



---

# Notre Dame

---

# R E P O R T

---

## Contents:

May 15, 1992

---

### The University

---

- 405 *Hickey and Jenky Receive Alumni Awards*
- 405 *Notre Dame Becomes Founding Member of Collegium*
- 405 *Merluzzi Named Director of Gerontological Research Center*

### Faculty Notes

---

- 406 *Faculty Honors*
- 406 *Faculty Activities*

### Documentation

---

- 409 *Colloquy for the Year 2000*
- 412 *Academic Council Minutes*  
*February 25, 1992*
- 418 *Faculty Senate Journal*  
*February 4, 1992*
- 421 *1991-92 Academic Affirmative Action Report*

### The Graduate School

---

- 438 *Current Publications and Other Scholarly Works*

---

# 17

---

1991-92

## Hickey and Jenky Receive Alumni Awards

The Notre Dame Alumni Association has honored two Notre Dame graduates.

Lawrence F. Hickey, a 1942 alumnus from New York, N.Y., has received the William D. Reynolds Award. Hickey, who retired from his family's construction business in 1977, is the president of the board of trustees of the Kennedy Child Center. The center, which has facilities in Manhattan and the Bronx, provides educational programs for 247 children with physical, emotional and mental handicaps. Hickey also serves on the board of the Astor Home for Children in Rhinebeck, N.Y., and is president of the Neighborhood Coalition for Shelter, a group of synagogues, churches and community organizations which operates two shelters and a referral center for homeless people in New York City.

The Reynolds Award, which memorializes a 1954 graduate and former president of the Alumni Association, is given annually to a Notre Dame graduate who works with young people for the betterment of the quality of life.

Rev. Daniel R. Jenky, C.S.C., a 1970 graduate, has received the James E. Armstrong Award. Jenky, rector of the Basilica of the Sacred Heart and of the Fischer Graduate Residences, joined the Congregation of Holy Cross in 1973 and was ordained the following year. Aside from a year teaching social studies at Bourgade High School in Phoenix, Ariz., he has been at Notre Dame since his ordination. In addition to his responsibilities as Sacred Heart's rector, he has served as rector of Dillon Hall, and director of Campus Ministry. He has also taught a course on the literature of prayer in the Graduate School.

The Armstrong Award, which memorializes the first executive director of the Alumni Association is given annually to a Notre Dame graduate who is an employee at the University and has performed outstanding service to it.

## Notre Dame Becomes Founding Member of Collegium

Notre Dame has become a founding member of Collegium, a Catholic higher educational institute designed to bring together faculty and future faculty who are interested in exploring how their faith influences their academic work and what it means to be a Catholic intellectual in our culture.

Timothy O'Meara, provost, has been named to the founding board of the institute.

Funded by a grant from the Lilly Endowment, Inc., Collegium is sponsored by Fairfield University in Connecticut in conjunction with St. John's University of Collegeville, Minn., and Loyola Marymount University in Los Angeles. As many as 50 American Catholic colleges and universities are expected to become participating members.

Beginning in 1993 the institute will sponsor an annual eight-day summer fellows program for 70 young faculty and advanced graduate students. These programs will help participants to understand better the meaning and mission of the college or university as a Catholic institution.

## Merluzzi Named Director of Gerontological Research Center

Thomas V. Merluzzi, associate professor of psychology, has been named director of the Center for Gerontological Education, Research and Services (GERAS). Merluzzi succeeds John F. Santos, professor emeritus of psychology.

The center has been renamed the Gerontological Research Center and will be devoted exclusively to research on aging since most of the center's services are now duplicated in other agencies. Merluzzi anticipates that the center's research will be interdisciplinary and that it will involve community service agencies.

Merluzzi, who has studied extensively how cancer patients cope with their disease, hopes to broaden his research to investigate the various ways people cope with aging.

# Faculty Notes

---

## Honors

Aubrey Diamond, professor in the London Law Program, has been appointed Queen's Counsel, *Honoris Causa*, by Queen Elizabeth II. Until last year, solicitors — British lawyers who handle lower court cases — had been excluded from Queen's Counsel appointments, which were reserved only for barristers. Diamond is the second solicitor and academic to receive the honorary title.

Robert C. Johansen, senior fellow in the Kroc Institute and professor of government and international studies, has been appointed visiting scholar at the Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, for the 1992-93 academic year.

Rev. Edward A. Malloy, C.S.C., president and professor of theology, has received an honorary Doctor of Humane Letters degree from the Catholic University of America in ceremonies at the Basilica of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington, D.C., May 9. He gave the commencement address.

Ralph M. McNerny, Grace professor of medieval studies, director of the Maritain Center and professor of philosophy, has been awarded the Thomas Aquinas Medal from the American Catholic Philosophical Association at its annual convention in St. Louis, Mo., March 26-28.

Michael K. Sain, Freimann professor of electrical engineering, was reappointed associate editor at large for *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* for the year 1993.

Robert H. Schuler, director of the Radiation Laboratory and Zahm professor of radiation chemistry, has been awarded the Maria Sklodowska-Curie Medal by the Polish Association of Radiation Research at the association's ninth triennial meeting in Cracow, Poland, April 2-3. This medal is presented in commemoration of Madame Curie who was born in Poland and received the Nobel prize for her discovery of radium. It is given triennially to prominent scientists who carry out radiation, chemical and radiobiological researches. Schuler is the fifth radiation chemist and the first American to receive the Curie Medal, first awarded in 1983. He gave the medal award lecture "Three Decades of Spectroscopic Studies of Radiation Produced Intermediates" at the Institute of Nuclear Studies in Warsaw and at the Technical University of Lodz, Poland.

Donald E. Sporleder, professor of architecture, was appointed one of the nine statewide founding board members to establish an Indiana State Chapter of National Rails-to-Trails Conservancy. The first organizational meeting and workshop was held at Purdue University in West Lafayette, Ind., March 14. The objectives of the Indiana group are to encourage and facilitate statewide development of Linear greenspace and rails to trails.

Nancy K. Stanton, professor of mathematics, has been appointed to the Meetings Committee of the American Mathematical Society. She has also been appointed to the AMS-CMS-MAA Joint Program Committee for the 1993 summer meeting.

Flint O. Thomas, associate professor of aerospace and mechanical engineering, has been awarded the Notre Dame Chapter of Sigma Xi 1992 Award for Outstanding Research. Selected from recent research publications nominated by members of the University research community, Thomas received the award for his paper "An Experimental Investigation into the Role of Simultaneous Amplitude and Phase Modulation in the Transition of a Planar Jet" published in *Physics of Fluids*. The award consists of a permanent traveling plaque for display in the awardee's college and an honorarium.

## Activities

Ani Aprahamian, assistant professor of physics, presented an invited talk on "Vibrations in Deformed Nuclei" at the ACS Symposium on Radioactive Nuclear Beams in San Francisco, Calif., April 9.

Stephen M. Batill, director of the Hessert Center and associate professor of aerospace and mechanical engineering, presented the paper "Digital Time Series Analysis for Flutter Test Data" at the AIAA Dynamics Specialists Conference in Dallas, Tex., April 16-17.

Ikaros Bigi, professor of physics, gave the High Energy Physics Seminar "CP Violation in B Decays (and Elsewhere) — The Low Road to New Physics" at the Center for Theoretical Particle Physics at the University of Texas at Austin, Tex., Oct. 14. He presented an HEP Seminar to the OPAL Collaboration in CERN, Switzerland, March 13. He gave the review talk "The Element of  $\kappa$  or: CP Violation in B Decays — An Opportunity Not to Be Missed" at the Recontres de Moriond, Les Arcs, France, March 21. He gave that same talk at the Theoretical High Energy Physics Seminar at Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., April 27.

Raymond M. Brach, associate professor of aerospace and mechanical engineering, presented a paper titled "Trajectory Animation on a Personal Computer" at the international congress of the Society of Automotive Engineers held in Detroit, Mich., Feb. 28. He delivered an invited lecture titled "Mechanics of Braking and Tire Forces for ABS Design" at Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology in Terre Haute, Ind., May 5.

# Faculty Notes

---

Linda S. Buyer, assistant professor of psychology, presented the paper "Is Imagery a Functional Component of the Bizarre Imagery Phenomenon?" at the Midwest Psychological Association Convention in Chicago, Ill., May 2.

Theodore J. Cachey Jr., assistant professor of romance languages and literatures, presented the paper "Rewriting Columbian Encounters" at the annual convention of the American Association for Italian Studies held at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, N.C., April 9-12.

Kevin J. Christiano, associate professor of sociology, served as a discussant in the session on the "Sociology of Religion" at the annual meeting of the North Central Sociological Association in Fort Wayne, Ind., April 23-26.

Bernard Doering, professor of romance languages and literatures, attended the organizational meeting for the Colloques de Cérisy which, in July 1993, will be devoted to the intellectual legacy of Jacques Maritain in Paris, France, March 21. He delivered an invited lecture titled "The American Legacy of Jacques Maritain" at the conference on "The French in New York During World War II" at Columbia University in New York, N.Y., April 9-12.

Dennis P. Doordan, associate professor of architecture, presented a lecture titled "American Architecture Between Modernism and Postmodernism" sponsored by the Chicago Architecture Foundation as part of their 1992 Spring Docent Day in Chicago, Ill., April 11. He participated in a panel discussion as part of a symposium titled "Blurring Boundaries: The Politics and Aesthetics of the New Italian Theory" sponsored by the Art Institute of Chicago, the School of the Art Institute and the Instituto Italiano Di Cultura held at the Art Institute of Chicago, Ill., April 21-22.

Rev. Patrick D. Gaffney, C.S.C., associate professor of anthropology, gave a lecture in a series titled "The Arab World and Its Uncertainties: Does Peace Have a Chance?" sponsored by the University of Indianapolis in Indianapolis, Ind., Feb. 18.

J. Philip Gleason, professor of history, gave the lecture "Two Centuries of Catholic Higher Education in the United States" at the University of St. Thomas in St. Paul, Minn., April 6.

Denis A. Goulet, O'Neill professor in education for justice, lectured at the Forever Learning Institute on "The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development: The Rio Summit" in South Bend, Ind., April 15. He delivered the second annual Daniel S. Sanders Peace and Justice Lecture "International Development: Creator and Destroyer of Values" at the University of Illinois in Urbana-Champaign, Ill., April 21. He conducted a faculty seminar on "International and Cross-Cultural Social Welfare" at the

School of Social Work at the University of Illinois, April 22. Goulet was interviewed on the radio talk show *FOCUS 580* on "Development and U.S. Aid to the Third World: Where Next" at that university, April 22.

Roger F. Jacobs, professor of law, served on the American Bar Association Section of Legal Education and Admission to the Bar Site Evaluation Visitation team to the University of California, Hastings Law School, in Oakland, Calif., April 12-15.

Robert C. Johansen, senior fellow in the Kroc Institute and professor of government and international studies, presented the paper "Tradeoffs Between Military Values and Democratic Values in an Evolving World Order" at the annual convention of the International Studies Association in Atlanta, Ga., April 2.

David C. Leege, professor of government and international studies and director of the Hesburgh Program in Public Service, chaired a panel titled "Public Opinion, Foreign Policy, and Wars: Cold and Hot" at the Midwest Political Science Association's annual convention in Chicago, Ill., April 9.

Andrew Lumsdaine, assistant professor of computer science and engineering, presented the paper "Accelerating Dynamic Iteration Methods with Application to Semiconductor Device Simulation" at the Copper Mountain conference on Iterative Methods at Copper Mountain, Colo., April 12. The paper, submitted while Lumsdaine was a graduate student at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, was awarded third place in the student paper competition.

Bronislaw Marciniak, visiting scholar in the Radiation Laboratory, presented the paper "Energy and Electron Transfer Processes in the Quenching of Triplet States of Organic Compounds by 1,3-diketonate Metal Chelates. Laser Flash Photolysis Studies" co-authored by Gordon L. Hug, associate professional specialist in the Radiation Laboratory, at the 20th informal conference on Photochemistry in Atlanta, Ga., April 26-May 1.

Rev. Richard P. McBrien, Crowley-O'Brien-Walter professor of theology, gave the John Courtney Murray lecture "The Future of the Church: Looking Toward the 21st Century" at the Newman Center in Port Huron, Mich., March 23. He presented the fifth annual Walter W. Curtis lecture "Contemporary Catholic Discussion on the Church" at Sacred Heart University in Fairfield, Conn., March 26. He presented "The Future of the Church: Looking Toward the Third Christian Millennium" at the lenten lecture series at St. Michael the Archangel Church in Canton, Ohio, April 7. He gave the Margaret and Thomas Murray Lecture in Catholic Thought "The Church: A Review of Current Ecclesiology" at the University of Toledo in Toledo, Ohio, April 14.

## Faculty Notes

---

Rev. Ernan McMullin, O'Hara professor of philosophy, gave a colloquium on "Realism and Explanatory Power" at the University of Connecticut in Storrs, Conn., Feb. 6. He lectured on "Fine-tuning the Universe?" at Yale University in New Haven, Conn., Feb. 13. He delivered the annual Aquinas lecture on "The Inference That Makes Science" and lectured on "Sources of Modern Anti-realism" at Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wis., March 1. He spoke on "Causal Explanation in Ancient Greek Astronomy" at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, Pa., March 5.

Philip E. Mirowski, Koch professor of economics, presented the paper "The Meaning of Replication in Econometrics" as the invited lecture to the Economics Department at York University in Toronto, Canada, March 12. He presented an invited presentation "What Were Von Neuman and Morgenstern Trying to Accomplish?" to the History of Economics Seminar at Michigan State University in East Lansing, Mich., April 21.

Daniel J. Pasto, professor of chemistry and biochemistry, presented a paper titled [2+2] Cycloaddition of Enantio-enriched 1-2-Butyl-3-methylallene with 1, 1-Dichloro-2, 2-difluoroethene" before the Division of Organic Chemistry at the national American Chemical Society meeting in San Francisco, Calif., April 9.

