Spirituality at the Colgate Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, N.Y., April 3. He also lectured at the symposium on "The Inner Journey of the Layperson," in St. Bernadette's Spirituality Symposia, Houston, Tex., April 25-26.

Isaac Elishakoff, visiting Freimann professor of aerospace and mechanical engineering, gave invited seminars titled "Random Vibration-Status and Recent Developments" for the Department of Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., Feb. 28, and at United Technologies Research Center, East Hartford, Conn., March 31. He also gave invited seminars titled "Buckling of Shells with Random Imperfections" at the Hartford Graduate Center April 1, at the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering at Syracuse University April 2, and at the Center for Applied Stochastic Research, College of Engineering, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Fla., April 11.

Pamela R. Falkenberg, assistant professor of communication and theatre, presented a paper titled "Psychoanalysis, 'Girl Books,' and Escape Literature" as part of a panel on "The 'New'

Heroine in Popular Film and Fiction" at the Florida State University Comparative Literature and Film Circle 11th Annual Conference on Literature and Film, Tallahassee, Fla., Jan. 30-Feb. 1. She also presented "Changing the Difference: Psychoanalytic Fantasies in Hollywood Films" as part of the "Figuration of Psychoanalysis" panel at the Society for Cinema Studies 26th Annual Conference, University of New Orleans, La., April 3-6.

Denis Goulet, O'Neill professor of education for justice in the department of economics, was an invited participant in a symposium on "The Future of U.S.-U.S.S.R. Relations: Lessons from Forty Years without World War," sponsored by The University of Texas at Austin, The Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, and the Distinguished Visiting Tom Slick Professorship of World Peace, April 3-4.

Arthur M. Grubert, director of international student affairs and assistant to the director of the Foreign Study Programs, was awarded a Fulbright grant to study in Germany from April 8 to May 2. Grubert used the grant to study and observe educational developments and international education in the Federal Republic of Germany under the Project for Educational Experts.

Mark A. Herro, assistant professor of electrical and computer engineering, presented a paper on "Capacity and Cutoff Rate of a Concatenated Coding System with an Inner Convolutional Code" at the 1986 Conference on Information Sciences and Systems, Princeton, N.J., March 20.

Roger F. Jacobs, law school librarian and professor of law, participated in the joint American Bar Association/American Association of Law Schools inspection of Rutgers University-Camden School of Law, Camden, N.J., March 31-April 3.

Rev. Charles Kannengiesser, S.J., Huisking professor of theology, gave a presentation titled "Comments on Frederick J. Crosson, 'Cicero and Augustine'" at a conference on Christianity and Classical Thought held on campus March 15. He also

participated in the 140th meeting of the American Society of Church History in Fort Worth, Tex., April 3-5, and presented "Augustine on Love: a Response to T.J. van Bavel: 'The Double Face of Love in Augustine'" at Chicago Theological Union April 8. He was coordinator (with William L. Petersen, visiting assistant professor of theology) of the Origen Colloquium at Notre Dame April 11-13, and delivered a paper, "Origen On Divine Trinity" at the colloquium.

Eileen Kearney, assistant professor of theology, has received a Mellon Fellowship in the Humanities for 1986-87 at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Donald Kline, associate professor of psychology, presented an invited address titled "Through Old Eyes: A Changing View of a Changing Scene" at Villanova (Pa.) University April 11.

Douglas W. Kmiec, professor of law and director of the Thomas and Alberta White Center for Law and Government, delivered a lecture titled "Federalism in Perspective" at the Mid-Year Meeting of the American Bar Association, held in Baltimore, Md., in February.

Rev. Robert A. Krieg, C.S.C., professor of theology, gave a lecture, "Karl Barth's Use of Scripture" at the meeting of the American Theological Association, DePaul University, Chicago, April 25.

Jay A. LaVerne, assistant professional specialist in the Radiation Laboratory, presented a paper titled "Production of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  in the Radiolysis of Water with Heavy Ions: A Comparison of  $^{12}\text{C}$  and  $^4\text{He}$  Radiolysis" at the 34th Annual Meeting of the Radiation Research Society, Las Vegas, Nev., April 13-17.

Robert J. Lordi, professor of English, presented a paper to the seminar, "New Approaches to Shakespearean Comedy" at the meeting of the World Shakespeare Congress held in Berlin, West Germany, April 1-6.

Louis A. MacKenzie, Jr., visiting assistant professor of modern languages, delivered a paper titled "Collage: Cutting and Pasting the Jesuits in the Lettres Provinciales" at the annual meeting of the Northeast Modern Language Association, held in New Brunswick, N.J., April 3-5. He was elected secretary of the 17th-Century French Literature section of NEMLA at that meeting.

Rev. Richard P. McBrien, chairman and Crowley-O'Brien-Walter professor of theology, gave a presentation on "Church Authority and Conscience" at Fordham University, New York, N.Y., April 8, and gave the keynote address, "Empowered for Service: Church and Ministry" at the Heartland Conference, held in Kansas City, Mo., April 22.

Rev. John A. Melloh, S.M., associate professional specialist in theology and coordinator of the John S. Marten Program in Homiletics and Liturgics, presented a parish renewal titled "Dying and Rising with Jesus" in preparation for the Easter Festival at the Parish of St. Raphael, Englewood, Fla.,

March 17-21. He also preached at the Sunday worship service for the congregation at Culver Military Academy, Culver, Ind., April 20, and submitted a report to Saint Mary's College on the renovation of Le Mans Chapel and Holy Cross Chapel. He gave five presentations on the Celebration of the Sacraments to participants in a program sponsored by the Center for Continuing Formation in Ministry and held at Notre Dame April 23-25.

Kevin M. Misiewicz, associate professor of accountancy and Arthur Young faculty fellow in taxation, gave a presentation titled "Micro-computers for Education in Taxation" at the Midwest regional meeting of the American Accounting Association, held in Chicago March 21.

Asokendu Mozumder, associate faculty fellow in the Radiation Laboratory, presented a paper titled "Free-ion Yield in Liquid Argon by High-energy Electron and Heavy Particle Irradiation" at the annual meeting of the Radiation Research Society, Las Vegas, Nev., April 13-17.

Dian Murray, assistant professor of history, presented a paper on "Violence in South China during the 18th Century" at the Midwest Conference on Asian Studies, held at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, Oct. 12, and was an invited participant in the Outreach Conference on East Asian Affairs, held at the University of Chicago Jan. 11. She also presented "The Sino-Vietnamese Border Conflict from the Maritime Perspective" and chaired a panel on "Historical Perspectives on the Sino-Vietnamese Border Conflict" at the national meeting of the Association for Asian Studies, held in Chicago March 23.

Walter Nugent, Tackes professor of history, presented committee reports on Fulbright awards for American lecturers and researchers, and on institutional development grants in American Studies at a meeting of the Board of Directors of the U.S.-Israel Educational Foundation at Tel Aviv Jan. 30. He presented a paper, "American Exceptionalism: A Demographic Perspective," at the annual meeting of the Israel American Studies Association, Neve Ilan, Israel, Jan. 28, and presented a revised version of that paper at Indiana University, Bloomington, April 4, in the "Horizons of Knowledge" lecture series. He also presented "Transatlantic Population, 1870-1900" at the annual meeting of the Organization of American Historians, New York City, April 12, and presented "American Farmers and the Market Economy, 1880-1920" at a conference on 20th-century American agricultural policy held at Iowa State University Ames, April 25.

Rev. Edward D. O'Connor, C.S.C., associate professor of theology, gave a retreat, "Mary, Ikon of the Church" at the Wheeling Diocesan Center, Wheeling, West Virginia, April 11-13, and presented "The Story of Medjugorje" for the Serra Club, South Bend, May 4.

Rev. Thomas O'Meara, O.P., acting chairman and Warren professor of theology, gave a lecture on "The Future of Ministry" at Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa., April 14.

William A. O'Rourke, assistant professor of English, gave an invited reading of his fiction as part of the "Writing Out Loud" series at the Michigan City (Ind.) Public Library, April 8.

Joseph E. O'Tousa, assistant professor of biological sciences, (with Drs. Meredith L. Applebury, William L. Pak and Jay Hirsch) has been selected as a recipient of the annual Fight for Sight Citation, awarded for outstanding achievement in basic research. The group won for the poster titled "Isolation of ninaE, the Major Drosophila Opsin Gene." The award was presented April 29 in Sarasota, Fla.

Larry K. Patterson, assistant director and faculty fellow in the Radiation Laboratory, gave the following invited seminars: "Photophysics in Spread Monolayers at the Air-Water Interface," at the Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute, Bethesda, Md., April 3; and "Photophysics and Photochemistry of Porphyrins at the Air-Water Interface," at the National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C., April 4.

John F. Santos, director of the Center for Gerontological Education, Research and Services and professor of psychology, served as a judge on the final review panel for the Retirement Research Foundation's National Mass Media Awards Program. The "Wise Old Owl" Awards that are the trademark of the program will be given by Helen Hayes in four separate categories at a ceremony in Chicago May 15.

Leonard M. Savoie, chairman and professor of accountancy, was moderator of a panel discussion, "Financial Accounting Standards: The Bottom Line," at the American Accounting Association Midwest Regional Meeting in Chicago March 21.