Dean A. Porter, director of the Snite Museum and associate professor of art, art history and design, delivered a lecture on "Victor Higgins and Modernism" at the symposium "The Taos Society of Artists: Impact and Influence" at the Eiteljorg Museum in Indianapolis, Ind., April 11.

Joseph M. Powers, assistant professor of aerospace and mechanical engineering, presented an invited seminar titled "Summary of Oblique Detonation Theory and Topics for Future Research" at the ICASE Colloquium at the Langley Research Center in Hampton, Va., April 20.

Kathy A. Psomiades, assistant professor of English, gave a paper titled "Troping Japan: Gender and Cultural Imperialism" at a conference sponsored by Interdisciplinary Nineteenth-Century Studies at Loyola University in New Orleans, La., April 11.

Jonathan R. Sapirstein, associate professor of physics, presented the invited talk "Testing the Standard Model at Low Energies" at the spring American Physical Society meeting in Washington, D.C., April 20.

Donald E. Sporleder, professor of architecture, participated in the Indiana Department of Natural Resources "Re-Leaf Indiana" Urban Forestry Workshop held in Merrillville, Ind., Feb. 18.

J. Kerry Thomas, Nieuwland professor of chemistry, presented three invited talks at the American Chemical Society meeting in San Francisco, Calif., April 5-10: "Photodestruction of Contaminants on Clays" in the Environmental Chemistry Division, "Trapping of Ions in Zeolites" in the Kendall Symposium and "Energy and Charge Transport in Solid Polymers" in the Polymer Chemistry Division.

G.N.R. Tripathi, professional specialist in the Radiation Laboratory, presented the paper "Time-resolved Raman Spectra and Reaction Dynamics of Solvated Radicals" at the 20th informal conference on Photochemistry in Atlanta, Ga., April 26-May 1.

Arvind Varma, Schmitt professor of chemical engineering, presented an invited paper titled "Optimal Catalyst Activity Profiles in Pellets" at the American Chemical Society meeting held in San Francisco, Calif., April 6.

Jaime R. Vidal, assistant director of the Cushwa Center, gave a presentation on "Historical Perspectives on National Parishes" at the national convocation of the Holy Cross Hispanic Ministries in Notre Dame, Ind., April 27.

Andrezej Walicki, O'Neill professor of history, presented the paper "Polish Romantic Messianism" at 1992 annual conference for the Study of Political Thought at the University of Tulsa in Tulsa, Okla., April 3-5.

## Colloquy for the Year 2000

### Committee on Finances, University Relations and Athletics

April 3, 1992

Father Beauchamp convened the sixth meeting of the Committee on Finances, University Relations and Athletics on Friday, April 3, at 3:30 p.m. in room 200 of the Center for Continuing Education (CCE).

Members present: E. William Beauchamp, C.S.C. (chairman), Kathleen Anthony, Paul Doyle, C.S.C., Maureen Gleason, Michael Hamilton, Roger Jacobs, Gerald Jones, Barry Keating, James Kuser, Terence Linton, C.S.C., Scott Malpass, Thomas Mason, Richard Rosenthal, Joseph Russo, Richard Sheehan, Stephen Trust and William Wilkie.

Father Beauchamp began the meeting by noting that various members of the committee had requested an update on any formal University deliberations involving possible renovation and expansion of Notre Dame Stadium. In response to this request, Father Beauchamp reviewed the petition brought to the University by the national Alumni Board of Directors requesting a review of the feasibility of stadium expansion in order to satisfy the increasing demand by alumni for tickets to home football games. In order to effectively respond to the petition, Father Beauchamp noted that a committee had been formed with representatives from the Athletic Department, University Relations, Business Affairs, Student Affairs, the Provost's Office, Academic Services for Student-Athletes, the Faculty Senate and the Physical Plant to discuss, on a preliminary basis, the feasibility of stadium expansion.

Father Beauchamp noted that the committee has been meeting on a regular basis and has developed a preliminary report on the feasibility of stadium expansion which examines the following five general areas: short history and current status of the football stadium, ticket allocation and demand, security, financing alternatives and public relations. This report, in its final form, will be reviewed by the officers of the University and shared with the trustees, who will ultimately decide whether to proceed with an expansion or to maintain the status quo.

Highlights from the preliminary report indicate the following:

- A thorough architectural study of the existing stadium structure and its support systems indicates that structural rehabilitation and modernization could cost some \$25 million, depending upon the extent of the work done, which does not include any additional seating capacity.
- A straight line projection of alumni ticket demand for 1991 through 1996 (based on the 1986-91 growth) indicates that the University will only meet 25 percent of the alumni demand by 1996.
- An expansion of the stadium would generally be welcomed by the local community, but would require additional resources for security and safety, increased parking and traffic control.
- There are numerous financing alternatives available to pay for the construction of any renovation and/or expansion of the stadium, some of which could result in significant incremental revenues being made available for general university operating purposes.
- The public relations implications, both among and within, the University's five key publics of faculty, students and parents, alumni, benefactors, and the public-at-large would vary considerably and no public relations strategy could possibly bridge the gap between extreme positive and negative sentiments.

Discussion by committee members on the feasibility report focused on public relations implications, especially among the faculty, which is expected to voice the strongest negative reaction due, in part, to current budget constraints affecting new faculty positions and class offerings. It was noted that there is a segment of the faculty that would never reconcile themselves to the need for a stadium expansion, but that there is also a large segment of the faculty that would respond favorably to a financing plan that would generate additional revenues for their operating budgets.

Father Beauchamp noted that a prerequisite to any financing plan for stadium expansion is that no operating revenues would be utilized to fund the expansion. It was also noted that an expansion to the stadium was not seriously considered earlier due to the need to enhance academic facilities, and that significant additions to each of the buildings housing research and administrative activities in the four colleges have been completed. In addition, the new classroom facility is expected to be ready for use next semester. Committee members generally agreed that, as the University continues to enhance academic facilities, the public relations implications of a stadium expansion would be more positive.

# Documentation

---

Mr. Thomas Mason and Mr. Michael Hamilton noted that an expansion of the stadium represents a unique opportunity to generate significant incremental revenues, above and beyond the construction costs of the expansion, that could be used for academic enhancement. Mr. Mason emphasized that the University should be proud that its athletic program supports academic activities and that no other institution of higher learning in the country is in such an enviable position.

Father Beauchamp concluded the meeting by thanking committee members for their insights and reactions to the feasibility study, and for the productive discussions that are taking place at both the committee and sub-committee level throughout the Colloquy.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott C. Malpass

## Committee on Student Life April 6, 1992

Professor Patricia A. O'Hara convened the meeting on the 14th floor of the Hesburgh Library at 7:12 p.m.

Members Present: Matthew Barrett, Susan Brandt, Missy Conboy, Ann Firth, David Florenzo, Sr. M. L. Gude, C.S.C., Mark Herro, Alan Howard, William Kirk, Rev. Gerald Lardner, Sr. Jean Lenz, O.S.F., Daniel McDevitt, Rev. Don McNeill, C.S.C., Rev. Wilson Miscamble, C.S.C., Molly O'Neill, F. Clark Power, David Prentkowski, Roland Smith Jr. and Katharine Sullivan.

Members Absent: Rev. Joseph Carey, C.S.C., Kurt Mills, Iris Outlaw and Lee Tavis.

Professor O'Hara asked each subcommittee to report on its work to date.

### Student Services Subcommittee

This subcommittee reported that it distributed a questionnaire regarding Career and Placement, Health Services and the University Counseling Center to a random sample of 450 students. The subcommittee is in the process of tabulating results of this survey. A quick review of the responses, however, seems to indicate that the level of concern among undergraduate students about the services provided by these offices is not particularly high. The subcommittee is preparing a similar survey for distribution to graduate and professional students.

One committee member expressed surprise that the students did not indicate greater concern about Career and Placement in light of the current state of the economy. Others remarked that Career and Placement often observes a drop-off in the use of services among second semester seniors, many of whom discontinue their job search until after commencement.

### Student Activities Subcommittee

This subcommittee reported that it is in the process of completing its interviews with various student groups. It will then begin to review the results of these conversations in order to identify common themes. The subcommittee hosted an open forum recently to which it invited 50 students with a variety of interests and backgrounds. Only 11 of the 50 students responded to the invitation. Although the subcommittee tried to elicit their views on student activities, the primary issues that the students raised were coed housing and parietal hours.

# Documentation

---

In light of questions raised in interviews with student groups about the availability of more food service options, this subcommittee also met with Dave Prentkowski, director of University Food Services. They discussed some of the history of the food services operation, as well as the department's vision for the future.

The subcommittee conducted a second interview with the Center for Social Concerns. In the first meeting with the center, the committee focused on the history of the center. The second meeting focused on the future. The subcommittee has concluded that it is important to view the Center for Social Concerns as a center, not just as a coordinator of volunteer service opportunities for students. It has a significant role to play in the lives of faculty, staff and students.

The subcommittee also reported a strong voice among the students for the creation of a commercial district close to campus. One committee member questioned, however, whether there would be sufficient year-round student traffic to support a commercial district from the standpoint of financial feasibility.

## Residence Life Subcommittee

This subcommittee reported that it intends to visit a few residence halls before the end of this semester. It will continue these visits in the early fall. The subcommittee also intends to conduct some follow-up interviews with some of the departments within the division of Student Affairs.

## Student Life Policies

This subcommittee reported that it has been spending time discussing and reflecting upon the following issues:

- a) How the residential aspect of the University fits into the University's mission;
- b) Intellectual life within the residence halls;
- c) The importance of the liturgical life of the residence halls;
- d) The role of hall staffs;
- e) The changes that hall staffs and others are observing in the student body;
- f) The role of the Holy Cross community in the residential life of the University;
- g) Services and support available through the University Counseling Center;
- h) Male/female relationships.

Unlike the other subcommittees, the Student Life Policies subcommittee has spent only a limited amount of time meeting with campus constituencies. Instead, it has discussed and reflected on policies affecting student life as a subcommittee.

Professor O'Hara reminded committee members that the final meeting of the Student Life Committee for the spring semester will be on April 27, 1992. She asked that each subcommittee prepare a written report of its work to date for this meeting, together with any supporting data that has been collected.

The committee then discussed its plans for the summer months. Professor O'Hara suggested that the committee could continue to listen to campus constituencies over the summer months, using this time to focus on conversations with faculty and staff groups. Committee representatives could be sent to each college to meet with a cross-sampling of faculty members. A similar process could be used with other administrative offices outside of the division of Student Affairs.

Professor O'Hara suggested that the committee complete the listening process over the summer months so that the early fall can be spent in preparing the committee's final report. The Committee of the Whole has asked that each of the four committees complete their work by fall break.

The committee then discussed plans for the April 13 dinner with the rectors. Subcommittee members will be seated at dinner with groups of rectors so that committee members and rectors can become acquainted. After dinner, each of the four subcommittees will gather in separate rooms with the same rectors to discuss the work of that subcommittee and to elicit the rectors' opinions. After these meetings with the subcommittees, the rectors and committee members will gather again as a large group to report the results of these separate conversations and to give the rectors an opportunity to air any other concerns that they might have. Additional time will then be allowed for rectors to approach individual subcommittee members.

Professor O'Hara adjourned the meeting at 8 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ann M. Firth



## Academic Council Minutes February 25, 1992

**Members in Attendance:** Edward A. Malloy, C.S.C., Timothy O'Meara, E. William Beauchamp, C.S.C., Roger Schmitz, Patricia O'Hara, Nathan Hatch, Harold Attridge, Francis Castellino, Fernand Dutilleul, John Keane, Eileen Kolman, Anthony Michel, Paul Conway, Jennifer McRedmond, Kathleen Biddick, Frank Bonello, David Burrell, C.S.C., Cornelius Delaney, Maria Rosa Olivera-Williams, Thomas Werge, Morton Fuchs, Robert Hayes, V. Paul Kenney, Mark Herro, Arvind Varma, Bill McDonald, William Nichols, Carol Mooney, Maureen Gleason, Regina Coll, C.S.J., Kenneth DeBoer, James Sledge, Kathleen Vogt and Anthony Yang. Joanne Bessler substituted for Robert Miller.

**Observers in Attendance:** Douglass Hemphill, Dennis Moore and James Pattison

**Guest in Attendance:** David O'Connor

The meeting was opened at 3 p.m. with a prayer of St. Patrick by Prof. O'Meara.

1. Minutes. The minutes of the meeting of December 4, 1991, were approved as presented.
2. Continuation of the discussion on the report by the Faculty Committee on Governance. Readdressing this report, Fr. Malloy emphasized that the fundamental question raised is one of determining the most appropriate and effective means of addressing concerns related to participation and communication at our University at a time when American higher education is facing difficulties. He felt that substantial progress in communication and follow-through of Faculty Senate proposals has been made, and he reiterated his belief that existing structures of governance incorporate a very important role for that body. With regard to the Academic Council, he expressed concern that the alteration of the council's current balance among elected faculty, academic administrators and students would undermine the healthy interaction among these groups which permits the council to perform its assigned mission.

Fr. Malloy concluded his remarks by stating that he disapproves the proposed changes in the structure of the Academic Council. His decision, he stated, follows a great deal of thought and consultation. He emphasized that his disapproval is not born from any desire to be confrontational, but rather from his understanding of the role of the Academic Council within the University. He maintained that the faculty committee's proposal would not succeed in enabling the Academic Council to address the entire responsibility of governance. Instead, he felt, it would substantially restructure the council to the point that it could no longer adhere to its proper, present function. He emphasized that none of this is meant to preclude necessary changes, espe-

cially in terms of the style of participation and the nature of governance and problem solving. To the contrary, the administration, in collaboration with every unit of the University, is now engaged through the Colloquy for the Year 2000 in an effort to address that need through the most extensive process of self-reflection, analysis and projection that has taken place here in recent history. Early indications, he said, suggest that this process will help us identify appropriate goals and the steps we can take to achieve them. He expressed his belief that while no existing unit is sufficient for the entire responsibility of governance, the mechanism of the Colloquy can be used to develop another entity which will address the very legitimate purposes raised by the faculty committee.