Robert H. Schuler, director of the Radiation Laboratory and Henkels professor of chemistry, chaired a session and presented a paper titled "Phosphate as a Source of H Atoms in Pulse Radiolysis Studies" at the 34th annual meeting of the Radiation Research Society, Las Vegas, Nev., April 13-17.

Mark Searle, associate professor of theology, gave a lecture on "Spirituality and Catechesis" at the Religious Education Institute, Camden, N.J., March 15. He also lectured on the Notre Dame Study of Catholic Parish Life at Valparaiso (Ind.) University April 10, and gave three lectures on liturgy and social justice at Marywood Liturgical Center, Grand Rapids, Mich., April 19.

George P. Smith II, visiting professor of law, presented the eighth annual Robert E. Gross Lectureship at The University of Texas Medical School in Houston, titled "Beginnings and Endings in Life," March 14th; he also gave the Sister Rosemary Donley Lecture, titled "Death Be Not Proud: Medical, Legal and Ethical Dilemmas," at The Catholic University of America's School of Nursing, Washington, D.C., March 27. Professor Smith presented a paper titled "The Right to Property in American Constitutional Law" at a Conference on German and American Constitutional Law co-sponsored by the Notre Dame Law School and the Konrad

Adenauer Foundation, held on the Notre Dame campus April 11.

Carl L. Stam, associate professional specialist in music and director of choral music, was conductor of the 1986 Choral Festival for the Virginia Association of Independent Schools, Richmond, Va., April 6-7.

Boleslaw B. Szczesniak, professor emeritus of history, conducted research in Italy from December 1985 to March 1986. During this time, he studied the manuscript collection in the Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana and the Oriental books of the Jesuit missionaries, as well as the Roman Archives of the Jesuits. He also worked in the Bibliotheca Medicea Laurenziana in Florence and in the Bibliotheca Nazionale Centrale di Firenze.

M. Katherine Tillman, associate professor in the Program of Liberal Studies, gave a paper titled "Newman's Personalist Epistemology" at the meeting of the American Catholic Philosophical Association in Baltimore, Md., April 5.

Chris R. Vanden Bossche, assistant professor of English, presented a paper titled "Revising 'The Prelude': Aurora Leigh as Laureate" (with Laura Haigwood, adjunct assistant professor in the Freshman Writing Program) at the Northeast Modern Language Association annual meeting, New Brunswick, N.J., April 3.

Rev. James F. White, professor of theology, gave a lecture on "Liturgy and Language" at St. Joseph College, Patchogue, N.Y., April 13. He also gave the Thomas H. Miller Lectures, "Old Frontiers in Worship" and "New Frontiers in Worship," at Christian Theological Seminary, Indianapolis, March 5.

Patricia L. Wismer, assistant professor of theology, gave a presentation on "Teaching Biblical Theology from a Feminist Perspective" at the Wooster Clergy Academy of Religion, Wooster, Ohio, Feb. 18. She also presented "The Women Around Jesus: Then and Now" at a Conference on "Christianity and Women: Past and Present," held at the College of New Rochelle, N.Y., April 5.

John H. Yoder, professor of theology, spoke on "The Care for the Dignity of the Secular" at a Conference on Faith and Learning, held at Bethel College, Newton, Kans., April 18.

Michael Zalkin, assistant professor of economics, presented a paper titled "Grain Policy and Transition in Revolutionary Nicaragua," at the 4th annual Meetings of the Association for Economic and Social Analysis, held at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst April 15. He also presented "National and International Determinants of Food Consumption in Post-Revolutionary Nicaragua" at the 6th annual Meetings of the Society for Economic Anthropology, held at the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, April 12.

# documen- tation

---

## academic council minutes march 17, 1986

(1) Members present - Father Hesburgh, Professor O'Meara, Father Joyce, Father Malloy, Father Tyson, Dr. Gordon, Dean Loux, Dean Castellino, Dean Schmitz, Dean Reilly, Dean Link, Dean Hofman, Mr. Miller, Professor Yoder, Mr. Baker, Professor Gleason, Professor Kline, Professor Swartz, Professor Conway, Professor Wittenbach, Professor Marley, Professor Taylor, Professor Bottei, Professor Derwent, Professor McGlinn, Professor Dutile, Mrs. Porter, Dr. Weigert, Miss Finch, Mr. Kennedy.

Observers present - Mr. Conklin, members of the University Honesty Committee.

(2) Provost O'Meara opened the meeting with a prayer.

(3) College Academic Advising

Provost O'Meara announced that the reports from Colleges on academic advising were not yet complete. Discussion has been deferred until the fall semester.

(4) Report of the University Honesty Committee

The Report of the University Honesty Committee was presented by Father Malloy. He began by highlighting some aspects of the survey data obtained in the questionnaires completed by faculty and students.

### Student-body survey data - (addendum)

- There was a 21% response rate. Students considered the two main types of cheating to be copying outside assignments and colluding on outside class assignments.
- Students thought that the submission of fraudulent term papers was relatively uncommon, even in the College of Arts and Letters.
- There seemed to be a general lack of knowledge of University policies and procedures with regard to academic honesty.
- There is ambiguity about whether colluding on outside assignments constitutes cheating, especially when some teachers encourage group efforts.
- Students believe that an Honor Code will not work because students will not turn in their peers. However, they do believe that offenders should be punished severely.

### Faculty survey data - (addendum)

- There was a 34% response rate.
  - Seventy-five percent of the faculty deal with dishonesty cases personally rather than by sending them to the departmental committees.
  - Fifty-seven percent of the faculty favored improved University procedures to deal with dishonesty.
-



- 
- The faculty considered penalties for cheating too varied and too lenient.
  - The main difference between the faculty responses and those of the students is that the latter believed more cheating was going on than the former.

#### Honor Code - (addendum)

- The Committee chose not to recommend a strict Honor Code for Notre Dame. In a separate document the Committee explained its reasons.
- The main obstacle to the implementation of a full Honor Code is that student reportage is not workable. This was the conclusion as well of a 1971 Notre Dame study.

#### Final Recommendations - (addendum)

Father Malloy reviewed each of the eight recommendations. After thanking all of the members of the Committee for their generous service, especially the student representatives, he then recommended that the Academic Council adopt the recommendations as its own. The next step would be to submit them to the College Councils and to Student Government for a formal response.

- The remainder of the Academic Council meeting was devoted to matters of clarification of the Report as submitted.

•Dean Schmitz opened the discussion by asking what 'submitting to the office of the appropriate Dean' meant in part 2 of recommendation 5. It was explained that the Dean of the student's own College was intended. He also asked about 'the appropriate College Honesty Committee' in part 1 of recommendation 5. Father Malloy said that this referred to the Dean of the College in which the course was taken. Finally, he wondered whether the Report really intended for the Honor Committee to assign the penalty. The answer was 'Yes,' but the decision can be appealed.

•A number of members of the Council then pursued the issue of the 'prerogative' of the individual faculty member to submit a letter to the appropriate Dean. Provost O'Meara suggested that the phrase 'a determination of cheating has been made' should replace the phrase 'the student has been caught cheating' in Recommendation 5, section (2). Is the encouragement too soft? Should such an action (the submission of a letter) be mandated by the Report? Father Malloy said that the wording was intended to reflect the strong feeling of independence on the part of individual faculty in dealing with such matters, a feeling that has surfaced often in survey responses. The Committee concluded that there is no way to enforce a mandated response since no one other than the professor will know that unreported cheating had taken place. Some members of the Academic Council argued for stronger wording, wording that would stress the obligation of a faculty member to advance the larger interests of the academic community. Such reporting is necessary to uncover patterns of cheating. Reporting a first offense would be a deterrent to a second, assuming that the student knew that the reporting had been done.

- Dean Hofman argued that an accused student should have formal input in reporting, whether acknowledging guilt or invoking the appeal procedure.

•Professor Swartz asked how many letters reporting cheating currently go to the Deans. The responses from the Deans indicated on the average somewhere between two and ten letters a year at the undergraduate level. The Law School, which

has an Honor Code, said that forty percent of reporting is done by students and sixty percent by faculty. Tightened enforcement in the mid-1970's led to increased reporting in the Law School, but the main problem is the difficulty of proof in many cases.

•Professor Kline suggested that the Committee recommendations are more lenient than the present practice in freshman writing courses where there is a standardized definition of cheating and standardized penalties. They average seven to ten cases a year.

•Returning to the question of the degree of faculty discretion in handling cheating cases, it was explained that the Committee felt that the faculty wanted this leeway and would be prudent in exercising it. The less formal the system, the better the chance that the faculty would report cheating to the Deans.

•Professor McGlinn wondered to what extent an Honesty Committee or a Dean can require a certain action of a faculty member, such as a failing grade, without violating academic freedom. The Committee thought that the best solution is to get in advance faculty adherence to policies and procedures.

•Professor Gordon indicated that the Graduate School now relies on Departmental Honesty Committees in its procedures. The move to College Honesty Committees would mean a new system. Father Malloy acknowledged that the Committee Report was drawn up with undergraduate problems primarily in mind. The Report assumed no major problems on the graduate and professional level.