As chair of the Faculty Committee on Governance, Fr. Burrell responded by saying that he interprets the president's veto to be a studied and reflective response to a specific proposal designed to enhance faculty participation in governance at Notre Dame. The 21-12 vote by the council for approval, he added, stands as a firm endorsement of the principle embodied in the proposal. He concluded by expressing his hope that the veto of the proposal is not a choice of administrative power over wisdom and that the action will not despirit faculty. (Attachment A gives the full text of Fr. Burrell's prepared response.)

Prof. Biddick voiced concern that veto of the proposal causes a loss of productive tension among the different constituencies — students, faculty and staff — and she expressed disappointment that the proposal is viewed as standing in opposition to the Colloquy. She questioned why change in existing bodies could not occur along with creation of a new entity.

Fr. Malloy stated that from his vantage point peer institutions with different structures of governance do not appear to be facing today's dilemmas as well or better than is Notre Dame. Stating that the assigned responsibility of the Academic Council is to determine policies and structural changes, he reiterated his concern that the proposal would affect the ability of that body to perform this mission by changing the proportionality of its membership. He argued that it is important to preserve the proportion of academic administrators, who are concurrently highly qualified faculty, because their role in the life of the University brings a certain kind of perspective and response to a discussion that is healthy for the University. He emphasized that his references to the Colloquy are not intended to imply that the format of the Colloquy provides a means of resolving all issues of representation. The Colloquy, however, will bring together a different combination of people in a different way.

Fr. Malloy expressed his belief that we need to analyze how the council can improve its methods of doing business — without restructuring the council or altering its mission. He agreed that the agenda can be developed more astutely, and

# Documentation

he pointed out that the number of council meetings is restricted only by the calendar. As an example of the kind of agenda items he would welcome, he suggested the report on undergraduate teaching submitted recently to the Board of Trustees by the Student Government. An appropriate format would be for the Executive Committee to set up a structured conversation for the next council meeting in which both issues and errors of fact and perception contained in the report could be discussed. He felt that the council must respond to undergraduate students who find that something is seriously awry from their perspective. He added that although discussion of the undergraduate report within Colloquy groups, by the Faculty Senate, or among groups with a different mix of students would be perhaps more interesting, that same discussion should occur within the Academic Council as part of an ongoing conversation about the priorities and purposes of the University. He reiterated that his objection to the proposal is based on the significant structural and directional changes it would mean; nothing, he said, is unchangeable in terms of the processes within the structure itself. He concluded his remarks by pledging a concerted effort by the administration to close existing gaps in communication about decision making, and to develop a more satisfying mode of participation in the Academic Council.

Prof. Delaney commented on the implied inconsistency between the view that the council as currently structured works very well and the veto of a proposal for a change that was accepted by a majority of that very council.

Prof. Varma commented on the lack of deliberation on agenda items selected by the Executive Committee. He asked whether creation of standing committees might be advisable in order to discuss, develop and present ideas. Fr. Malloy responded that reduction in the size of the council several years ago included a reduction of committee seats in favor of operating through a committee of the whole. Standing committees, he argued, presuppose a kind of activist, agenda-setting mode of operation which is more appropriate to a more broadly based forum established for the purpose of considering University-wide issues. The Academic Council should remain the forum in which final approval or disapproval is developed. Like changes in proportionality, the creation of standing committees would substantially alter the structure of the council. Although internal committee structure could be reevaluated if the Colloquy fails to develop a "third thing," he reaffirmed his conviction that the current committee-of-the-whole concept makes the Academic Council much more effective.

Prof. O'Meara observed that historical justification exists for the current structure and procedures. He pointed out that the parliamentary style in which the council does business was adopted in response to the difficulties of the 1960s and 1970s. As recently as three years ago, he added, an attempt was made to engage the council in more general, open-

ended discourse. Although that attempt was dropped when the resulting discussion did not go well, he agreed that the Executive Committee should revisit the idea of topics which can be discussed more openly by the council without the requirement to reach a specific conclusion at a specific time.

Fr. Burrell expressed enthusiasm over the idea of the council discussing the aforementioned Student Government report. He expressed the hope that such discussion would include the appropriateness of the appellation "national Catholic research university."

**3. Faculty Senate resolution to amend Article IV.5(a) to permit the communication of recommendations by the departmental Committee on Appointments and Promotions and departmental chair to candidates for renewal, tenure or promotion.** Prof. O'Connor introduced the following resolution which passed unanimously at the Faculty Senate meeting on October 16, 1991.

*Resolved: that the following sentence be appended to Article IV, Section 5, Subsection (a) of the Academic Articles:  
After the departmental Committee on Appointments and Promotions and the departmental chair send to the dean their final recommendations concerning a candidate's renewal, tenure or promotion, the departmental chair is permitted to communicate the recommendations to the candidate.*

(The Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee appended to this resolution a summary of the arguments in its favor. That appendage is given in Attachment B.)

Prof. O'Connor stated that because of concerns expressed over a previous proposal, which would have required notification of candidates as recommendations or decisions are made at every level of the process, the current proposal focuses on actions at the department level. He pointed out that the proposal does not *require* a department chair to inform the candidate of a decision; it simply *permits* the chair to do so. He reiterated and summarized the arguments and statistics contained in the summary prepared by the senate's Academic Affairs Committee (Attachment B to these minutes), and he contended that, in view of the 95 percent level of approval by a group that includes many senior faculty members, a vote against the proposal implies that the senior faculty are either negligent or incompetent.

In response to an argument by Prof. Olivera-Williams that notification should either be mandated or prohibited, not optional, Prof. O'Connor said that the language which *permits* a chair to inform the candidate of a decision was chosen to allow for extraordinary circumstances.

Prof. Attridge expressed concern about cases in which the vote by a Committee on Appointments and Promotions (CAP) is split. He asked whether the candidate would be informed of a split vote, and if so what kind of relationship

# Documentation

---

would be established if the split were subsequently overturned. Prof. O'Connor reiterated that the proposal does not require a report of the vote or the reason for it. He admitted that the proposal cannot address all possibilities, but argued that neither does it make the tough cases any more difficult to deal with.

Prof. Castellino began by denying the premise that a vote against the proposal is a negative reflection on the senior faculty. He continued that the proposal does not really address the issue of anxiety as it may claim. While the system generates anxiety in the candidate for tenure and renewal throughout a six-year period, this proposal addresses only the last two or three months of the process. He offered that it might be more productive to discuss ways of shortening the process itself. Prof. O'Connor agreed that the proposal does not solve the problem of anxiety, but added that any reduction of that anxiety is important. He argued further that the proposal addresses other matters, such as the undermining of collegiality that results from unnecessary secrecy in the evaluation process. Absent strong justification, he said, presumption is all on the side of allowing the candidate to find out about departmental recommendations. Prof. Biddick concurred, adding that the fostering of support of mature collegiality and mutual accountability is a major benefit of the proposal.

In response to a question from Prof. Delaney concerning the support of department chairs for the proposal, Prof. O'Connor said he was unable to identify the 36 chairs who responded to the questionnaire. He could say, however, that no respondent classified as a chair expressed preference for the current system.

Fr. Burrell reiterated his previously expressed concern over the type of case in which a departmental decision was reversed at the college level or higher. Prof. Hatch gave the opinion that in such cases, where there is ongoing discussion among the chair, the dean and perhaps the Provost's Advisory Committee, the proposal might not be helpful. Prof. O'Connor responded that such cases will be difficult regardless of the approval or disapproval of the proposal, but argued that the proposal will not make things any worse. It will enhance the concept of mature collegiality, he continued, and that benefit outweighs any slight cost.

Prof. Dutile reflected that if the process is viewed as unitary rather than as a series of discrete decisions, the proposal in fact gives the candidate an incomplete description of the decision. He asked whether conveying that incomplete decision might become part of the dynamic which affects the rest of the process. Prof. Michel commented that once the department's decision is known, the opportunity for discussion between the department and the college is eliminated.

Summing up the discussion to this point, Prof. O'Meara identified the intrinsic reasons for making the change em-

bodied in the proposal are anxiety, job market and collegiality. Noting that the proposal does not really resolve the problems inherent in these issues, he pointed out that it also brings with it new difficulties. It could have a devastating effect on a candidate whose rejection by the department was overturned by the college, simply because it would make that initial rejection known. It could also promote a campaign in support of a candidate who had been turned down, which might begin while the process was still ongoing. And, he added, no argument has been made that the change would *improve* standards — only that standards would not erode. Responding to Prof. O'Connor's argument that the proposal would strengthen collegiality, Prof. O'Meara continued that it might in fact undermine that dimension of collegiality which exists among faculty, administrators and faculty administrators. He concluded by stating that since neither the pro nor the con arguments were really convincing, his inclination was to support the current system.

Prof. Bonello observed that if communication within the department and the college is what it should be, such stark differences of opinion between levels should not exist. He agreed with Prof. O'Connor that adoption of the proposal might serve to identify areas in which communication is a problem.

Fr. Malloy argued that communication, or specifically the lack of it, is the primary source of anxiety within the advancement and tenure process. He related that in his own experience communication within the department had been very good, but observed that the level of consultation and feedback that he had experienced personally was not evident in all academic departments. Communication may be hampered by the large size of some departments, or perhaps by the psychology of relationships between junior and senior departmental faculty. Whatever the cause, improved communication can only be emphasized to department chairs when they are appointed; it can be encouraged by the president, the provost and the deans, but it cannot be mandated from above. Nothing about the proposal, he continued, alleviates the problem of inadequate communication from the day a candidate enters a department until the day before the CAP begins its work. He expressed the belief that the process as it currently exists has a sense of integrity that might well be fractured by revelation at any intermediate point. Regardless of whether the resolution requires or simply permits revelation at the department level, it creates the potential for blaming someone else for subsequent decisions. Levels of anxiety and collegiality will not be improved by revelation in the final months of the process, he argued; they can be affected, however, by better communication during the preceding six years.

Prof. O'Meara indicated that in cases that were extremely clear, historical precedent exists for informing the candidate prior to convening the CAP that the department is not in-

# Documentation

clined to support retention. He stated that he had approved such a step a few years ago as an experiment, and the result had been good.

Prof. Varma stated that much of the anxiety which surrounds tenure decisions could be precluded if departments were all required to write annual performance reviews. Prof. Herro concurred, emphasizing the importance of contact and communication especially during the first three years and expressing support for required, scheduled contact between chair and candidates. Prof. O'Meara agreed that annual reviews are a good thing, but observed that they cannot address every contingency because such reviews do not include the outside opinions which may figure so prominently in tenure decisions. Unless the reviews are done carefully, they could give the prospective candidate a false sense of security. Responding to a question from Prof. Varma concerning the possibility of shortening the current four to six week waiting period preceding announcement of results, Prof. O'Meara said that some cases required more than usual consultation either internally or outside the University. A waiting period ensures that some announcements will not be made in advance of others.

Prof. Castellino expressed support for beginning the process earlier to shorten the time candidates must wait for a decision. Prof. Olivera-Williams offered that the real anxiety peaks just before announcement, and that the length of the process would not really affect that. Prof. Delaney stated that while the proposed change is a significant one for Notre Dame, it is still far short of standard operating procedures at several peer institutions.

The resolution was voted by written ballot. Fifteen votes were recorded in favor, 15 opposed and three members abstained. The motion was not approved.

**4. Proposal to allow studio and creative writing courses to satisfy the fine arts and literature requirement.** Prof. Schmitz referred to an excerpt from the minutes of the council meeting of February 5, 1985, which stipulated that studio and creative writing courses would not satisfy the then newly created Fine Arts and Literature requirement. He stated that both the Provost Advisory Committee and the Executive Committee of the council unanimously support striking this exclusion, and presented a motion that the council take that action. Discussion indicated that no other elements of the requirement would be altered by this motion. The motion was passed by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger A. Schmitz  
Secretary of the Academic Council

## Attachment A

### Statement to the Academic Council

by Fr. David Burrell  
February 25, 1992

As chair of the Faculty Committee on Governance, selected by a faculty-wide referendum and charged with finding ways to enhance faculty participation in governance at Notre Dame, and as an elected member of this Council, I am called upon to respond to the president's veto of our proposal. He and I are brothers in Holy Cross, as we are all of us here colleagues, so each of us can be presumed to have the good of this institution at heart. I take it, then, that we are at odds not over an ideal but over a way of attaining that ideal. At least that is how I choose to read the veto: as a studied and reflective response to a specific proposal designed to enhance faculty participation in governance at Notre Dame. One can doubtless find objections to the means we have proposed to that end, just as there can be significant reservations about timing. Yet the 21 - 12 vote by this body in favor of a particular proposal to reform itself — ever a difficult political goal — stands as a firm endorsement of the principle embodied in the proposal: enhanced participation on the part of its faculty in the governance of this institution as a university worthy of the name. Moreover, the tradition in which Notre Dame self-consciously places itself recalls a pattern of participative governance in Catholic universities reaching back to their inception in the early middle ages. So the next series of moves lies with the administration, whose future actions can alone corroborate this benign reading of the president's veto as the rejection of a particular proposal and not of a principle. Otherwise, all of us will be the losers for having betrayed a tradition and a trust. For great universities — medieval, modern or contemporary — have become so by dint of the cumulative care of that same faculty to whom the formal education of their students is entrusted. The intent of the proposal generated by an elected group of faculty and passed by a significant majority of this body was just that: to offer a much-enhanced quality of participation in the governance of this institution by its qualified faculty. Wisdom is far more at issue than power, for without sustained and efficacious engagement of faculty in deliberations regarding the mission of the University, we cannot hope to become the Catholic university we aspire to be. As faculty we shall do what we can, through the Faculty Senate, to carry on such deliberations, but will miss the collaborative exercise with administrators for which our proposal provided. Any move to a more participative mode of governance is a delicate one, yet poses a crucial choice for a university, especially for a university which aspires to be Catholic in its life and inquiry. We can only pray that the veto of this proposal does not itself spell a choice by the administration of power over wisdom, nor that such an action will yet further dispirit faculty

# Documentation

who care about our mission and ethos. We are at a point in our history where something new is needed. May it arise from these ashes by collaborative efforts of men and women of good will.

## Attachment B

### Summary of considerations relevant to the Faculty Senate resolution on timely notification of candidates for renewal, tenure or promotion of departmental recommendations

1. The Senate believes that only clear and grave reasons can justify keeping the recommendations of ATP committees secret from candidates. The evaluation process cannot avoid creating anxiety in candidates, and the Senate certainly does not think this anxiety will suddenly disappear if department chairpersons are permitted to inform candidates of the department's recommendation. But the anxiety would be lessened. In addition, renewal and tenure candidates have a special claim to be informed of departmental recommendations when they are made, usually in early January: an unsuccessful candidate can have an extra chance at the job market, a chance untainted by dismissal. But our proposal does not aim only at these "humanitarian" benefits to the candidate, important as they are for a university that strives to be Catholic. Unnecessary secrecy in the evaluation process undermines the standards of collegiality and shared confidence essential to an academic community. It leads to a natural suspicion that ATP committees have something to hide from candidates, as if they operate in a manner that cannot be publicly acknowledged, and that makes them bashful about standing behind the results of their deliberations. Some aspects of the process may require confidentiality; but keeping the very recommendation of the department secret from the candidate is a very different matter from making general provisions for the confidentiality of particular individuals' votes or evaluations. At any rate, the proposal does not *require* notification, though the Senate expects that would be the norm; a chairperson could refuse if some unusual circumstance arose.

No reasons of sufficient clarity and gravity have been offered for requiring the secrecy of departmental decisions on renewal, tenure, and promotion at Notre Dame. The insufficiency of the main justifications so far offered will be considered below.

2. The argument has sometimes been made that if chairpersons and members of ATP committees know that candidates will be informed in January of the departmental recommendation, they will compromise their standards to avoid passing along bad news (see the minutes of the May 15, 1991, Academic Council meeting). No evidence has been offered to support this extraordinary claim; one might think that it

is at least as likely that guaranteed secrecy would compromise responsible decision-making. At any rate, the Senate offers the following considerations in response to this argument:

(a) *Within* Notre Dame, faculty members, including department chairpersons and present or former members of ATP committees, are *overwhelmingly* opposed to the present secrecy requirements. None of 36 chairpersons, only 15 of 210 present or former ATP committee members, and only four of the other 197 faculty members who returned surveys preferred the current secrecy requirements to alternatives that allowed notification, and most preferred alternatives much stronger than the present proposal. This is surely as close to a consensus as we can expect to come on any serious issue at Notre Dame: over 95 percent of the 443 responses show dissatisfaction with the secrecy requirement. (See the results of the Faculty Senate Questionnaire: Resolution on Reappointments, Tenure and Promotion, presented to the Academic Council, May 15, 1991. A summary of this survey is attached here.) In other words, the secrecy requirements receive virtually no support *even from those faculty whose experiences and responsibilities might be expected to have given them an appreciation for those "grave reasons" that would justify secrecy*. Having exercised power under the present system, faculty members are willing, indeed eager, to forgo secrecy at the departmental level. There seem to be only two interpretations of this consensus: (1) our most distinguished and respected senior faculty members, on the basis of considerable experience judge the present secrecy requirement unnecessary for responsible renewal, tenure and promotion decisions, and perhaps believe that the requirement is an impediment to such decision-making; or (2) our experienced senior faculty members are incompetent or irresponsible, either ignorant of or indifferent to their inability to maintain standards when their decisions may be communicated to candidates. If (2) is true, then whether or not chairpersons may inform candidates of departmental decisions is the least of our worries.

(b) *Outside* Notre Dame, our peer institutions share the experiences and judgments of our own faculty members. None of seven surveyed in the fall of 1990 (Brown, Duke, Fordham, Indiana, Johns Hopkins, Michigan State, Princeton) prohibited notification of candidates to the extent that Notre Dame does; indeed, only Fordham has a policy more restrictive than the one now proposed. In addition, the guidelines of the AAUP call for a much greater degree of openness than the present proposal. The relevant guideline reads as follows (*Academe* v. 69, Jan.-Feb. p. 16a):

2.(d) When a faculty recommendation or a decision not to renew an appointment has first been reached, the faculty member involved will be informed of that recommendation or decision in writing by the body or individual making the initial recommendation or decision; the faculty member

# Documentation

will be advised upon request of the reasons that contributed to that decision. The faculty member may request a reconsideration by the recommending or deciding body.

In the absence of evidence that either (1) our peer institutions make worse decisions about renewal, tenure and promotion, or (2) our own faculty members are distinctively incompetent, the argument that less secrecy at the departmental level would undermine standards is at best no more than a bald assertion.

3. The second justification sometimes offered for the secrecy requirement is that notifying candidates of departmental recommendations undermines the shared responsibility (sometimes called the "integrity") of the review process (see the minutes of the May 15, 1991, Academic Council meeting). To a large extent, this justification seems to reduce to the previous one: if ATP committee members know that the committee's recommendation will be identifiable separately from the final decision announced in May, then ATP members will compromise their standards. The argument in this form does not really depend on the belief that *shared* responsibility is necessary for responsible decision-making by the faculty, but rather on the claim that *hidden* or *unidentifiable* responsibility is necessary. Again, no evidence has been cited to support this claim, and the experiences and judgments of our own faculty and of our peer institutions are strong evidence against it. Of course, the Senate also believes that those involved in renewal, tenure, and promotion decisions beyond the departmental level are at least as competent and responsible as the faculty, so that forgoing secrecy at the department level will not compromise standards at these higher levels. The final decision would still be in every way a shared responsibility, since no party to the review process would make arbitrary decisions or ignore the standards and values of the other parties. The Senate certainly hopes to foster such a spirit of cooperation and common purpose. Shared responsibility or "integrity" in the review process cannot, of course, guarantee consensus. But the present secrecy requirement does not either, and has the further defect of predictably raising suspicions that there is less common purpose and integrity in the process than there really is.

4. Finally, it is sometimes darkly hinted that changing the secrecy requirement will expose Notre Dame to litigation from disgruntled candidates. Once again, no evidence has been offered to support this claim. Relevant evidence might include proof that the secrecy requirement has made Notre Dame more immune to litigation than our less secretive peer institutions, or that our peer institutions receive less competent legal advice than Notre Dame.

## Summary of Faculty Survey

### Key to Chart

- 1 = I would be willing that the decision re RTP be shared with the candidate as soon as it has been sent to the dean.
- 2 = I would be willing that the decision re RTP be shared with the candidate including the rationale for the decision as soon as it has been sent to the dean.
- 3 = I would be willing that the decision re RTP be shared with the candidate including the rationale for the decision when the entire process has been completed.
- 4 = I prefer the present system; i.e., that the decision re RTP is not revealed to the candidate at any point in the process.
- 5 = I am indifferent toward the resolution.
- 6 = Other (Comment here was often: The Faculty Senate Resolution as stated).
- 7 = (On questionnaire for chairs only) I would like to be permitted to share the decision re RTP with the candidate as soon as the process has been completed.

Category	Option Chosen							Totals
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Faculty (non-ATP committee)	45	281	31	19	5	6		387
Present or former ATP committee	28	134	23	15	4	4		208
Chairpersons	5	15	6	0	2	1	7	36
Totals	78	430	60	34	11	11	7	631

**Commentary:** A total of 595 Faculty Surveys were returned; 36 chairperson surveys were returned; a total return of 631.

A total of 430 opted for informing the candidate, including rationale for the decision. Thirty-four indicated preference for the present system, but no chairperson took this option.



# Documentation

## Faculty Senate Journal February 4, 1992

The chair Professor Paul Conway called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in room 202 of the Center for Continuing Education and called upon the secretary Professor William Tageson to offer a prayer. There were no minutes available for review; also unavailable were the members of the Provost Review Committee, who will meet the senate at a later date.

### COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Academic Affairs — the chair Professor David O'Connor had nothing to report.

2. Administration — the chair Professor Anand Pillay presented a resolution from his committee (no second necessary) on matters that Committees on Appointments and Promotions should and should not review in its deliberations. What should count are the qualifications listed in the Faculty Manual. Professor Philip Quinn believed that good people will come to good decisions; the procedures we set up will help them to come to these decisions, but there are no guarantees that some people will not harbor inappropriate thoughts. Professor Willis Bartlett wondered how the proposal would be enforced. Pillay responded that if something is written people would have to follow it, or procedural error appeals could be made. Conway wanted clarification about procedural error; Quinn thought that the resolution could be the basis for an appeal on personal bias or procedural error, which would then be up to the appeals committee to judge. Professor Frank Connolly opposed the motion, but sensed that perhaps a CAP committee could be guilty of considering some extraneous factor; however the motion is quite broad as written, and yet could also be considered as too narrow. If it were more carefully drafted, it would be a better motion, but it is an extremely difficult topic. CAP committees have great power for good reasons, and sometimes do not work well, but this motion does not help. O'Connor had some of the same reservations as Connolly; he felt the manual could be interpreted to include what we want and to exclude what we want also. He saw a difference between disciplinary procedures and tenure procedures; they are separate and should be kept that way. There was a further difference in the evidence needed in a case against an untenured faculty member and a tenured one. Everyone has to guard against character assassination, and take proper account of confidentiality; no group of good people will take into account unsubstantiated evidence. Any proposal like this runs into trouble; our discussion should perhaps center on standards of proof.

Quinn agreed that the manual's definitions for promotion to tenure were broadly drawn and many things could be

read into them, in good and bad senses to allow for positive and negative results. The language in this resolution is simply to remind committee members of the relevance of the publicly-stated criteria. Both Connolly and O'Connor were correct in their comments about levels of evidence, but this resolution does nothing to change that. Connolly asked specifically if there was anything wrong in considering in the tenure process allegations of an instructor's involvement with a student of the opposite sex? The resolution, according to Quinn, says such allegations are not relevant. Connolly was more concerned with academic qualifications that may have been faked.

Professor Thomas Cashore brought up another hypothetical instance where someone was constantly pushing to publish something, to the extent that those around him suspected something of plagiarism may be involved; how is that kind of unproved allegation to be handled by a CAP?

Professor Richard Sheehan was hardpressed to come up with something that would not fall under the existing guidelines and yet would be "personal bias." An unsubstantiated rumor of sexual misconduct can be taken care of by existing procedures. Quinn believed that unsubstantiated irrelevant charges cannot be found out because the proceedings are confidential. This resolution under consideration would allow for some possibility of redress. Cashore asked if existing procedures allowed for serious charges brought up in a CAP to be resolved before the CAP continues its work. Quinn, pointing to an instance of his knowledge at another school, thought that was possible. Professor Donald Sporleder returned to O'Connor's earlier point on unsubstantiated charges; candidates should be able to respond to them, and CAPs must allow for due process.

Professor Y. C. Chang believed the manual should be adhered to especially in its guidelines with regard to student interaction. O'Connor thought they were quite broad, and standards of proof quite loose; CAPs should distinguish between academic qualifications and others. Connolly pointed out that the motion did not mention due process or evidence at all, and thus was flawed. Quinn commented that the committee considered many of the points raised by the senate. He pointed out that at Notre Dame qualifications like "salutary influence on students" with its moral overtones were important. To tackle such things was far beyond what the committee thought it could consider; such a project was too far-reaching in scope. The committee thought that tying its proposal to the existing structures was appropriate as a modest step.

Professor Peter Moody was frustrated by the discussion. The manual listed certain guidelines, but we know what professional judgment is, and CAPs exist to exercise it. To some extent adding a small line or two will not help. O'Connor saw at this point that the proposal was aimed at other con-

# Documentation

cerns than his stated ones; as a very modest step it may be helpful to pass it, and leave his concerns for the larger project. Professor Sonia Jordan asked if some kind of unsubstantiated allegations could be introduced above the departmental level; if so, this resolution would have no effect. Quinn agreed that was probably true, and the senate may want to look further at this. Connolly said again that allegations of personal bias and unsubstantiated charges can be addressed without this resolution. Professor Charles Parnell thought the discussion was focusing too much on possible allegations of sexual misconduct issues; there are others CAPs might consider that they should not, like political leanings. Tageson reminded the senate that when bias is found to exist and a case is referred back to a department, the same people may rehear the case. Professor Clark Power worried about that too, and thought maybe an ad-hoc committee from outside the department might be constituted to take care of it. Professor A.E. Miller agreed with Quinn that the proposed change was moderate, but he thought too moderate; a major reconsideration of the whole process has to be undertaken by the whole University community, not just the senate. In answer to Power, Quinn said there is no empirical evidence about the extent of rehearings; only the provost really knows. But there does not seem to be a large problem and to prevent bias a second time, the rehearing process is overseen by a representative chosen by the provost. Conway remembered the provost telling us that only one out of 12 cases required a rehearing.

The lengthy and complicated discussion was closed when Bartlett called the question. There being no objection, the motion was read and voted upon. The result: 18 for, nine against. The chair will bring the resolution to the Academic Council in its usual way. (The resolution is printed as Appendix A of this journal.)

## 3. Student Affairs — no report.

4. Benefits — Sheehan, chair, reported that work is progressing with Affleck-Graves on the compensation report; it will include a section on the growth in the number of administrators. If anyone has suggestions for inclusion of material, let him know. The minimum guaranteed benefit for retirees has not been raised as yet because of certain legal and tax questions; there may be a way to do it by a form of indexing benefits. Affleck-Graves had nothing to report from the Budget Priorities Committee.