•Professor McGlinn asked how one can talk about the importance of uncovering a 'pattern' of cheating when suspension or dismissal is the sanction for a second instance. The Committee felt that two determinations of academic dishonesty were sufficient warrant for severe penalties, some systems invoke them on the first instance. Indeed, it is possible to suspend or dismiss a student on the first instance if the professor refers the case to the Honesty Committee.

•A wording change was suggested in Recommendation 5.3. For the phrase "by the student members of the respective College Councils" substitute "by the members of the respective College Councils of students."

•Recommendation 8, which calls faculty attention to environmental factors that affect cheating, is important in emphasizing faculty obligation to adopt preventive measures to limit cheating.

•Father Hesburgh urged the Committee to refine the language of some of the proposals in light of the discussion before conveying them to the College Councils and Student Government.

(5) Father Hesburgh then adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

(Rev.) Edward A. Malloy, C.S.C.  
Secretary to the Academic Council

March 25, 1986

## Appendix 1. University Honesty Committee Revised Version of Final Recommendations (March 1986)

**Recommendation 1.** (A brief statement that could be used as a preamble to the specific policies and procedures)

The academic community relies upon a high standard of integrity in the relations between its members. To the extent that this standard is not maintained, the good of the community suffers, and injustice (sometimes serious injustice) may be done. One of the most important aspects of academic integrity concerns the just measure of each student's academic accomplishments. These are ordinarily evaluated through written examination or submitted work. For such modes of assessment to operate fairly, it is essential that the instructor be assured that the work used to evaluate the student's performance is genuinely the student's own.

The basic form of academic dishonesty is academic fraud, which consists of presenting work not one's own. Academic fraud also includes the giving or receiving of unauthorized aid in academic work. Such offenses call into question the central values of truthfulness and honor. It is desirable that a university foster in its students patterns of principled behavior. Our education should encompass the whole person. By the level of expectation

---

we project for both faculty and students we reaffirm our institutional commitment to the pursuit of the truth and to a fair evaluation of one's academic performance.

(The first paragraph of this recommendation is taken from the Preamble of the present Policy on Academic Honesty - p. 37 of the Faculty Handbook.)

#### **Recommendation 2.**

There should be clear policies and procedures in promoting a climate of honesty. These policies and procedures should be well-publicized.

#### **Recommendation 2a.**

The individual professor should have the primary responsibility for defining standards of honesty. This should be done in writing at the beginning of each course accompanied by an oral explanation.

(The Committee has found that the following elements have been problematic in the past and professors should clarify their attitudes concerning the following:

- (i) Cooperative work on outside class assignments, especially take-home quizzes
- (ii) Methods of citation for sources employed in written assignments
- (iii) Reference to exam files of previous tests in a course (some professors encourage students to keep tests, others forbid it)
- (iv) Cooperative work on computer assignments.)

#### **Recommendation 2b.**

Particular attention should be paid to new faculty and first-year students in the effort to clarify policies and procedures

#### **Recommendation 3.**

There should be a pledge of honesty accompanying all work submitted by students as part of course requirements. This could be done in a variety of ways depending on the nature of the material. Blue books should include such a pledge.

#### **Recommendation 4.**

As a norm, examinations should be proctored. It is the responsibility of the individual professor to assure a format of honesty if he or she chooses not to proctor examination.

#### **Recommendation 5.**

When cases of dishonesty are discovered, the following steps of reporting should be implemented:

(1) It is the prerogative of the individual professor to assign an appropriate penalty for cheating or to submit the violation to the appropriate College Honesty Committee, (i.e., the College Honesty Committee of the department offering the course). At a minimum, the student should be informed of the charge and of the proposed penalty. If a student considers a charge of cheating or the assigned penalty to be unjust, he or she may appeal to the College Honesty Committee.

(2) The individual professor should submit to the office of the appropriate Dean (i.e., the Dean of the student's main program of studies) a letter indicating that a determination of cheating has been made. The professor should notify the student charged with such an offense that a letter is being sent to the Dean. If the determination of cheating is made by the College Honesty Committee, it should be responsible for submitting the letter to the Dean.

Such a letter should be kept in the student's file until graduation so that patterns of cheating might more easily be discovered.

(3) There should be established in each College an Honesty Committee entrusted with the responsibility of making judgements and assigning penalties with regard to cases of dishonesty presented to it or to hear appeals if a student feels that he or she has been unfairly treated. The Committee would replace all departmental honesty committees. The College-wide Honesty Committee would be made up of an appropriate number of members as determined by the Dean. One-half of the members would be faculty and one-half students. The faculty would be appointed by the Dean. The students would be elected by the student members of the respective College Student Councils, or in the case of the Freshman Year of Studies by the Freshman Advisory Council, from among any student in the College.

(4) Students and/or faculty should be encouraged to report anonymously to the College Honesty Committee patterns of cheating in specific courses.

#### **Recommendation 6.**

The penalty for a first instance of cheating in a course is left to the discretion of the individual professor or to the College Honesty Committee. The penalty for a second instance of cheating as recognized by submission to the College Honesty Committee or by a second letter to the Dean is suspension or dismissal from the University.

#### **Recommendation 7.**

The University at all academic levels should foster regular discussion about honesty as a value. Special programs should be developed in the year following the adoption of this report.

#### **Recommendation 8.**

The academic administration of the University and its faculty should give special attention to the following environmental factors which seem to increase the instances of cheating:

- (i) Objective tests in large classes.
- (ii) Identical tests in successive semesters.
- (iii) Inadequate proctoring for examinations.
- (iv) Ambiguous expectations for outside class assignments.
- (v) Inadequate completion time for computer-based assignments.
- (vi) Testing in rooms which are excessively cramped and offer the opportunity for unplanned cheating.

[Editor's Note: Following are the original version of passages that were changed for the revised version of the Final Recommendations.]

#### **Recommendation 2a.**

- (iv) Cooperative work on computer programming assignments )

#### **Recommendation 5.**

(1) It is the prerogative of the individual professor to assign an appropriate penalty for cheating or to submit the violation to the appropriate College Honesty Committee. At a minimum, the student should be informed of the charge and of the proposed penalty. If a student considers a charge of cheating or the assigned penalty to be unjust, he or she may appeal to the College Honesty Committee.

(2) The individual professor has the prerogative of submitting to the office of the appropriate Dean a letter indicating that the student has been caught cheating. This is the case, whether or not the punishment is handled by the professor or by a Committee set up for this purpose.

(3) There should be established in each College an Honesty Committee entrusted with the responsibility of making judgements and assigning penalties with regard to cases of dishonesty presented to it or to hear appeals if a student feels that he or she has been unfairly treated. The Committee would replace all

departmental honesty committees. The College-wide Honesty Committee would be made up of an appropriate number of members as determined by the Dean. One-half of the members would be faculty and one-half students. The faculty would be appointed by the Dean. The students would be elected by the student members of the respective College Councils, or in the case of the Freshman Year of Studies by the Freshman Advisory Council, from among any student in the College.

## Appendix 2. Results of Student Body Survey by University Honesty Committee

### Responses:

Questionnaires distributed: 4,000

Responses: 824 Response rate: 21 percent

### Summarized Numerical Responses:

Response scale: 1 = Highly Uncommon  
2 = Uncommon  
3  
4 = Common  
5 = Highly Common

	Total	Fresh.	A&L	Bus.	Eng.	Sci.
Number of responses	824	210	234	147	125	106
o Q: For each of the following types of academic dishonesty, indicate by checkmark the extent to which you believe each is practiced in your college.						
a. Copying outside class assignments	3.26	2.96	2.96	3.46	3.97	3.36
b. Colluding on outside class assignments	3.66	3.45	3.44	3.63	4.41	3.70
c. Stealing advance copies of exams	1.27	1.30	1.29	1.28	1.18	1.22
d. Copying from another student's exam	2.43	2.17	2.46	2.83	2.34	2.43
e. Using "crib sheets" on exams	2.02	1.98	2.08	2.02	2.08	1.88
f. False excuses to postpone exams	2.43	2.26	2.86	2.30	2.14	2.37
g. Submitting fraudulent term papers	1.77	1.73	1.91	1.70	1.76	1.63
h. Stealing books or notebooks	1.75	1.61	1.89	1.79	1.79	1.65
o Q: For each of the following conditions, indicate by checkmark the extent to which you believe each contributes to academic dishonesty in your college.						
a. Large (and/or over-crowded) classrooms	3.65	3.59	3.56	3.83	3.68	3.70
b. Objective exams	3.07	2.91	3.20	3.37	2.92	2.82
c. Faculty apathy	2.54	2.25	2.62	2.61	2.64	2.71
d. Student apathy	3.03	2.82	3.15	2.96	3.20	3.06
e. Competition for grades	3.70	3.47	3.75	3.83	3.78	3.79
f. Poorly proctored exams	3.00	2.82	3.09	3.09	2.95	3.08
g. identical exams/assignments each year	2.96	2.65	3.10	2.88	3.11	3.20
h. Exams that don't test material covered	3.03	3.04	2.99	3.00	3.03	3.12
i. Inadequate preparation for exam	3.60	3.54	3.69	3.69	3.47	3.53

Total Fresh. ADL Bus. Eng. Sci.

Q: Do you believe the current procedures for handling academic dishonesty (i.e., Departmental honesty committee, appeal to Dean) are appropriate?

Yes	42%	43%	42%	40%	43%	43%
No	8	5	10	9	11	4
Not Sure	50	52	48	51	46	53

Q: Do you believe additional university-wide policies should be implemented?

Yes	22%	13%	27%	26%	22%	24%
No	37	41	34	35	39	35
Not Sure	41	46	39	39	39	41

#### Summarized Open-Ended Responses

Q: Please offer any additional comments/suggestions in the space provided.

SUMMARY: The following summarizes recurring comments. Unless otherwise noted, the comments were not specific to any one college.

- . Cheating is not a serious problem at Notre Dame.
- . Collusion on outside assignments is not cheating.
- . Major contributors to cheating are overcrowded classrooms, high level of competition, exams covering too much material, lack of preparation, exams that don't test material covered, poorly proctored exams, and faculty apathy.
- . An honor code would not deter cheating; students will not report cheating. (However, a few believe an honor code should be established. Four students mentioned the University of Virginia honor policy is fair and worthy of the Honesty Committee's attention.)
- . Offenders should be punished severely (e.g., suspension, expulsion.)
- . Freshman Year: Respondents did not believe there is a cheating problem at Notre Dame.
- . Arts and Letters: Respondents believe there is very little cheating in their college.
- . Business: Scheduling of exams is not planned properly, thereby creating pressure and some cheating.
- . Engineering: Students are "cut throat", thereby creating creating pressure and some cheating.

#### Appendix 3. Results of Faculty and Department Honesty Committee Survey

Summary of faculty responses to questions on faculty survey.

- 76% of the faculty responding to the faculty survey experienced academic dishonesty in their classes.
- 75% of those responding ignore or deal with dishonesty cases on their own. 70% cited insufficient evidence for their failure to take action, 21% the "hassle" associated with following the formalized procedures and 9% dissatisfaction with the results of previously submitted cases.
- 64% of those responding believe that permitting faculty members to establish their own penalties leads to inequities.
- 45% of the respondents thought that additional university policies were required. 57% thought that improved university procedures were required.
- Although 70% of all faculty responding were familiar with current formalized procedures, only 50% of faculty with less than five years of service were familiar with them.

- Faculty perceptions of forms of student dishonesty varied depending on the college. Copying and colluding on outside class assignments were much more frequent in Engineering and Science than in Arts & Letters. Plagiarism was more frequent in Arts & Letters.
- The general faculty sentiment was that penalties for dishonesty were too varied and too lenient. They felt that clearly understood and more severe penalties would limit cheating. Several suggested failure in a course for the first offense and suspension from the university for a second offense.
- Faculty believe that dishonesty is more widespread than is indicated by the reported cases.

#### Summary of responses from Faculty Honesty Committees.

- Faculty Honesty Committees' penalties for student dishonesty varied considerably for similar offenses. The most common penalty for plagiarism was an "F" grade on the paper with the opportunity to write another paper. Some students were failed in the course and some had their grade reduced one letter for the same offense.
- Faculty thought that the following conditions led to cheating: large overcrowded classes, multiple choice examinations, and using the same examinations repeatedly.
- Faculty thought the problem would intensify as more students do their work on computers.
- 20 of the 26 Honesty Committee responses argued that more clearly defined policies/procedures were needed and 3 thought an honor code was necessary.
- 15 of 26 thought that the current system of dealing with cases of academic dishonesty were effective if the system is used.
- Only 9 of the 26 committees believe that faculty were familiar with current university policies.

#### FACULTY SURVEY RESULTS

##### Response:

Surveys distributed:	700	Experience of Respondents	
Responses:	241	at Notre Dame:	
Response Rate:	34%	1-5 years:	82
		5-15 years:	66
		Over 15 years:	78

##### Questions and College Response:

	<u>Total</u>	<u>A&amp;L</u>	<u>Bus</u>	<u>Eng</u>	<u>Sci</u>
1. Number of Respondents	241	98	36	36	64
2. Have you encountered situations involving academic dishonesty in your undergraduate classes?					
Yes:	178	72	30	29	44
No:	55	24	4	7	16
3. Could you estimate a frequency, regardless of whether you took action, of occurrence of such instances per academic year?					
Instances per year:	1.74	1.56	2.67	1.06	1.59
4. How do you normally deal with the situations that arise in your class? (Respondent indicated the percent of times in which the following actions were taken.)					
a) Formal letter to Department Honesty Committee (current policy):	24%	27%	12%	26%	25%

- b) Discuss incident with students involved and establish my own penalty: 60% 64% 64% 60% 3%
- c) Ignore 16% 9% 24% 15% 21%
5. If you have ignored possible situations is it because of:  
(Respondent indicated the percent of times in which following reasons applied)
- a) Insufficient evidence available for formal accusation: 70% 73% 62% 73% 70%
- b) "Hassle" associated with the formalized procedures not worth the effort: 21% 19% 31% 20% 19%
- c) Dissatisfaction with results of previously submitted cases: 9% 8% 6% 7% 11%
6. Do you specifically outline your policies regarding honesty for your class?
- Yes: 124 48 18 18 37  
No: 107 47 16 17 23
7. Do you attempt to have your students submit the "honesty" statement as outlined by the Academic Code?
- Yes: 18 9 1 3 4  
No: 211 84 34 32 55
8. Have your attempts to reduce situations involving dishonesty adversely affected your teaching effectiveness or style?
- Yes: 33 17 7 7 1  
No: 183 68 26 24 61
9. Do you give the "same" assignments each time you teach your courses?
- Yes: 47 17 6 5 19  
No: 182 76 28 28 43
10. Do you feel that your students understand what actions constitute dishonesty in the academic environment particular to your course?
- Yes: 202 83 27 30 56  
No: 28 9 7 5 6
11. Do you feel that allowing individual faculty members to establish their own penalties for cases involving academic dishonesty can result in students being treated unfairly or inequitably?
- Yes: 139 62 17 22 36  
No: 77 24 16 10 22
12. Do you feel that additional University wide policies are required?
- Yes: 92 39 16 18 18  
No: 118 45 18 14 35
13. Do you feel that modified or improved University wide procedures are required?
- Yes: 117 53 22 20 19  
No: 82 28 12 10 28



14. Are you familiar with the current formalized procedure for accusation, charges and appeals?

Yes:	174	64	31	27	46
No:	64	32	4	9	18

15. Based on your experiences and perceptions, both in your classes and through discussion with others, how would you assess each and rank their frequency.

Scale for response:

1 - Highly uncommon
2 - Uncommon
3 -
4 - Common
5 - Highly Common

a. Copying outside class assignments:	2.43	2.00	2.89	3.72	2.17
b. Colluding on outside class assignments:	2.52	2.23	2.81	3.67	2.19
c. Stealing advance copies of exams:	1.09	1.14	1.22	1.06	1.02
d. Copying from another student's exam:	2.15	2.04	2.72	2.14	2.05
e. Using "crib sheets" on exams:	1.61	1.56	1.94	1.47	1.61
f. False excuses to postpone exams:	2.29	2.21	2.69	2.44	2.06
g. Submitting plagiarized term papers:	1.82	2.46	2.03	1.61	0.78
h. Stealing books or note-books:	1.49	1.31	1.47	1.36	1.89

Others listed:

- Resubmitting altered exams for regrading
- Taking exams from classroom during test

#### Appendix 4. Honor Code Report

The University Honesty Committee has decided not to recommend adoption of an Honor Code at this time.

The Committee agrees that the following elements are an integral part of an Honor Code:

1. unproctored examinations;
2. a pledge signed by each student indicating willingness to be governed by the Honor Code and/or, if a pledge accompanies submission of work, that the student has neither given nor received unauthorized aid;
3. a requirement that a student having knowledge of an Honor Code violation take action either by confronting the offender or by reporting the violation to the appropriate body;
4. some degree of student participation in investigation and determination of guilt or innocence, and
5. a system of sanctions.

Although the committee recognizes that there are academic institutions which have Honor Codes which do not contain one or more of these elements, the committee consensus is that each element is essential to the Honor Code concept as the committee understands it.

Based upon its belief that an Honor Code should contain the five elements listed, the committee does not recommend adoption of an Honor Code at this time. The conclusion is based upon several factors, prominent among which is doubt that the reportage requirement (element no. 3) is workable. The failure of most students to report dishonesty was at least part of the reason Notre Dame abandoned its Honor Code. Committee members initiated, and in some cases conducted, a number of informal meetings with students in various dormitories. The student participants in the meetings generally expressed unwillingness to report known or suspected violations. Indeed, some students questioned the University's authority to impose a reporting obligation on the students. Since the effectiveness of an Honor Code depends upon the willingness of individuals to support the system and function within its rules, the committee believes that lack of widespread student (and faculty) support for such a system indicates that it would not work well.

The committee also notes that Notre Dame currently lacks the tradition of an honor code and it is always somewhat difficult to overcome the inertia of the status quo.

The evidence gathered by the committee regarding the extent of the cheating problem is inconclusive. The sense of the committee members is that there is more cheating at Notre Dame than any of us wants, but that the problem is not overwhelming or rampant. The committee feels that the situation does not warrant a radical change, which may work no better than the present system, and which may be perceived as an admission of a serious problem and thus damage the reputation of the institution and its current students. In addition, the committee notes that an Honor Code may be inconsistent with Notre Dame's general in loco parentis posture. If it is, adoption of an Honor Code may look like an abdication of responsibility.