## Old Business

Connolly reported that the senate had received a response from the chair of the Board of Trustees (printed as Appendix B of this journal) to its letter in regard to the reappointment of the provost. Keough felt it would have been awkward to reappoint the president and the executive vice president without also reappointing the provost as part of the administrative "team." Both Conway and Connolly agreed that

the response did not properly address our objections. Conway also said he was disappointed that no mention was made of steps being taken to prevent a reoccurrence of this kind of disregard of the Academic Articles. Power felt the senate should respond to this disturbing development right away. If the team concept remains in place, then perhaps we should review the whole team. Then, after updating the articles, we would have input into reviewing all three major officers. O'Connor agreed to take up the issue in the Academic Affairs Committee, and we should make a sharply-worded reply to his letter. Professor John Yoder thought a committee should look into the affair and issue a report; that report would likely include a review process for all three officers. Bartlett said the letter simply reflected one of a series of similar incidents, and we should point that out. We have to remedy it for the future. Moody wanted our response to include concrete expression of faculty dissatisfaction with what happened. Connolly pointed out that the letter implies that the provost is appointed by the board, but the articles say that officer is appointed by the president. Sheehan commented that other parts of the articles are also "awkward" (in Keough's word) like tenure and promotion standards, and the sexual harassment policy. If the faculty is bound by the articles, so is the board; it is a legal contract which they can't break unilaterally — but they did.

Conway mentioned that the trustees would be meeting on campus later in the week. The major item of business for the Faculty Affairs Committee was to be a report by Student Government on research and teaching at Notre Dame. He urged all senators to read the report, and consider whether it is a topic for the senate to take up. With the Academic Council voting to approve the governance proposal, how can the senate contribute to the better functioning of the Academic Council is another issue to ponder.

Quinn moved to adjourn, Tageson seconded, and the senate did so at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William Tageson

Present: Tageson, Harmatiuk, Parnell, Cashore, Serianni, Schorn, Vecchio, Connolly, Pillay, Garg, Leighton, Sporleder, Hayes, Moody, Chang, Collins, Miller, Litzinger, Bartlett, Jordan, O'Connor, Power, Quinn, Goetz, Sheehan, Conway

Absent: Affleck-Graves, Bentley, Lombardo, Fallon, Sauer, Pratt, Powers, Pattison, Nichols, McCarthy, Kenny, Antsaklis, Blenkinsopp, Boyd, Day, Esch, Falkenberg, Johnson, P., Johnson, C.

Excused: Scully, Tidmarsh, Jenkins, Welle



# Documentation

## Appendix A

January 21, 1992

To: Members of the Faculty Senate  
From: Committee on Administration

In connection with a case that has been brought to its attention, the Committee on Administration has deliberated about the issue of whether considerations of certain sorts should be excluded from the deliberations and records of the departmental Committees on Appointments and Promotions described in the Academic Articles under III 4 (a) and (b). Consider a case in which allegations of impropriety in an instructor's relations with students of the opposite sex enter into the Committee's deliberations or records. Is there something wrong with this? If so, what is the remedy?

There are two reasons for thinking there is something amiss in such a case. First, the Articles specify under III 3 professional qualifications for various faculty ranks. Candidates legitimately expect that departmental Committees will attend only to considerations related to those professional qualifications. Other reasons for dissatisfaction with a faculty member's conduct can be best handled by means of the procedures specified in the University's policies on discriminatory harassment, sexual harassment, and drugs and alcohol. The Articles specify under III 6 (b) procedures for establishing serious cause for dismissal that may be invoked if necessary. Second, because the departmental Committee's deliberations and records are confidential, they are open to abuses that may leave candidates without adequate protection against allegations that are inaccurate, unsubstantiated or malicious. The procedures for establishing serious cause for dismissal, by contrast, grant an accused faculty member a right to counsel, to confront the accusers and adverse witnesses, and to present witnesses in his or her own behalf.

Can anything be done to make sure that departmental Committees restrict their attention to proper considerations? In the last analysis, we probably can do little more than hope that good people will serve on these Committees and trust that the few abuses will be caught by the procedure for handling allegations of personal bias or procedural error spelled out by the Articles under III 4 (e). But perhaps the changes proposed in the following resolution would be helpful.

BE IT RESOLVED: that the Faculty Senate endorse adding the following language to the Articles:

(1) In III 4 (a), after the fourth sentence at the asterisk, insert the following: "In its deliberations and report the Committee takes into account only considerations reasonably related to the qualifications specified in Section 3, Subsection (a)."

(2) In III 4 (b), after the sixth sentence at the double asterisk, insert the following: "In its deliberations and report the

Committee takes into account only considerations reasonably related to the qualifications specified in Section 3, Subsection (b)."

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Faculty Senate exercise its right of agenda to bring the above resolution before the Academic Council.

## Appendix B

January 29, 1992

Professor Francis X. Connolly, Vice Chair  
The Faculty Senate  
University of Notre Dame  
Box 489  
Notre Dame, IN 46556

Dear Professor Connolly:

I write in response to the letter from the Faculty Senate concerning the five-year reappointment of Provost Timothy O'Meara by the Board of Trustees.

When the Board elected Father Malloy to succeed Father Hesburgh as president in November 1986, it simultaneously announced the reappointment of Prof. O'Meara as provost of the University and the selection of Father Beauchamp as executive vice president. This was done deliberately to emphasize a team approach to the University's management.

This emphasis carried over to the Board's recent formal evaluation of the University's three top administrators, its leadership cadre. The timing proved awkward because the Academic Articles provide for a separate review of one of those positions, but for the Board to have acted in regard to two officers while delaying a decision on one would have been even more awkward.

While the Board is pleased with the progress Notre Dame has made under its current administration, five years is a brief time frame in which to judge leadership in the setting of a modern university. Informal evaluations of all officers of the University are done at each spring meeting of the Board, providing an on-going process which culminates in a formal review such as recently completed. The Board looks forward to receiving comments on the performance of the Provost from the faculty review committee now at work.

With assurances that the Board's ultimate objective is that of the faculty — a Notre Dame of scholarly distinction and moral sensitivity — I am,

Yours truly,

Donald R. Keough  
Chairman of the Board

## 1991-92 Academic Affirmative Action Report

"... the University of Notre Dame is ... committed to a serious effort to create a Notre Dame community enriched by increased minority presence among students, faculty and administration" (University of Notre Dame. Minority Report Press Release, Feb. 22, 1988).

"In my Inaugural Address four years ago, I described my priorities as president of the University; prominent among these was sustained effort to increase cultural diversity ... I suggested then and reaffirm now that we must find a unique, Notre Dame way to realize this goal" ("Open Letter on Cultural Diversity" *The Observer*, April 29, 1991).

Rev. Edward A. Malloy, C.S.C.

The University of Notre Dame, with its aspirations to be an outstanding center of learning, has voiced its commitment to attaining among its faculty a broad range of perspectives and insights. To accomplish this requires a substantial presence in the faculty of minorities and women. Therefore, more than equal opportunity — which assures equitable treatment of applicants — is necessary. Affirmative Action is the active effort to attract minority and women candidates and the implementation of programs that assist in the appropriate retention of individuals actually hired.

In 1989, the provost's office, with the approval of Rev. Edward A. Malloy, C.S.C., expanded the membership of the Academic Affirmative Action Committee (AAAC) to aid in fulfilling the University's stated commitment. The committee has earmarked five critical areas of responsibilities.

1. To analyze organizational and policy issues that assist or hinder the goals of Academic Affirmative Action at Notre Dame.
2. To recommend to the University policies and procedures to assist in the attainment of University goals.
3. To assist academic units in developing programs to further the University's goals and to identify sources of suitable candidates.
4. To develop and maintain a database of current information on minority and female representation on the faculty of this University.
5. To report annually to the University community on the progress and problems in the University's quest for diversity.

Related to these responsibilities, over the past year the committee has undertaken a number of specific tasks which are discussed.

### I. Current Faculty Diversity

In this section faculty diversity among various groupings of our faculty is analyzed. The discussion is based on the various attached tables which are derived from a self-identification questionnaire sent to all faculty by the Academic Affirmative Action Committee. This data will be used as a baseline for all future comparisons. We give data for U.S. citizens (US), for permanent residents (PR), and for non-residents (NR). (Prior to 1990 only the sum of all three categories has been given. This makes comparisons with earlier data difficult.)

In Table 1, our "Total Faculty" is divided first into regular and non-regular categories and then into subcategories of Teaching and Research (TR), Special Professional (SP), Research (RE), and Administration (AD). We first look at the subset of our faculty which affect our students most directly: the tenure track Regular Teaching and Research Faculty (TR). This faculty's affirmative action characteristics are detailed in the first row of Table 1. We will summarize these data as percentages of the total faculty in a given category without regard to citizenship (i.e., the sum of the US, PR and NR numbers). The percentage for U.S. citizens is given in parenthesis only, since we feel that, for some purposes, this is a significant distinction.

Among our 627 Regular Teaching and Research Faculty women represent 14.4 percent (12.4 percent) of the total while all minorities\* are 11.6 percent (6.5 percent). In this second category black representation is 1.4 percent (1.4 percent), Hispanic is 3.5 percent (1.6 percent), and Asian is 6.7 percent (3.5 percent). In the Non-Regular Faculty the picture brightens somewhat for women so that in the "Total Faculty" there are 241 women out of a total faculty of 1145 for 21 percent (18.7 percent). However, the situation with respect to minorities actually worsens so that we have 122 minority faculty members for 10.7 percent (5.9 percent).

The distribution of women and minorities by rank is given in Table II. Among our Regular Teaching and Research faculty, 39 of our 453 Professors and Associate Professors are women. Thus, of our senior faculty only 8.6 percent (7.9 percent) are women. The untenured ranks provide some improvement with women representing 29.3 percent (24.1 percent) of our Assistant Professors and Instructors. All minorities represent 11.5 percent (7.7 percent) of our faculty at the senior ranks of Professor and Associate Professor. In the junior ranks, all minorities are 12.1 percent (3.4 percent). We note that the distribution of minorities in rank is fairly even whereas women are much less represented in the senior ranks.

Table III distributes to the individual colleges and administrative units all women and minorities who hold faculty appointments. The representation of women on the faculty is largest in the University Libraries (category U3) at 52.9 per-

# Documentation

cent (50 percent) and in the College of Arts and Letters (AL) which has, for example, 20.3 percent (18 percent) women on the Regular Teaching and Research Faculty. Engineering is the lowest (we exclude some small academic units) with 4.3 percent (2.1 percent) women on the Regular Teaching and Research Faculty. The situation is just reversed with respect to minorities where the library has 5.9 percent (5.9 percent), arts and letters has 7.9 percent (3.9 percent), but engineering has 17 percent (8.5 percent) minority representation on the Regular Teaching and Research Faculty.

For Regular appointments other than TR we construct from Table III the women/minority percentages averaged over all academic units. Women are well represented in the Regular Special Professional Faculty at 38.1 percent (34.5 percent) but less so in the Regular Special Research Faculty 21.8 percent (18.8 percent) and the Regular Administration 19.6 percent (19.6 percent). The figures for minorities are 12.2 percent (5.5 percent) of the Regular Special Professional Faculty, 25 percent (6.3 percent) of the Regular Special Research Faculty, and 11.8 percent (11.8 percent) of Regular Administration.

Table IV provides still more detail concerning the Teaching and Research Faculty. This table displays our data by colleges and departments. This table also provides an "availability index" which can be used to begin an evaluation of the affirmative action status of our academic departments. The provost's office and our academic departments assisted in the development of these availability indexes. They are reflective of the national experience\*\* and our own University's experience in the academic labor marketplaces. Non-residents (NR) are excluded from this table because they are not counted in the national availability data.

There are 29 academic units listed in Table IV for which we have availability figures. Of these, just eight (four departments in arts and letters, one in science, one in engineering, two in business) have sufficient women on their regular faculty to be within one percentage point or better of the availability figure. While the absolute numbers of minorities is usually much smaller than those of women, they are better represented when compared to their availability. Here 12 units (six departments in arts and letters, two in science, three in business, and law) equal or exceed the availability figures. From this point of view there seems to be a more widespread problem in hiring and retention of women than minorities. We should note from Table I, however, the very small numbers (and availability) of American Indians, Blacks and Hispanics as compared to Asians.

Since 1981-82 our faculty size has increased by about 20 percent. What has happened to the representation of women and minorities on our faculties in that 10 year period? In this discussion, we use total figures, independent of citizenship status. In 1981-82 minorities were 9.2 percent

of the Regular Teaching and Research Faculty while they were 11.6 percent in 1991-92. Women were 10 percent of that faculty in 1981-82 and 14.4 percent in 1991-92. In the Total Teaching and Research Faculty minorities were 8.3 percent in 1981-82 and 11.5 percent in 1991-92 while women were 11.2 percent and 16.65 percent respectively. In the total of all faculties minorities increased from 9.4 percent in 1981-82 to 10.7 percent in 1991-92 while women increased from 13.7 percent to 21 percent.

In summary, the progress with respect to minorities appears minimal — in the 2 percent range. This is somewhat mitigated by the very small availability figures for some minorities. It is more disturbing that so few of our academic units have used the growth of faculty size in the past 10 years to at least meet the availability figures. The percentage of women on the faculty has increased substantially but a relatively small part of that increase occurs in the Regular Teaching and Research Faculty — an increase of only 4.4 percent. Again, it is disappointing that so few academic units meet the availability figures.

We have made some progress in the past decade. We have nearly tripled the number of Hispanics on our Total Faculty, we have raised the number of Asians from 46 to 67, and the number of women from 113 to 241. We note again, however, that a disproportionate number of these are not in Teaching and Research Faculty. The addition of women and minorities, particularly Blacks, Hispanics and Native Americans, to the Regular Teaching and Research Faculty, and in the higher ranks, continue to be the areas of greatest need. In this regard, the figures for new hires in 1991-92 offer some encouragement. Of the 45 new members of the Regular Teaching and Research Faculty, 21 were women and six were minorities, representing respectively 46.7 percent and 13.3 percent of new hires. The effect on this year's statistics of adding this large number of women was reduced by the loss of 11 women from the TR faculty. Five of these, however, assumed administrative responsibilities and are now counted in the administration, rather than the TR, category. Six women on the TR faculty left the University in 1991-92 (two retired, two returned to graduate school, one went to another university and one changed careers).

## II. Report on Visits to the Provost and New Administrators

In the 1991 report of the Affirmative Action Committee interviews were reported with the deans of each of the colleges and with the provost. In keeping with this tradition, the committee conducted interviews with the provost, Professor Harold Attridge, the new dean of the College of Arts and Letters, and Professor Thomas Gordon Smith, the chair of the newly restructured School of Architecture. What follows is a summary of those meetings.

# Documentation

---

## *A. Interview with Timothy O'Meara, Provost*

Professor O'Meara began by noting that, in respect to the hiring of women progress continues to be made, particularly in the College of Arts and Letters where 60 percent of the offers made during 1991-92 were to women. The progress in respect to the hiring of minority faculty has not been as pronounced. According to O'Meara the current budgetary situation will have some impact on affirmative action, but only in so far as the overall rate of growth in the faculty will have to be curtailed. Budgetary considerations also have prevented any action on the AAAC Committee's recommendation regarding a Visiting Scholars program (see the 1991 Affirmative Action Report). The provost suggested that this proposal be offered for inclusion in the Colloquy report where it could then become an official goal for the University.

O'Meara stated that affirmative action remains a high priority and as such has been discussed in venues such as PAC. Although he did not have an opportunity to raise the issue with departmental chairs this year, he intends to do so next.

Prof. O'Meara noted that the problems of spousal hiring and day care are being discussed and that progress may be expected in these areas in the foreseeable future.

Finally, the provost reiterated his support for the Academic Affirmative Action Committee. He reaffirmed its function as a body specifically charged with gathering and reporting data relevant to affirmative action, and with reviewing and making specific policy recommendations germane to this area.

## *B. Interview with Dean Harold Attridge, College of Arts and Letters*

Dean Attridge indicated that the college has been doing well in regard to hiring women. If the present trend continues, nearly 70 percent of the new hires for 1992-93 will be women, including some significant senior appointments. Dean Attridge also felt that the college had been making some progress in the area of minority hirings, resulting primarily in an increase in the number of African-American faculty. Attridge felt that the college could improve its affirmative action record in regard to other underrepresented minority groups, e.g., Hispanics. He did express some concern over the effect which the current budgetary problems might have on the ability of the college aggressively to pursue and hire qualified minority candidates. In general, however, the dean felt that affirmative action concerns, especially regarding women, had been thoroughly absorbed into departmental A & P processes.

## *C. Interview with Professor Thomas Gordon Smith, Chair, School of Architecture*

Professor Smith indicated that some progress had been made in the School of Architecture in respect to the hiring

of women. Of the seven new or replacement faculty hired over the past three years, two have been women. Professor Smith noted that some of the affirmative action problems faced by the school were systematic. He observed that women who pursue a career in architecture tend not to go into academics, making the availability numbers relatively small. The same phenomenon exists in respect to underrepresented minorities in an even more dramatic way. Finally, Professor Smith stated that affirmative action concerns are a very significant part of all appointment decisions.

## III. Departmental Affirmative Action Plan Requests

### *A. Submission and Review of Plans*

As indicated in last year's report, the committee requested each academic unit within the University to formulate an affirmative action plan to address the specific problems faced by that unit to achieving faculty diversity. Throughout this past academic year, the various academic units have responded by discussing, within their own units, the formulation of an affirmative action plan and subsequently submitting a draft of that plan to the committee. As of the date of this report, 33 of the 43 units in the University have submitted a plan.

The following departments have not yet submitted an affirmative action plan to the committee: architecture, chemical engineering, communication and theatre, computer science and engineering, English, German and Russian languages, music, Peace Institute, Program of Liberal Studies.

The committee has reviewed each of the plans submitted and responded in writing to each academic unit, sharing ideas and information to help improve and clarify the plans. The committee intends to report on the more successful strategies contained in the plans.

### *B. Departmental Assessment of Affirmative Action Progress*

The committee has also discussed methods for ensuring that the affirmative action plans, once devised, play an active part in shaping the hiring and retention decision within the academic unit and do not become a dead letter. To that end, the committee is preparing an affirmative action self-assessment form to be completed by each academic unit on an annual basis. This form will provide a checklist for comparing the unit's performance in following the steps outlined in its plan for removing barriers to faculty diversity and in achieving the goals established by its plan.

### *C. Provision of Data Base Sources to Departments*

Departments again received information from the Academic Affirmative Action Committee on minority and women Ph.D. candidates and recipients by academic fields. The

# Documentation

sources for that information were: *The CIC Directory of Minority Ph.D. Candidates and Recipients*; *Minority and Women Doctoral Directory*; and *National Minority Faculty Identification Program Subscription*.

## IV. Up-date on Proposal for a Visiting Junior Scholars Program at the University of Notre Dame

Last year the Affirmative Action Committee submitted a proposal to the administration for a Minority Scholars Program which would bring young scholars to campus in what would essentially be a postdoctoral program with several additional special features. In a letter to the A.A.C. dated March 30, 1992, Provost Timothy O'Meara related that he feels the Minority Scholars proposal is "an excellent way to introduce minority scholars to Notre Dame and vice versa." However, with the current budgetary problems the administration will not be able to support new programs in the next academic year. Provost O'Meara did point out that the Minority Scholars Program is very similar to the Coca-Cola Minority Faculty Fellowship Program administered by the Graduate School through which two minority women have been awarded fellowships for the 1992-93 academic year.

## V. Up-date on Spousal Issue

Spousal hiring has been identified in the recent Colloquy reports and by departmental interviews conducted by the Affirmative Action Committee as a major impediment in hiring and retaining faculty at the University. Because a high percentage of women academics are married to academics or other professionals, spousal hiring is sometimes viewed as a "woman's issue," however, the problem transcends gender issues and seriously affects the University's ability to improve faculty quality.

Recently the University has initiated what should be an important step forward in providing spousal hiring assistance. Mr. Doug Hemphill in Human Resources is currently developing an information network of local employers which will share employment opportunities. Included in the data base will be academic institutions in a 100+ mile radius, in addition to numerous non-academic employers. Current listings of faculty, staff and administrative openings at Notre Dame will of course be maintained. Faculty, prospective faculty, the chair of a search committee, etc., will be able to gain ready access to information concerning local employment opportunities. This information will include brief descriptions of the institutions, job descriptions, contact persons, phone numbers, etc. (It should be noted that the University will not serve as an employment agency.) This information service will be developed over the next several months and should provide a partial solution to the spousal hiring problem.

The more difficult aspect of spousal hiring is the possibility of the creation of special academic positions for spouses of faculty. These might be short-term visiting professorships, "2 for 1" positions, etc. While such positions generally have their drawbacks, these negatives must be weighed against the large potential gain to be derived from the judicious use of these innovative positions. The Affirmative Action Committee and the Faculty/Student Committee on Women will continue to study this issue.

## VI. Review of Grievance Procedures Designed to Handle Affirmative Action, Discriminatory and Sexual Harassment Complaints

The committee attempted a review of the various appeals procedures (Grievance, Appeals, Freese, Sexual Harassment and Discriminatory Harassment) currently in operation to handle affirmative action, discriminatory and sexual harassment complaints. Based on current information the committee was unable to ascertain their effectiveness and the reasons why they may or may not be effective. Some evidence suggests that complaints if they are handled, are handled at a departmental or college level. It is therefore difficult, beyond anecdotal evidence, to determine the extent to which known, efficient and fair procedures exist. Concern was expressed that faculty members — especially junior faculty, the category in which most women and minorities are represented — are uncomfortable with approaching the administration to settle disputes or complaints that they may have with the administration or their colleagues. Therefore, the committee suggests that faculty dispute resolution procedures be more carefully examined in the future to determine their effectiveness.

## VII. Institution of Terms for Committee Members

Given the amount of work and commitment involved in the committee's work in the last few years, and to ensure that the committee's work will engage the widest range of people, the committee requested the provost to increase the membership to 12 appointed members and to establish staggered three-year terms of service.

## VIII. Recommendations:

### A. General Recommendations:

1. The University needs to acknowledge that the creation of a truly diverse faculty is not a matter of achieving percentages. It also entails the creation of an atmosphere in which women and members of all ethnic groups feel welcome and part of the whole community.
2. It should be recognized that affirmative action is a shared responsibility of the administration and faculty. All members of the various faculties are encouraged to

# Documentation

- assist the president, provost, deans, department chairs, and Committees of Appointments and Promotion in achieving progress toward these goals.
- 3. The goal of achieving a truly diverse faculty is too important to be sacrificed to short term financial considerations.
- 4. It is essential to recognize that quality, the maintenance of a Catholic identity, and cultural diversity are all high priorities of the University. They must not be seen as in conflict with one another, or used as excuses for lack of progress in one area or another.

## *B. Recommendations to the President and Provost:*

- 1. The University needs to reaffirm on a regular basis its commitment to affirmative action and to state publicly that it is one of the highest priorities of the institution.
- 2. Deans and departments should continue to be pressed administratively to maintain diversity as a high priority in hiring decisions.
- 3. The administration should clarify its procedures and funding methods for implementing and improving affirmative action hires and retention.
- 4. Achieving faculty diversity should be carefully factored into the University's larger allocation of budgetary resources, both for the hiring of new faculty and the retention of existing faculty.
- 5. In order to develop and recruit women and minority candidates, special fellowships, post-doctoral appointments and visiting faculty positions should be targeted at these underrepresented groups.
- 6. Issues of the family, particularly as they affect the retention of women, continue to be a pressing concern. Areas which still need attention include a spousal hiring policy and the provision of child care facilities.

## *C. Recommendations to the Deans of the Colleges:*

- 1. The creation of a truly diverse faculty should be regularly and publicly reasserted as a high priority of each of the colleges.
- 2. Departmental chairs and A & P committees should be regularly reminded of the importance of generating a list of candidates which reflects the diversity of the availability pool.
- 3. Departments should be encouraged to show a certain amount of flexibility in respect to defining their particular sub-disciplinary needs when these needs act as impediments to the achievement of affirmative action goals.
- 4. Economic resources in the form of faculty lines, interviewing costs, and visiting positions should continue to be allocated so as to encourage and assist departments in achieving affirmative action goals.

## *D. Recommendations to Department Chairs:*

- 1. Affirmative action goals and strategies should be clearly defined and be part of all A & P considerations.

- 2. Actions should be taken to ensure that, whenever a search is conducted, the candidate list reflects the diversity of the larger population. Networking and the consultation of minority vita data banks should be used to expand the candidate pool to include women and minorities.
- 3. An effort should be made to incorporate women and minority faculty in departmental governance, including participation in searches, curriculum development, and appointment and promotion decisions.
- 4. Departments should ensure that all speakers' series and conferences have a wide representation of women and minorities.
- 5. Efforts should be made to provide faculty guidance and resources to encourage and support promising female and minority undergraduates to pursue an academic career.

## **The University Academic Affirmative Action Committee Members:**

Sharon O'Brien, Chair, Associate Professor, Department of Government and International Studies  
Kathleen Cannon, O.P., Associate Provost  
Xavier Creary, Professor, Department of Chemistry  
John G. Duman, Associate Dean, College of Science  
Barbara J. Fick, Associate Professor, Law School  
Gerald L. Jones, Chair, Department of Physics  
Carmella Kinslow, Assistant Librarian, Law Library  
Kenneth Lauer, Professor, Department of Civil Engineering and Geological Sciences  
Jerry Marley, Associate Dean, College of Engineering  
Robert C. Miller, Director, University Libraries  
Charles M. Rosenberg, Chair, Department of Art, Art History and Design  
Juan M. Rivera, Associate Professor, Department of Accountancy  
Robert W. Williamson, Associate Dean, College of Business Administration

*\* Minorities are defined in the following manner: White: A person with origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa or the Middle East (not of Hispanic origin). Black: A person with origins in any of the Black racial groups (not of Hispanic origin). Hispanic: A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race. Asian or Pacific Islander: A person with origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent or the Pacific Islands. American Indian or Native: A person with origins in any of the original peoples of North America and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition.*

*\*\* The baseline data were compiled by the University of Washington Equal Employment Office. This office estimated faculty work force availabilities on the basis of national data through 1988. It should be noted that the index is reflective of the availability of affirmative action appointments at all ranks. In many instances, the current availability of new women Ph.D.s is much higher.*

# Documentation

Table 1: Counts\*

Women and Minority Composition for 1991-92 by Faculty

	Men			Women			Black		Asian			Hispanic			White			Total
	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	
Regular																		
TR	40	12	485	7	5	78		9	14	6	22	10	2	10	23	9	522	627
SP	3	4	78	3	4	47		4	3	3	1	1	2	2	2	3	118	139
RE	5	1	19	1		6			3	1	2	1			2		23	32
LI			20	1		21		2			1			1	1		37	42
OT			3			2											5	5
AD			41			10		3			3						45	51
Non-regular																		
TR	29	4	141	4	2	46	1	3	4	1	2	2		2	26	5	180	226
SP	2		4			2			1						1		6	8
RE	1		5			1									1		6	7
LI						1											1	1
OT	4	1	2												4	1	2	7
TOTAL	84	22	798	16	11	214	1	21	25	11	31	14	4	15	60	18	945	1145

\* Note: In Tables 1-4A: White is imputed when ethnicity is unknown; male is imputed when sex is unknown; foreign is imputed when citizenship is unknown; non-resident alien is imputed when visa is unknown; includes spring only appointments (figures tabulated by Institutional Research).