On the other hand, the committee did not neglect to consider the valuable aspects of an Honor Code. Probably the most distressing information culled from the surveys is that little attention is paid by either faculty or students to the issue of academic integrity. The University community apparently is not nurturing an environment in which the virtue of academic integrity is emphasized or cultivated. An Honor Code can provide an ongoing opportunity, and even necessity, to directly address a value of central importance in any academic endeavor. The committee notes that to the extent that an Honor Code can play an educative role, an Honor Code may be desirable independent of whether it can minimize cheating.

The committee also observes that an Honor Code directly places responsibility for honesty upon the individual rather than upon the institution. As such, an Honor Code may engender a habit of honor which the graduates carry with them to situations where there will be no institutional overseers.

Additionally, the committee considered that the simple act of recommending an Honor Code would initiate valuable discussion on the Academic Council and elsewhere. At a minimum such discussions would promote awareness of the issue and probably better and more clearly perceived procedures. It was decided, however, that it would not be appropriate to make a recommendation that the committee is not ready to support.

Although Notre Dame fosters a community, a precondition to a successful Honor Code, and although Notre Dame as a Catholic institution has greater reason than most secular institutions to assume that students share common values that are consonant with personal honor, the committee concludes that the time is not right to implement an Honor Code at Notre Dame.

## Appendix 5. Membership of University Honesty Committee

### University Honesty Committee

Professor Timothy O'Meara, Provost of the University, has appointed a University Honesty Committee as a result of a recommendation of the University Curriculum Committee, formally approved by the Academic Council in its final meeting of the Spring semester, 1985. The Committee is entrusted with the responsibility to evaluate the matter of cheating and to determine steps that can be taken to alleviate the problem.

The following faculty and students have agreed to serve on the Committee:

Rev. Edward A. Malloy, C.S.C., Associate Provost (Chair of the Committee)

Prof. Stephen Batill, College of Engineering

---

Prof. Francis J. Castellino, Dean of the College of Science

Prof. Carol Mooney, School of Law

Prof. David Ricchiute, College of Business Administration

Prof. Robert Wegs, College of Arts and Letters

Earl Baker, Academic Commissioner of Student Government

Vincent Lowell, Sophomore, College of Engineering

Margaret McCabe, Junior, College of Business Administration

Robert G. Molnar, Junior, College of Science

## faculty senate journal

### january 28, 1986

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman John Yoder. The invocation was given by Prof. David Burrell. The meeting consisted of an open forum with Provost Timothy O'Meara.

Prof. Jean Pec, referring to the concern for faculty governance expressed in both the accreditation report of 1984 and the Carnegie Survey of December 1985, began the session by asking whether administrative policy at Notre Dame was "autocratic" and what plans the administration had for addressing the concerns of faculty governance. O'Meara responded that in his view the faculty played a very significant role in the governance process, especially with regard to the procedures for promotion and appointment. If there is to be change, it will come with the new administration.

Prof. Burrell, while agreeing that the best place for faculty governance is in the promotion process, expressed his concern for changes in the voting procedure for promotion which had been implemented without prior faculty consultation. Previous procedures had allowed for discrimination in votes where a given candidate could be "strongly approved," "approved," "disapproved," or "strongly disapproved" whereas under the new system, the vote can express only "approval" or "disapproval." O'Meara responded that although this was not regarded by the administration as a very important issue, individual departments could still register such discrimination in their votes if they desired.

Burrell responded that in his department, this was perceived as an important issue and that it illustrates how a simple form change forced the committee into a new departure or procedure. O'Meara responded that it had not been raised as an issue in any of his meetings with department chairmen in the fall but added that if they want to take up the matter, they may.

Prof. Dino Cervigni stated that such issues should be made known within the departments and went on to ask how the administration's concern for the feelings of the faculty is reflected within the current situation, where department chairs are not only not elected but are often appointed against the will of the departments themselves. O'Meara responded that the administration is concerned with faculty input. If greater discrimination in voting really is desirable, it can be discussed. He reiterated that in discussions with the deans, it was not viewed as a big matter.

There ensued a brief discussion about the current voting procedures within the departments.

Prof. Katharina Blackstead turned the discussion to the forthcoming plans for automating the library. In light of the fact that the mainframe and hardware for this project are to be housed in the Computing Center, she asked what procedures are being undertaken to support this system and whether the Computing Center is equipped to assume this additional burden. O'Meara responded that while resources are being designated to support it, neither the package nor the support mechanisms have been wholly determined. O'Meara said he would bring Blackstead's concerns to Roger Schmitz, who has the responsibility for campus-wide computing.

---

Prof. Harvey Bender asked whether a replacement for Larry Woods is being named. O'Meara responded that the position is still there. O'Meara then discussed the relative advantages and disadvantages of the two library automation systems, BLIS and NOTIS.

Prof. Wilhelm Stoll asked whether collective or individual action would be more effective in responding to the proposed revisions in the TIAA-CREF pension plans. O'Meara responded that letter writing would surely have an effect. He further pointed out that academics are at present a tax target and brought up the additional issues of college tuition benefits for faculty children, taxability of fellowship stipends, charitable contributions, and tax-exempt bonds. After predicting that the efforts to tax tuition will not succeed, but that those to tax stipends will, he further pointed out that in order to force a major tax reform law, Congress seems unwilling to take patchwork action for the interim. O'Meara then mentioned that he had already written members of Congress on these matters.

Prof. Wilhelm Stoll next raised questions about the timing and suitability of the language examination for graduate students seeking to schedule their candidacy examinations, who, owing to the necessity of getting the language exams out of the way first, were having to delay their candidacy examinations for one semester. He also cited several examples of individuals such as Chinese students who, although able to read Japanese, were being held back because of having failed an examination in French and asked just what the purpose of those language examinations was intended to be.

O'Meara suggested that Robert Gordon, Vice President for Advanced Studies, be consulted. He also indicated that the subject could be raised in the Graduate Council.

Prof. Mario Borelli, complaining about the character of several students in a recent class, asked whether there were any ways to combine the exigencies of good academics and good athletics with the demands of good citizenship. O'Meara responded that he was unwilling to comment on particular cases involving individual students through a blanket statement and suggested that such cases be handled on a private basis.

Prof. Frank Bonello asked about the status of the report from the Committee on Academic Honesty. O'Meara responded that the data has been collected and is already in the process of being refined, digested, and readied for presentation to the Academic Council. He then stated that one of the things he liked about the honor system at Princeton was the need to take a new pledge with each examination. A brief discussion about the fate of the honor system of the late 60s followed.

Prof. Philip Gleason asked what had stimulated the current investigation of academic honesty. O'Meara responded that it was engendered in part by a recommendation of the PACE Report and in part by publicity involving some particular courses.

Prof. Burrell asked what had caused the decision to sell the University's house at Princeton where Notre Dame faculty had formerly been allowed to reside while on sabbatical there. O'Meara responded that the decision had been a financial one resulting from the fact that Notre Dame faculty interest in the house was insufficient to justify its further retention.

Prof. Teresa Ghilarducci asked what still needs to be done and what projects are targeted for the future. O'Meara responded that his philosophy was to concentrate on one major goal at a time, rather than on several smaller ones simultaneously. After citing progress on faculty salaries at all levels and the construction of Decio Hall as examples, he targeted the following for future endeavors:

1. Consolidating the gains already made
2. A new classroom facility
3. Library
4. Computers
5. Construction of a new dormitory to accommodate the shifting proportion of female to male students
6. Opening up courses in the College of Business to students in all Colleges
7. Investing additional resources in Graduate Studies
8. Expanding interest in foreign programs among the undergraduates
9. Making Notre Dame more accessible through expanded financial aid

A brief discussion about the projected location of the new classroom facility ensued.

Prof. Frank Connolly asked what procedures were followed in the selection of the Faculty Governance Committee and whether similar committees duly constituted by members of the

administration were truly representative of the faculty. Chairman Yoder pointed out that the same concern could be raised with regard to the selection of the Committee on Academic Honesty. O'Meara responded that since the Academic Honesty Committee will report to the Academic Council, it is the Academic Council which will finally decide on policy, and not the committee itself.

Prof. Daniel Barrett asked what procedures were followed with regard to changes in the tuition benefits for faculty children. O'Meara responded that the underlying motivation throughout was to minimize the loss of benefits to the faculty at large. If the University had not changed the existing policy on tuition benefits, then these benefits would have become taxable to all who enjoyed them. In making the changes the University was guided by these four principles: First, preserve the tax-free nature of the benefits; second, minimize erosion of the benefit; third, extend the benefit to as wide a group of faculty and staff as possible; and fourth, minimize the effects on tuition.

The new package preserves Notre Dame tuition benefits (i.e., the benefit for faculty children attending Notre Dame) for those who have been here three years. The ten-year wait for the portable benefit is owing to the unpredictable effects on costs.

O'Meara also reported that the package here was determined only after consultation with more than a dozen other schools. The faculty subcommittee of the Budget Priorities Committee played a significant role in determining the final package.