Table 1: Percentages (Base=Status Category Citizen)

Women and Minority Composition for 1991-92 by Faculty

	Men			Women			Black		Asian			Hispanic			White			Total
	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	
Regular																		
TR	80%	71%	86%	15%	29%	14%		1.6%	30%	35%	3.9%	21%	12%	1.8%	49%	53%	93%	100%
SP	50%	50%	62%	50%	50%	38%		3.2%	50%	38%	.8%	17%	25%	1.6%	33%	38%	94%	100%
RE	83%	100%	76%	17%		24%			50%	100%	8.0%	17%			33%		92%	100%
LI			49%	100%		51%		4.9%			2.4%			2.4%	100%		90%	100%
OT			60%			40%											100%	100%
AD			80%			20%		5.9%			5.9%						88%	100%
Non-regular																		
TR	88%	67%	75%	12%	33%	25%	3%	1.6%	12%	17%	1.1%	6.1%		1.1%	79%	83%	96%	100%
SP	100%		67%			33%			50%						50%		100%	100%
RE	100%		83%			17%									100%		100%	100%
LI						100%											100%	100%
OT	100%	100%	100%												100%	100%	100%	100%
TOTAL	84%	67%	79%	16%	33%	21%	1%	2.1%	25%	33%	3.1%	14%	12%	1.5%	60%	55%	93%	100%



# Documentation

**Table 2: Counts**  
**Faculty Composition Detail for 1991-92 by Track and by Faculty Level**

	Men			Women			Black		Asian			Hispanic			White			Total
	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	
Regular																		
TR																		
FULL	9	6	229			12	3		2	2	15	5	1	4	2	3	219	256
ASSOC	6		164	1	2	24	2		3	1	7	2	1	4	2		175	197
ASST	24	5	86	5	1	40	3		8	3		3		1	18	3	122	161
INSTR	1	1	6	1	2	2	1		1					1	1	3	6	13
TOTAL	40	12	485	7	5	78	9		14	6	22	10	2	10	23	9	522	627
SP																		
FULL	1		9			2			1								11	12
ASSOC		1	36		1	12	1			1			1	1			46	50
ASST	2	2	27	3	3	28	3		2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	50	65
INSTR		1	6			5										1	11	12
TOTAL	3	4	78	3	4	47	4		3	3	1	1	2	2	2	3	118	139
RE																		
FULL		1	5			1				1							6	7
ASSOC			5			3					1						7	8
ASST	5		9	1		2			3		1	1			2		10	17
TOTAL	5	1	19	1		6			3	1	2	1			2		23	32
LI																		
FULL			4			3	1				1						5	7
ASSOC			7			11											18	18
ASST			6			5	1							1			9	11
INSTR			3	1		2									1		5	6
TOTL			20	1		21	2				1			1	1		37	42
OT																		
UNKWN			3			2											5	5
TOTAL			3			2											5	5
AD																		
UNKWN			41			10	3				3						45	51
TOTAL			41			10	3				3						45	51
Non-Regular																		
TR																		
FULL	13	1	31			2	1	1	2						10	1	32	47
ASSOC	5	2	32	2		2					1	1		1	6	2	32	43
ASST	7	1	54			23		2	1	1	1			1	6		73	85
INSTR	4		24	2	2	19			1			1			4	2	43	51
TOTAL	29	4	141	4	2	46	1	3	4	1	2	2		2	26	5	180	226
SP																		
ASSOC	1		2						1								2	3
ASST	1		1			2									1		3	4
INSTR			1														1	1
TOTAL	2		4			2			1						1		6	8
RE																		
FULL			3														3	3
ASST	1		2			1									1		3	4
TOTAL	1		5			1									1		6	7
LI																		
INSTR						1											1	1
TOTAL						1											1	1
OT																		
UNKWN	4	1	2												4	1	2	7
TOTAL	4	1	2												4	1	2	7



# Documentation

**Table 2: Percentages (Base=Status Category Citizen)**  
**Faculty Composition Detail for 1991-92 by Track and by Faculty Level**

	Men			Women			Black		Asian			Hispanic			White			Total
	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	
Regular																		
TR																		
FULL	19%	35%	41%			2.1%		.5%	4.3%	12%	2.7%	11%	5.9%	.7%	4.3%	18%	39%	41%
ASSOC	13%		29%	2.1%	12%	4.3%		.4%	6.4%	5.9%		4.3%	5.9%	.7%	4.3%		31%	31%
ASST	51%	29%	15%	11%	5.9%	7.1%		.5%	17%	18%		6.4%		.2%	38%	18%	22%	26%
INSTR	2.1%	5.9%	1.1%	2.1%	12%	.4%		.2%	2.1%					.2%	2.1%	18%	1.1%	2.1%
TOTAL	85%	71%	86%	15%	29%	14%		1.6%	30%	35%	3.9%	21%	12%	1.8%	49%	53%	93%	100%
SP																		
FULL	17%		7.2%			1.6%			17%								8.8%	8.6%
ASSOC		13%	29%		13%	9.6%		.8%		13%			13%	.8%			37%	36%
ASST	33%	25%	22%	50%	38%	22%		2.4%	33%	25%	.8%	17%	13%	.8%	33%	25%	40%	47%
INSTR		13%	4.8%			4.0%										13%	8.8%	8.6%
TOTAL	50%	50%	62%	50%	50%	38%		3.2%	50%	38%	.8%	17%	25%	1.6%	33%	38%	94%	100%
RE																		
FULL		100%	20%			4.0%				100%							24%	22%
ASSOC			20%			12%					4%	17%					28%	25%
ASST	83%		36%	17%		8.0%			50%		4%	17%			33%		40%	53%
TOTAL	83%	100%	76%	17%		24%			50%	100%	8%				33%		92%	100%
LI																		
FULL			9.8%			7.3%		2.4%			2.4%						12%	17%
ASSOC			17%			27%											44%	43%
ASST			15%			12%		2.4%						2.4%			22%	26%
INSTR			7.3%	100%		4.9%									100%		12%	14%
TOTAL			49%	100%		51%		4.9%			2.4%			2.4%	100%		90%	100%
OT																		
UNKWN			60%			40%											100%	100%
TOTAL			60%			40%											100%	100%
AD																		
UNKWN			80%			20%		5.9%			5.9%						88%	100%
TOTAL			80%			20%		5.9%			5.9%						88%	100%
Non-Regular																		
TR																		
FULL	39%	17%	17%			1.1%	3%	.5%	6.1%						30%	17%	17%	21%
ASSOC	15%	33%	17%	6.1%		1.1%					.5%	3%		.5%	18%	33%	17%	19%
ASST	21%	17%	29%			12%		1.1%	3%	17%	.5%			.5%	18%		39%	38%
INSTR	12%		13%	6.1%	33%	10%			3%			3%			12%	33%	23%	23%
TOTAL	88%	67%	75%	12%	33%	25%	3%	1.6%	12%	17%	1.1%	6.1%		1.1%	79%	83%	96%	100%
SP																		
ASSOC	50%		33%						50%								33%	38%
ASST	50%		17%			33%									50%		50%	50%
INSTR			17%														17%	13%
TOTAL	100%		67%			33%			50%						50%		100%	100%
RE																		
FULL			50%														50%	43%
ASST	100%		33%			17%									100%		50%	57%
TOTAL	100%		83%			17%									100%		100%	100%
LI																		
INSTR						100%											100%	100%
TOTAL						100%											100%	100%
OT																		
UNKWN	100%	100%	100%												100%	100%	100%	100%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%												100%	100%	100%	100%

# Documentation

**Table 3: Counts**  
Detail of All Faculties for 1991-92 by College

	Men			Women			Black		Asian			Hispanic			White			Total
	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	
AL																		
Regular																		
TR	14	3	226	4	3	55		6	4	2	2	5	1	4	9	3	269	305
SP			23	2	3	14		1	1			1	1	2		2	34	42
RE			1														1	1
AD			5			3		2									6	8
Non-Regular																		
TR	15	3	68	2	2	36	1	2	2		1	1		1	13	5	100	126
SP						1											1	1
BA																		
Regular																		
TR	5	2	64			9		1	3	1	5	1		2	1	1	65	80
SP		1	6			2				1							8	9
OT			3			2											5	5
AD			5														5	5
Non-Regular																		
TR	4	1	22			6			1	1					3		28	33
OT			1														1	1
EG																		
Regular																		
TR	10	3	77	1	1	2			3	2	7	2	1	1	6	1	71	94
SP			3														3	3
RE			1														1	1
AD			5								1						4	5
Non-Regular																		
TR	2		17								1				2		16	19
OT			1														1	1
FY																		
Regular																		
TR			2														2	2
SP		1	10			9					1				1		18	20
AD			1			2		1									2	3
Non-Regular																		
SP			1														1	1
LW																		
Regular																		
TR			19			5		1			1			1			21	24
SP	1					2									1		2	3
RE			1														1	1
LI			4			4		2									6	8
AD			5			1											6	6
Non-Regular																		
TR	2		10			2		1							2		11	14
OT	4														4			4
SC																		
Regular																		
TR	9	3	97	2	1	7		1	4	1	7			2	7	4	94	120
SP			7	1		7			1								14	15
RE	4		12			4			3		2				1		14	20
AD			3			1											4	4

# Documentation

	Men			Women			Black		Asian			Hispanic			White			Total
	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	
Non-Regular																		
TR	6		23	2		2			1			1		1	6		24	33
SP			1														1	1
RE						1											1	1
U1																		
Regular																		
AD			3			2											5	5
U2																		
Regular																		
SP			6			2											8	8
AD			2			1											3	3
U3																		
Regular																		
LI			16	1		17					1			1	1		31	34
AD			1														1	1
Non-Regular																		
LI						1											1	1
U4																		
Regular																		
AD			1														1	1
U6																		
Regular																		
SP						1											1	1
AD			1														1	1
Non-Regular																		
OT		1													1			1
W0																		
Regular																		
TR	1											1						1
W1																		
Regular																		
TR	1											1						1
SP	2	2	14		1	4		2	1	2			1		1		16	23
RE	1	1	4	1		2				1		1			1		6	9
AD			3														3	3
Non-Regular																		
TR			1														1	1
SP	2		1			1			1						1		2	4
RE	1		5												1		5	6
W2																		
Regular																		
SP			5			5											10	10
Non-Regular																		
SP			1														1	1
W3																		
Regular																		
SP			4			1		1									4	5
AD			6								2						4	6
TOTAL	84	22	798	16	11	214	1	21	25	11	31	14	4	15	60	18	945	1145

# Documentation

Table 3: Percentages (Base=College Status Category Citizen)  
Detail of All Faculties for 1991-92 by College

	Men			Women			Black		Asian			Hispanic			White			Total
	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	
AL																		
Regular																		
TR	78%	50%	80%	22%	50%	20%		2.1%	22%	33%	.7%	28%	17%	1.4%	50%	50%	96%	100%
SP			62%	100%	100%	38%		2.7%	50%			50%	33%	5.4%		67%	92%	100%
RE			100%														100%	100%
AD			63%			38%		25%									75%	100%
Non-Reg.																		
TR	88%	60%	65%	12%	40%	35%	5.9%	1.9%	12%		1%	5.9%		1%	76%	100%	96%	100%
SP						100%											100%	100%
BA																		
Regular																		
TR	100%	100%	88%			12%		1.4%	60%	50%	6.8%	20%		2.7%	20%	50%	89%	100%
SP		100%	75%			25%				100%							100%	100%
OT			60%			40%											100%	100%
AD			100%														100%	100%
Non-Reg.																		
TR	100%	100%	79%			21%			25%	100%					75%		100%	100%
OT			100%														100%	100%
EG																		
Regular																		
TR	91%	75%	97%	9.1%	25%	2.5%			27%	50%	8.9%	18%	25%	1.3%	55%	25%	90%	100%
SP			100%														100%	100%
RE			100%														100%	100%
AD			100%								20%						80%	100%
Non-Reg.																		
TR	100%		100%								5.9%				100%		94%	100%
OT			100%														100%	100%
FY																		
Regular																		
TR			100%														100%	100%
SP		100%	53%			47%					5.3%				100%		95%	100%
AD			33%			67%		33%									67%	100%
Non-Reg.																		
SP			100%														100%	100%
LW																		
Regular																		
TR			79%			21%		4.2%			4.2%			4.2%			88%	100%
SP	100%					100%									100%		100%	100%
RE			100%														100%	100%
LI			50%			50%		25%									75%	100%
AD			83%			17%											100%	100%
Non-Reg.																		
TR	100%		83%			17%		8.3%							100%		92%	100%
OT	100%														100%			100%
SC																		
Regular																		
TR	82%	80%	93%	18%	20%	6.7%		1%	36%	20%	6.7%			1.9%	64%	80%	90%	100%
SP			50%	100%		50%			100%								100%	100%
RE	100%		75%			25%			75%		13%				25%		88%	100%
AD			75%			25%											100%	100%

# Documentation

	Men			Women			Black		Asian			Hispanic			White			Total
	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	NR	PR	US	
Non-Reg.																		
TR	75%		92%	25%		8%			13%			13%		4%	75%		96%	100%
SP			100%														100%	100%
RE						100%											100%	100%
U1																		
Regular																		
AD			60%			40%											100%	100%
U2																		
Regular																		
SP			75%			25%											100%	100%
AD			67%			33%											100%	100%
U3																		
Regular																		
LI			48%	100%		52%					3%			3%	100%		94%	100%
AD			100%														100%	100%
Non-Reg.																		
LI						100%											100%	100%
U4																		
Regular																		
AD			100%														100%	100%
U6																		
Regular																		
SP						100%											100%	100%
AD			100%														100%	100%
Non-Reg.																		
OT		100%														100%		100%
W0																		
Regular																		
TR	100%											100%						100%
W1																		
Regular																		
TR	100%											100%						100%
SP	100%	67%	78%		33%	22%		11%	50%	67%			33%		50%		89%	100%
RE	50%	100%	67%	50%		33%				100%		50%			50%		100%	100%
AD			100%														100%	100%
Non-Reg.																		
TR			100%														100%	100%
SP	100%		50%			50%			50%						50%		100%	100%
RE	100%		100%												100%		100%	100%
W2																		
Regular																		
SP			50%			50%											100%	100%
Non-Reg.																		
SP			100%														100%	100%
W3																		
Regular																		
SP			80%			20%		20%									80%	100%
AD			100%								33%						67%	100%
TOTAL	84%	67%	79%	16%	33%	21%	1%	2.1%	25%	33%	3.1%	14%	12%	1.5%	60%	55%	93%	100%

# Documentation

**Table 4: Counts**  
**1991-92 Teaching and Research Faculty**  
**Primary Appointment Must Be Teaching and Research By Appointing Departments**