Prof. David Burrell lauded the action taken by the University in generalizing the benefits, but raised the question of whether the University's conduct with regard to those enticed to come here by the attraction of the portable benefit as a fringe benefit might not have been tantamount to backing out of a condition of employment. O'Meara replied that benefits are determined by current University policy, not by contractual agreement. In the end, it was a matter of resolving several conflicting ethical values.

O'Meara then explained the so-called concept of "tainting." Under this concept, if one exception is made, then everyone enjoying the benefit is taxable!

Prof. Burrell asked that if the number of people caught were small whether the ten-year requirement couldn't be waived. O'Meara responded that there are potentially 600 faculty and 2,000 nonacademic employees involved. According to legal advice, paying Notre Dame benefits at Notre Dame on a nontaxable basis open to all and portable benefits to faculty alone on a taxable basis, constitutes tainting. Hence all benefits at Notre Dame as well as the portable benefits would be taxed.

Prof. Leo Despres asked whether those currently affected by the new policies either as the parents of students at other universities under the expectation of receiving the portable benefit or as recently arrived faculty with college-age children who did not expect to have to wait for such benefits constituted a relatively small number and if so, whether the University might not make some alternative adjustments on their behalf. O'Meara responded that any "alternative adjustment" would constitute "tainting" and thereby render all such benefits for everybody else "taxable." In response to a question about "ethical behavior" on the part of the University, O'Meara responded that the University had indeed behaved ethically.

Prof. Despres also asked about any plans to assist graduate students who may suddenly find themselves being taxed for their tuition benefits in addition to their graduate stipends. O'Meara responded that the big blow would be the taxability of tuition remission, but in the end he believed this would not happen. O'Meara indicated that the University was currently watching the actions of Congress and not withholding taxes on graduate student tuition at present. The issue will come up for review in the spring, and the University will wait to see what happens. The discussion then moved to Gramm Rudman and O'Meara pointed out that universities are fearful of the arbitrary way in which grants will be cut as a result of it. Nonetheless, O'Meara said that he remains "optimistic," but we certainly cannot expect "business as usual" in the years ahead.

Prof. Donald Sporleder asked what are the most effective aspects of faculty development currently on the table. O'Meara responded that most important was a good environment: good facilities, good colleagues, good students, time for research, and opportunities for leaves. He continued by pointing out that for those in the experimental sciences a good environment constituted good equipment which would enable them to do their work on campus. For those in Arts and Letters, this was often accomplished by leaves to other universities. According to O'Meara, the two tightest areas in the University at present are the College of Business and the Department of Mathematics. Change, he reiterated, does not come evenly across the board.

Prof. Dino Cervigni called attention to problems in the College of Arts and Letters, but in particular to the Department of Modern Languages where teaching loads are still heavy. O'Meara agreed that Modern Languages constituted a problem area which needs addressing and one that is further complicated by the nature of the courses they must offer. Similar problems in the Math and English departments were also mentioned.

Prof. Burrell brought up the Junior Faculty Report prepared last year. After indicating that it was the objective of the Senate to raise consciousness so that "misperceptions will not become problems," Burrell asked whether the discussion of it in the Academic Council had proved fruitful. O'Meara responded that the discussion was fruitful indeed and that it had been stimulated by the document. O'Meara also remarked that the reduced size of the Council had made for better discussions in general.

Prof. William McDonald brought up the matter of unfilled chairs in the College of Business. Indicating the University's difficulty in attracting academically qualified candidates, he questioned the wisdom of continuing to acquire additional chairs. O'Meara responded that at first the Arts and Letters College had the same problems and complaints in filling their chairs, but that now they were being filled with excellent people and the University is undoubtedly better off for having the chairs. O'Meara predicted a similar outcome in the College of Business in due course.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dian Murray

## faculty senate journal february 10, 1986

Chairman John Yoder called the meeting to order at 7:34 p.m. and offered the prayer. The first order of business was the need to update the Senate bylaws. Asked to report, Prof. Thomas Kosel of the Administrative Affairs Committee requested volunteers for a subcommittee on this issue to meet in two weeks' time and passed a sign-up sheet around.

Prof. Leo Despres moved approval of the Dec. 2 Journal and Prof. Jean Pec seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.

A discussion of the Jan. 28 session followed. Capt. John Rohrbough observed that these meetings could be as useful for the invitees as for the Senate and Prof. Donald Barrett expressed admiration for the Provost's candor. Subjects which still needed clarification were: 1) the new provisions for medical coverage, especially the Cost Guard program and what exactly was and was not covered; 2) the matter of the projected classroom building, the location of which had not yet, apparently, been decided. It was urged that faculty should be consulted on the design of this building, upon which Prof. David Burrell, C.S.C., proposed a motion that: The Chairman of the Senate write a letter to the Assistant Deans to pass on faculty suggestions re: the new classroom building. The motion was seconded by Prof. Katharina Blackstead. Prof. David Dodge advised that the Senate should first ascertain whether plans for the building had not already been drawn up. Prof. Paul Conway submitted a friendly amendment to include Associate Deans in the motion, which amendment was passed unanimously.

The Chairman distributed additional copies of the South Africa material (cover letter; current University policy; moral analysis; referendum) and explained the proposed procedures. He then raised the question of the desirability of a faculty referendum on the matter. Burrell alluded to his experience at Princeton where the faculty felt that the expression of opinion should not be left to students alone. He then made a motion that the referendum should be distributed to faculty and Pec seconded the motion. Various points were made in the discussion. Barrett advised against giving the faculty too much to read. Prof. Robert Vacca thought #3 was unnecessary, but Yoder pointed out that faculty should be given the opportunity to query the Senate's role if they wished to do so. Despres proposed an amendment to the motion that the results of the referendum be communicated to the executive officers of the University, which amendment was seconded by Rohrbough. The motion as amended was put to the vote and passed unanimously. The Senate then recessed briefly and reconvened at 8:45 p.m.

The Chairman then invited Senators to decide on the agenda for the meeting of March 3. Prof. Joseph Blenkinsopp suggested that the Senate should turn its attention to the University Libraries. Prof. Philip Gleason brought up the issue of procedures and criteria for renewal and tenure. He proposed the creation of a committee drawn from faculty throughout the college to review promotion to rank of professor. Such a procedure might in fact be extended to all renewals and promotions. Prof. Wilhelm Stoll thought it would be regarded as just another obstacle and Vacca wondered how it would be accepted by junior faculty. On the other hand, it was practiced at other institutions, as Prof. Teresa Ghilarducci pointed out, and the function of the members need not include evaluation of the specific scholarly competence of the individual. Barrett wondered whether it would complicate the pursuit of affirmative action and the balance of junior, senior and male-female at the departmental level.

In conclusion, the Chair pointed out the encouraging fact that Senate papers had provided the basis for the last three meetings of the Academic Council. Rather less encouraging was the lack of action following on the discussion. Burrell noted, however that at least some consciousness-raising had taken place, and on that hopeful note the meeting adjourned at 9:16 p.m.

Senate members in attendance: Donald Barrett, sociology; Katharina Blackstead, library; Joseph Blenkinsopp, theology; Frank Bonello, economics; Rudolph Bottei, chemistry; John Attanasio, law; David Burrell, C.S.C., theology; John Croteau, emeritus; Frank Connolly, mathematics; Leo Despres, anthropology; David Dodge, sociology; James F. Flanigan, C.S.C., art, art history and design; Teresa Ghilarducci, economics; Philip Gleason, history; Abraham Goetz, mathematics; Sandra Harmatiuk, freshman year of studies; Eugene Henry, electrical engineering; Nai-Chien Huang, aerospace/mechanical engineering; David Kirkner, civil engineering; Thomas Kosel, materials science/engineering; Jerry Marley, civil engineering; Bill McDonald, finance/business economics; Matthew Miceli, C.S.C., theology; Michael H. Morris, accountancy; Dian Murray, history; Jean Pec, library; John Rohrbough, naval science; Howard Saz, biological sciences; Wilhelm Stoll, mathematics; Robert Vacca, modern/classical languages; and John Yoder, theology.

Absent and excused: Panos Antsaklis, electrical engineering; Harvey Bender, biological sciences; Mario Borelli, mathematics; Linda-Margaret Hunt, biological sciences; James Powell, graduate admissions; Anthony Trozzolo, chemistry.

Absent but not excused: Gerald Arnold, physics; Salvatore Bella, management; Dino Cervigni, modern/classical languages; Pamela Falkenberg, communication and theatre; Suzanne Kelly, Institute for Pastoral and Social Ministry; Gilbert Loescher, government and international studies; Robert Lordi, English; Irwin Press, anthropology; Arthur Quigley, emeritus; Donald Sporleder, architecture; Robert Williamson, accounting; James Wittenbach, accounting.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Blenkinsopp, Secretary

## faculty senate journal march 3, 1986

Chairman John Yoder called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. and gave the invocation. The program for the evening consisted of a conversation on the theme of hopes and concerns with the following members of the University Committee on the Library: Bob Miller, Director of University Libraries, and Professors Harvey Bender, Bill McDonald and James E. Robinson.

Opening comments were made by Bender who stated that the Library Committee saw itself as a committee of the Faculty Senate and was thus glad for the opportunity to converse with it.

Prof. Thomas Kosel began the dialogue by asking what the history and status of the library automation project was. Mr. Miller replied that the history dated back to the early 60s when an attempt to automate the circulation system never took off. In 1983 the library received a major gift from a donor to begin automation. A search ensued for an individual to oversee this process and Mr. Larry Woods was hired. At that point a needs analysis along with an examination of extant systems was undertaken and an RFP was sent out to eleven vendors. Thereafter, the search was narrowed to three systems. In Dec. 1984, contract discussions were begun with BLIS. During the course of subsequent negotiations, the company's precarious financial situation was revealed and there followed a year of

agonizing discussions between the vendor and University officials. A decision was reached during the summer of 1985 to seek a new vendor and as a result a contract with Northwestern Online Total Integrated System (NOTIS) is expected to be signed within four to six weeks. NOTIS is an integrated system with a successful record in other universities. The estimated cost for the hardware and software will be approximately \$900,000. It is expected that the hardware will be installed early in the fall and that the main tasks will consist of clearing up the data base and converting the existing records into machine readable form (at present 80% to 90% are already in machine readable form). It is projected that the system will become available to the public sometime in 1987 and that online catalog will be slated for full operation in late spring of 1987, circulation for either the fall of 1987 or the spring of 1988 and acquisitions thereafter. The system will consist of IBM based hardware "4381" new model 13 which is a small mainframe that will be housed in the Computing Center. Miller also pointed out that while originally the Library had hoped to house the computer in the Library, that over the long haul that option would have proved too expensive and thus it was agreed that the hardware would be housed elsewhere.

To questions concerning the sharing of these resources, Miller pointed out that they would be shared with the administration but that the library would have priority and that the library would have its own storage.

Capt. John Rohrbough, impressed by the low cost, asked whether the estimated price included terminals. Miller replied that it included approximately 100 terminals. Rohrbough then asked how these would be allocated between the public and the library staff. Miller replied that the current plan was to put one public terminal on each floor, six on the second floor, thirteen on the first floor, ten in the other service areas, one or two in the branch libraries and perhaps one in Decio.

Bender asked whether one terminal would be the equivalent of one card catalogue. Miller explained that soon the card catalogue would, with the proper software, be available through individual PC's and that one could then access both the catalogue and a data base that would allow for searching and for procuring certain records not currently in the catalogue. Bender then asked how many people could use the catalogue at a maximum? Miller replied that currently between 18 and 22 could do so realistically but that under the new system this would increase by a factor of two or three times. Bender then asked what the effect on the system would be if all Profs assigned papers at about the same time; how much would simultaneous searches slow the system down? Miller replied that this was hard to predict but speculated that access through the library terminals should be unaffected. He also mentioned that there would be at least ten dial-in ports and that incoming messages could be stacked.

Prof. Jean Pec asked whether there would be channels in the proposed new classroom building. While no one knew whether or not this was the case, Miller added that access was being conceived largely through the campus network. He also indicated that a search should show whether a book was legitimately checked out, but not to whom.

Kosel then went back and raised the question of why BLIS was chosen and why ultimately the contract was not signed. Pec then asked what role the University Library Committee had played in the decision. Bender replied that at each meeting the committee had discussed the status of the project and that it felt comfortable in recommending BLIS to Miller. From Miller the recommendation had then gone to the Provost.

Rev. David Burrell asked several questions relating to how the library will know when it has reached a point where we can be proud of it and asked how priorities were determined. Robinson replied that money is the priority. He further pointed out that the Library Committee has often provided the initiative for the purchase of certain journals and monographs in certain fields. He also stated that while the committee did not work directly with the library staff, that staff members did come to the meetings to inform them as to what was being done and added that the committee does have the power to affect policy. McDonald added that as a newcomer to the committee, he was much impressed by the opportunities to balance requests. Bender then replied that collection development was not simply a matter of dollars, but one that also had to take into account retrospective and prospective costs. The prospective costs, Bender indicated, are up. Today there is emphasis on trying to even out the prospective costs and to develop a nice profile. He also stated that first purchases are critical today when press runs are characterized by increasingly smaller numbers. Bender also pointed out that the five bibliographers now employed have made a positive contribution toward developing more evenhanded collections. The woeful state of the foreign language collection was also noted and acknowledged. Bender also indicated that one of the projects of the committee was to employ a variety of means to enable those whose required resources are not available here to be put in touch with them.



There then ensued a discussion about special collections, special resources, and singular holdings whose value on the one hand serves to put their holders on the map and as a means of attracting special scholars to the campus, but that on the other, often amount in practice to a large drain of monetary resources for little-used material resources. The welcome reception that the bibliographers had received on this campus was then noted, as was the desirability of faculty members continuing to be involved in the book selection process.

Prof. Dino Cervigni then outlined some of the improvements that have occurred over the last 12 years, which included the addition of the bibliographers, the streamlined ordering process, the establishment of the approval plan, and an increase in Interlibrary Loan staff from one to three. Cervigni then raised the question of real purchasing power in terms of books now as compared to 12 years ago.

Miller replied that the budget has increased between 35 and 40 percent during the last five years without inflation. During the last two years, the low inflation rate plus the strong dollar combined to create a situation where the budget more than held its own in the purchase of books. He did point out, however, a nasty practice that is occurring with foreign journals whereby the British, and to a lesser extent the Germans, are selling their journals to American libraries only through special offices at 1.5 times the original price. The acquisitions budget, according to Miller, has kept pace with inflation during the last seven years. As of Dec. 31, 1985, the fund value of the endowment was \$6.5 million and the market value \$9 million which places UND among the top 20 in library endowments. But at the same time UND is still about 72 in terms of overall collection size libraries. When asked how much it would take to move us up, Miller responded that doubling the budget wouldn't get us to 50th and that we would actually do better by cataloging our backlog (which if nothing else were going on would take about two years). He did indicate, however, that an additional \$2.5 to 3 million would substantially raise us. He also pointed out that \$1 million would require \$20 million in endowment. Miller also pointed out that the problem of acquisitions is further complicated by the simultaneous demand for nonprint media and that it was not possible to make the print budget cover these other areas. Miller added that many of the priorities had to come from the faculty and that before new ones were set, it was important that they first develop an awareness of what is available here, of what our profile currently looks like and of what it should look like in the future. Care, he said, should be taken to be sure that not all the funds for an entire department go into a single area.

Prof. Paul Conway asked what policies the library committee could make. Bender replied things like the setting of library hours, the determining of letterheads, and the allocating of major resources with regard to the relationship between monographs and serials. He indicated that the committee served more as a Board of Directors than as a day-to-day runner of the library and that it relied on the library administration to advise it. Robinson added that the director initiated most of the policies. Conway pointed out that only the Academic Council and the Library Committee have policy-making ability and asked how the committee felt about that. Bender replied that the committee felt so deeply that it went to each graduate council. He also pointed out that it was critical for the faculty to play a role in the direction and maturation.

Prof. Frank Connelly asked how much of the next fundraising drive was to be allocated to increasing the library endowment. Miller replied \$10 million and Connelly then asked what the priorities for use of the money would be. Miller replied that most would go to collection development or access to materials. The acquisition of foreign language and American Catholic materials will also be a high priority.

Bender indicated that the Library Committee was now asking the professional librarians committee to do a self-study which once in the hands of the director would help in the development process.

Burrell asked whether there were formulae regarding the number of staff in proportion to the size of the collections and how one could get a handle on whether the size of the staff is sufficient. Miller replied that there were a number of formulae for such calculations but that they were only of limited use owing to the idiosyncratic qualities of individual and local situations. One problem today is the growing demand for service, especially with regard to data base information. In most cases, expanded service has come without increasing positions.

Prof. Rudolph Bottei asked how one dealt with library space and whether Memorial Library was now filled? Miller replied that it still has six to ten years worth of growth. He also stated that no branch library on campus save mathematics is adequate.

The Prof on the left of Conway??? asked with regard to the large numbers of data bases on tape where the library responsibility ended and if the college responsibility for nonprint materials was on a case by case basis. Miller replied that over the next ten years this would be a growing area toward which careful mention would be required, though he envisions no major move by the library regarding the acquisition of nonprinted data in the immediate future. He envisions the library's data base as being primarily bibliographic, but he does feel that the library should play a central role in providing information as to what is available across the campus. Bender pointed out that the committee is increasingly becoming concerned about the unequal use of computer resources on the campus and in light of that, asked if we are not still at an early enough stage in the data base process so that through an appeal to reason we might better pool our resources and suggested that everybody buy into the centrality of the library as defined in new ways compatible with the computer era.

Miller added that he did not see the current library role as one that would relieve departments for the cost of special services. The library will not pick up the bills for current costs covered by grants on the part of users/department members.

Kosel asked about the link between the college library committees and the University library committee. Bender replied that there were links and that it was the job of the college committees to liaison with the various departments and branch libraries. Kosel then asked how the budget was allocated and who did it. Bender replied that the allocation is reviewed by the University committee but that it comes down to the committee in already-allocated form. Kosel then pointed out that given the upper limit of \$75 per volume on the approval plan, most of the scientific conference proceedings exceeded the limit. Miller replied that he would love to eliminate the ceiling, but that if he did then the departmental base allocations would have to be reduced to cover the extra approved costs. Bender stated that the ceiling has not really affected monograph orders in your (Kosel's) department.

Bender asked about preservation costs for covering the deterioration of materials Miller explained that between a quarter and a half of all the collections require special attention. Originally the intention was to undertake a program to complete this task in five years but that that has been revised so that at present the push is for a major start to be funded initially through a grant and thereafter by the University. At present a proposal for \$1.4 million is in the works.

Rohrbough asked about special atmospheric conditions throughout the library and was told that ultraviolet rays from the fluorescent lights and great changes in temperature when the heat goes off in the winter, or the air-conditioning in the summer, are the greatest problems. Miller indicated shields for the lights are included in the grant.

Senators were then asked to vote for the slate of nominees for the Academic and Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. All other business was deferred until the next meeting. A motion of gratitude was passed and extended to the members of the Library Committee and the meeting adjourned at 9:13 p.m.

Senate members in attendance: Harvey Bender, biological sciences; Katharina Blackstead, library; Frank Bonello, economics; Mario Borelli, mathematics; Rudolph Bottei, chemistry; David Burrell, C.S.C., theology; John Attanasio, law; Frank Connolly, mathematics; Paul Conway, finance/business economics; Dino Cervigni, modern/classical languages; Pamela Falkenberg, communications and theatre; James Flanigan, C.S.C., art, art history and design; Philip Gleason, history; Abraham Goetz, mathematics; Sandra Harmatiuk, freshman year of studies; Suzanne Kelly, Institute for Pastoral and Social Ministry; Thomas Kosel, materials science/engineering; Bill McDonald, finance/business economics; Michael Morris, accountancy; Dian Murray, history; Jean Pec, library; Arthur Quigley, emeritus; John Rohrbough, naval science; Donald Sporleder, architecture; Wilhelm Stoll, mathematics; Anthony Trozzolo, chemistry; Robert W. Williamson, accountancy; James Wittenbach, accounting; John Yoder, theology.

Absent but excused: Joseph Blenkinsopp, theology; Paul Bosco, emeritus; David Dodge, sociology; Eugene Henry, electrical engineering; Linda-Margaret Hunt, biological sciences; Robert Lordi, English; Matthew Miceli, C.S.C., theology; James Powell, graduate admissions; Howard Saz, biological sciences.

---

Absent but not excused: Panos Antsaklis, electrical engineering; Gerald Arnold, physics; Donald Barrett, sociology; Salvatore Bella, management; John Croteau, emeritus; Leo Despres, anthropology; Teresa Ghilarducci, economics; Nai-Chien Huang, aerospace/mechanical engineering; David Kirkner, civil engineering; Gilbert Loescher, government and international studies; Jerry Marley, civil engineering; Irwin Press, anthropology; Robert Vacca, modern/classical languages.

Respectfully submitted,

Dian Murray, Secretary

In accordance with standing Senate policy, this Journal has been edited in mutual agreement with our guest speaker.

# advanced studies

---

## current publications and other scholarly works

Current publications should be mailed to the  
Division of Research and Sponsored Programs,  
Room 314, Administration Building.

### COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS

#### American Studies

- Schmuhl, Robert P.  
R.P. Schmuhl. 1986. Review of S.M. Besen's,  
Misregulating Television: Network Dominance  
and the FCC. The Annals of the American  
Academy of Political and Social Science  
483:194-195.

#### Economics

- Bonello, Frank J.  
F.J. Bonello and T.R. Swartz. 1986. Editors.  
Taking Sides: Clashing Views on Contro-  
versial Economic Issues. Dushkin  
Publishing, Guilford, Connecticut.  
xvi + 357 pp.  
Kim, Kwan S.  
K.S. Kim. 1985. Industrial Policy and  
Industrialization in South Korea (Spanish  
edition). Nacional Financiera/UNIDO  
Press, Mexico City. 151 pp.

- Swartz, Thomas R.  
See under Bonello, Frank J. 1986. Taking  
Sides: Clashing Views on Controversial  
Economic Issues.

#### English

- Hasley, Louis L.  
L.L. Hasley. 1986. Hyman Kaplan Revisited.  
Studies in American Humor 3/New Series/  
(1):56-60.v

#### Government and International Studies

- Leege, David C.  
See under Theology; Searle, M. 1985.  
Notre Dame Study of Catholic Parish Life  
6:1-7.  
Messina, Anthony M.  
A.M. Messina. 1986. The Politics of  
Decline, Reviews of Miles Kahler's  
Decolonization in Britain and France: The  
Domestic Consequences of International  
Relations and Peter Malone's, The British  
Nuclear Deterrent. The Review of  
Politics 48:(1):145-148.

#### Music

- Cramer, Craig J.  
C.J. Cramer. 1986. Reviews of Five Books  
on Austrian Organs and Organ Music.  
Early Keyboard Journal 3:78-85.  
C.J. Cramer. 1986. Solo Recital for the  
Peoria Chapter, American Guild of  
Organists. St. Mary's Cathedral, Peoria,  
Illinois.

#### Philosophy

- Quinn, Philip L.  
P.L. Quinn. 1985. Plantinga on Foreknowledge and Freedom. Pages 271-287 in, J.E. Tomberlin and P. van Inwagen, eds., Alvin Plantinga. D. Reidel, Dordrecht, The Netherlands and Boston, Massachusetts.  
P.L. Quinn. 1985. In Search of the Foundations of Theism. Faith and Philosophy 2(4):469-486.

#### Theology

- Searle, Mark  
M. Searle and D.C. Legee. 1985. Of Piety and Planning: Liturgy, the Parishioners, and the Professionals. Notre Dame Study of Catholic Parish Life 6:1-7.  
Ulrich, Eugene C.  
E.C. Ulrich. 1985. Editor. Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. 18:50.✓

#### COLLEGE OF SCIENCE

#### Biological Sciences

- Martin, Vicki J.  
V.J. Martin. 1986. Utilization of a Marine Invertebrate for Toxicology Testing. Page 9 in, Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Growth Research Organization for Women Conference. Bellarmine College, Louisville, Kentucky.

#### Chemistry

- Huang, Nai-Zhong  
See under Pasto, Daniel J. 1986. Journal of Organic Chemistry 51:412-413.  
Miller, Marvin J.  
M.J. Miller. 1986. N-Acyloxy Monocyclic  $\beta$ -Lactams. Assignee: University of Notre Dame Du Lac, Notre Dame, Indiana. United States Patent 4,565,654.  
Murtagh, James  
See under Thomas, J. Kerry. 1986. Pages 237-252 in, Chemical Reactions in Organic and Inorganic Constrained Systems.  
Nakamura, Takashi  
See under Thomas, J. Kerry. 1986. Pages 237-252 in, Chemical Reactions in Organic and Inorganic Constrained Systems.  
Pasto, Daniel J.  
D.J. Pasto and N.-Z. Huang. 1986. Measurement of the Secondary H-D Isotope Effect in Atom Transfer Reactions of the 1,1-Dideuterioallyl Radical. Journal of Organic Chemistry 51:412-413.  
Thomas, J. Kerry  
D.-Y. Chu, R. Stramel, S. Hashimoto, T. Nakamura, J. Murtagh, J. Kuczynski, B. Milosavljevic, J. Wheeler and J.K. Thomas. 1986. Photoinduced Charge Separation at Inorganic and Organic Interfaces. Pages 237-252 in, R. Setton, ed., Chemical Reactions in Organic and Inorganic Constrained Systems. D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

---

### Mathematics

- Sommese, Andrew J.  
A.J. Somnese. 1985. Ample Divisors on  
Normal Gorenstein Surfaces. Abhandlungen  
aus dem Mathematischen Seminar der  
Universität Hamburg 55:151-170.

### Physics

- Lundeen, Stephen R.  
S.R. Lundeen and F.M. Pipkin. 1986.  
Separated Oscillatory Field Measurement  
of the Lamb Shift in  $H, n=2$ . Metrologia  
22:9-54.

### COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

#### Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering

- Mueller, Thomas J.  
J.T. Kegelmann and T.J. Mueller. 1986.  
Experimental Studies of Spontaneous and  
Forced Transition on an Axisymmetric  
Body. AIAA Journal 24(3):397-403.

### Chemical Engineering

- Varma, Arvind  
A. Varma. 1986. Optimal Catalyst Activity  
Profiles in Pellets. Chapter in Reacting  
Flows: Combustion and Chemical Reactors  
(Part 2). Lectures in Applied Mathematics  
24:41-62.

### Civil Engineering

- Kinnmark, Igemar P.E.  
I.P.E. Kinnmark and W.G. Gray. 1986.  
Fourth Order Accurate One-Step Integration  
Methods With Large Imaginary Stability  
Limits. Numerical Methods for Partial  
Differential Equations 2:63-70.

### RADIATION LABORATORY

- Das, Paritosh K.  
K. Brobrowski and P.K. Das. 1986. Transient  
Phenomena in the Pulse Radiolysis of  
Retinyl Polyenes. 5. Association of Radi-  
cal Cations with Parent Molecules.  
Journal of Physical Chemistry 90:927.

---

## notre dame report

An official publication of the University of Notre Dame, Department of Public Relations and Information. 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.

Bernadette Zoss, Editor  
Jeff Smith, Layout  
Publications and Graphic Services  
415 Administration Building  
Notre Dame, Ind. 46556  
(219) 239-5337

---