	Total	Women Available	Women	Men	Minority Available	Black	Asian	Hispanic	White
Regular									
AL									
AMST	6		1	5		1			5
ANTH	6			6					6
ART	13		2	11		1			12
COTH	6		2	4					6
CSM	1			1					1
ECON	18		2	16			2		16
ENGL	35		9	26		3			32
FWP	1			1					1
GOVT	26		5	21				2	24
HIST	20		4	16		1			19
LLCO	8		1	7					8
LLGR	7		1	6					7
LLR	12		5	7					12
MI	3			3					3
MUS	15		6	9					15
PHIL	33		3	30			2		31
PLS	13		2	11					13
PSY	21		8	13					21
SOC	14		3	11				3	11
THEO	29		4	25					29
BA									
ACCT	20		3	17		1	1	1	17
FIN	23		3	20					23
MARK	12		1	11			2		10
MGT	20		2	18			3	1	16
EG									
AME	24			24			4		20
ARCH	12		1	11				1	11
CE	13		1	12			1		12
CHEG	11		1	10			1	1	9
CSE	5			5					5
EE	18			18			3		15
FY									
PE	2			2					2
LW									
LONL	1			1					1
ZOFC	23		5	18		1	1	1	20
SC									
BIOL	22		2	20			1		21
CHEM	25		1	24		1	1		23
MATH	28		3	25			3	2	23
PHYS	34		2	32			3		31
TOTAL	580		83	497		9	28	12	531

# Documentation

	Total	Women Available	Women	Men	Minority Available	Black	Asian	Hispanic	White
Non-Regular									
AL									
AMST	4		1	3					4
ANTH	3			3					3
ART	7		3	4		1			6
CORE	8		2	6					8
COTH	2			2					2
ECON	1			1					1
ENGL	2		1	1					2
FWP	17		11	6					16
GOVT	4			4					4
HIST	3		1	2					3
LLCO	1			1					
LLGR	3		2	1					3
LLR	8		6	2					8
LON	4			4					4
MUS	7		1	6					7
PHIL	3		1	2					3
PLS	2		1	1					2
PSY	16		5	11				1	15
SOC	3			3					3
THEO	8		2	6					8
ZOFC	3		1	2					3
BA									
ACCT	8		2	6					8
FIN	3		1	2					3
LONB	1			1					1
MARK	4			4					4
MGT	12		3	9			1		11
ZOFC	1			1					1
EG									
AME	2			2					2
ARCH	3			3					3
CE	1			1					1
CHEG	1			1					1
CSE	5			5			1		4
EE	2			2					2
ROME	2			2					2
ZOFC	1			1					1
LW									
ZOFC	12		2	10		1			11
SC									
BIOL	19		2	17				1	18
CHEM	4			4					4
MATH	2			2					2
W1									
RAD	1			1					1
TOTAL	193		48	145		3	3	2	185

# Documentation

**Table 4: Percentages (Base=Department Status)**  
**1991-92 Teaching and Research Faculty**  
**Primary Appointment Must Be Teaching and Research By Appointing Departments**

	Total	Women Available	Women	Men	Minority Available	Black	Asian	Hispanic	White
Regular									
AL									
AMST	100%		16.7%	83.3%		16.7%			83.3%
ANTH	100%	39.8%		100%	7.2%				100%
ART	100%	51.7%	15.4%	84.6%	5.2%	7.7%			92.3%
COTH	100%	32.2%	33.3%	66.7%	8.7%				100%
CSM	100%			100%					100%
ECON	100%	12.7%	11.1%	88.9%	10.7%		11.1%		88.9%
ENGL	100%	45.5%	25.7%	74.3%	5.3%	8.6%			91.4%
FWP	100%			100%					100%
GOVT	100%	19.1%	19.2%	80.8%	11.2%			7.7%	92.3%
HIST	100%	22.7%	20%	80%	7.8%	5%			95%
LLCO	100%	31.4%	12.5%	87.5%	21.1%				100%
LLGR	100%	44%	14.3%	85.7%	1.8%				100%
LLR	100%	50.9%	41.7%	58.3%	17.2%				100%
MI	100%			100%					100%
MUS	100%	25.8%	40%	60%	6.1%				100%
PHIL	100%	17.5%	9.1%	90.9%	5.2%		6.1%		93.3%
PLS	100%		15.4%	84.6%					100%
PSY	100%	38.7%	38.1%	61.9%	7.7%				100%
SOC	100%	34.6%	21.4%	78.6%	12.5%			21.4%	78.6%
THEO	100%		13.8%	86.2%					100%
BA		13.4%			9.6%				
ACCT	100%		15%	85%		5%	5%	5%	85%
FIN	100%		13%	87%					100%
MARK	100%		8.3%	91.7%			16.7%		83.3%
MGT	100%		10%	90%			15%	5%	80%
EG									
AME	100%	2%		100%	19%		16.7%		83.3%
ARCH	100%	20.2%	8.3%	91.7%	17.6%			8.3%	91.7%
CE	100%	3.6%	7.7%	92.3%	21.1%		7.7%		92.3%
CHEG	100%	5.1%	9.1%	90.9%	21.8%		9.1%	9.1%	81.8%
CSE	100%	11.2%		100%	10.8%				100%
EE	100%	2.5%		100%	20.5%		16.7%		83.3%
FY									
PE	100%			100%					100%
LW		24.6%			9%				
LONL	100%			100%					100%
ZOFC	100%		21.7%	78.3%		4.3%	4.3%	4.3%	87%
SC									
BIOL	100%	25.6%	9.1%	90.9%	8.4%		4.5%		95.5%
CHEM	100%	13.5%	4%	96%	11%	4%	4%		92%
MATH	100%	12.5%	10.7%	89.3%	10.5%		10.7%	7.1%	82.1%
PHYS	100%	6%	5.9%	94.1%	9%		8.8%		91.2%
TOTAL	100%		14.3%	85.7%		1.6%	4.8%	2.1%	91.6%



# Documentation

	Total	Women Available	Women	Men	Minority Available	Black	Asian	Hispanic	White
Non-Regular									
AL									
AMST	100%		25%	75%					100%
ANTH	100%			100%					100%
ART	100%		42.9%	57.1%		14.3%			85.7%
CORE	100%		25%	75%					100%
COTH	100%			100%					100%
ECON	100%			100%					100%
ENGL	100%		50%	50%					100%
FWP	100%		64.7%	35.3%		5.9%			94.1%
GOVT	100%			100%					100%
HIST	100%		33.3%	66.7%					100%
LLCO	100%			100%			100%		
LLGR	100%		66.7%	33.3%					100%
LLR	100%		75%	25%					100%
LON	100%			100%					100%
MUS	100%		14.3%	85.7%					100%
PHIL	100%		33.3%	66.7%					100%
PLS	100%		50%	50%					100%
PSY	100%		31.3%	68.8%				6.3%	93.8%
SOC	100%			100%					100%
THEO	100%		25%	75%					100%
ZOFC	17.6%		5.9%	11.8%					17.6%
BA									
ACCT	100%		25%	75%					100%
FIN	100%		33.3%	66.7%					100%
LONB	100%			100%					100%
MARK	100%			100%					100%
MGT	100%		25%	75%			8.3%		91.7%
ZOFC	5.9%			5.9%					5.9%
EG									
AME	100%			100%					100%
ARCH	100%			100%					100%
CE	100%			100%					100%
CHEG	100%			100%					100%
CSE	100%			100%			20%		80%
EE	100%			100%					100%
ROME	100%			100%					100%
ZOFC	5.9%			5.9%					5.9%
LW									
ZOFC	70.6%		11.8%	58.8%		5.9%			64.7%
SC									
BIOL	100%		10.5%	89.5%				5.3%	94.7%
CHEM	100%			100%					100%
MATH	100%			100%					100%
W1									
RAD	100%			100%					100%
TOTAL	100%		24.9%	75.1%		1.6%	1.6%	1%	95.9%

# Documentation

Table 4A: Counts

1991-92 Library Faculty Primary Appointment Must Be Library by College

	Total	Women Available	Women	Men	Minority Available	Black	Asian	Hispanic	White
Regular									
LW	8		4	4		2			6
U3	33		17	16			1	1	31
Total	41		21	20		2	1	1	37
Non-Regular									
U3	1		1						1
Total	1		1						1

Table 4A: Percentages (Base=Status)

1991-92 Library Faculty Primary Appointment Must Be Library by College

	Total	Women Available	Women	Men	Minority Available	Black	Asian	Hispanic	White
Regular									
LW	19.5%		9.8%	9.8%		4.9%			14.6%
U3	80.5%		41.5%	39%			2.4%	2.4%	75.6%
Total	100%		51.2%	48.8%		4.9%	2.4%	2.4%	90.2%
Non-Regular									
U3	100%		100%						100%
Total	100%		100%						100%

# The Graduate School Research Division

## Current Publications and Other Scholarly Works

Current publications should be mailed to the Research Division of the Graduate School, Room 312, Main Building.

### COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS

#### Economics

- Dutt, Amitava K.  
A.K. Dutt. 1992. Review of Conflict and Effective Demand in Economic Growth, by P. Skott. *Journal of Economic Literature*. 30(1):201-202.  
A.K. Dutt. 1992. Keynes, Market Forms and Competition. Pages 129-148 in, B. Gerrard and J. Hillard, eds., *The Philosophy and Economics of J.M. Keynes*. Edward Elgar, Aldershot, Hants., United Kingdom.  
Wilber, Charles K.  
C.K. Wilber and L.M. Grimes. 1992. Analyzing the Moral Defense of Free Market Capitalism, Part II: On Brian Griffiths, Mrs. Thatcher's Christian Economic Adviser. *New Oxford Review* 59(3):8-15.

#### English

- Vanden Bossche, Chris R.  
C.R. Vanden Bossche. 1992. Review of Victorian Sages and Cultural Discourse, by T. Morgan. *Victorian Studies* 35(2):236-238.

#### Philosophy

- McInerny, Ralph M.  
R.M. McInerny. 1991. Natural Law and Human Rights. *American Journal of Jurisprudence* 36:1-14.  
R.M. McInerny. 1992. St. Thomas Aquinas (1225?-1274). Pages 1244-1246 in, L. Becker and C. Becker, *Encyclopedia of Ethics*, Vol. II. Garland Publishing Company, New York, New York.  
R.M. McInerny. 1992. *Le Demon de Midi*. (Translation of *The Noonday Devil*) Editions Axel Noel. Paris, France. 305 pp.  
R.M. McInerny. 1992. Peter Abelard. Pages 1-2 in, L. Becker and C. Becker, eds., *Encyclopedia of Ethics*, Vol. I. Garland Publishing Company, New York, New York.  
R.M. McInerny. 1991. Foreword. Pages vii-ix in, *The Last Ugly Person and Other Stories*, by R.B. Thomas. Ignatius Press, San Francisco, California.

#### Psychology

- Howard, George S.  
G.S. Howard, T.D. Curtin and A.J. Johnson. 1991. Point Estimation Techniques in Psychological Research: The Role of Meaning in Self-Determined Action. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 38:219-226.  
G.S. Howard. 1991. Culture Tales: A Narrative Approach to Thinking, Cross-Cultural Psychology, and Psychotherapy. *American Psychologist* 46:188-197.  
R.E. Bartholomew, K. Basterfield and G.S. Howard. 1991. UFO Abductees and Contactees: Psychopathology or Fantasy-Proneness. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice* 22:211-219.  
G.S. Howard. 1991. Stop the Presses! I Think My Research Is Pseudoempirical. *Psychological Inquiry* 2:347-350.  
G.S. Howard and P.R. Myers. 1991. Philosophy of Science and Counseling Research. Pages 33-47 in, E. Watkins and L. Schneider, *New Directions in Counseling Research*. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey.  
G.S. Howard, P.R. Myers and T.D. Curtin. 1991. Can Science Furnish Evidence of Human Freedom? Self-Determination Versus Conformity in Human Action. *International Journal of Personal Construct Psychology* 4:371-395.

#### Theology

- Bradshaw, Paul F.  
P.F. Bradshaw. 1991. Zebah Todah and the Origins of the Eucharist. *Ecclesia Orans* 8(3):245-260.  
Coll, Regina A., CSJ  
R.A. Coll, CSJ. 1992. *Supervision of Ministry Students*. Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota. 128 pp.  
Cunningham, Lawrence S.  
L.S. Cunningham. 1992. Response to Lloyd Young. *International Papers in Pastoral Ministry* 3(1):6-8.  
L.S. Cunningham. 1992. *Catholic Prayer* (Paperback 1992). Crossroad, New York, New York. 208 pp.  
L.S. Cunningham. 1992. The Early Days: Religious Booknotes. *Commonweal* 119(March 13):40-44.  
L.S. Cunningham. 1992. Of Dandies and Pilgrims: Religious Booknotes. *Commonweal* 119(Feb. 28):28-30.  
L.S. Cunningham. 1992. Review of Systematic Theology, Vol. 2, by Fiorenza/Galvin. *Commonweal* Feb. 14:30-31.  
Melloh, John A., SM  
J.A. Melloh, SM. 1992. Review of Jewish Prayer. The Origins of Christian Liturgy, by C. DiSante. *Homiletic*.  
J.A. Melloh, SM. 1992. Review of *The Monk's Tale: A Biography of Godfrey Diekmann, OSB.*, by K. Hughes, RSCJ. *Worship*.  
White, James F.  
J.F. White. 1992. The Minister's Bookshelf: Worship. *Quarterly Review* 12(Spring):73-80.

# The Graduate School Research Division

## COLLEGE OF SCIENCE

### Chemistry and Biochemistry

Castellino, Francis J.

See under deSerrano, Vesna S. 1992. *Archives of Biochemistry and Biophysics* 294(1):282-290.

Creary, Xavier

X. Creary, H.N. Hatoum, A. Barton and T.E. Aldridge. 1992. Solvolytic Elimination Reactions of Tertiary  $\alpha$ -CSNMe<sub>2</sub>-Substituted Systems. *Journal of Organic Chemistry* 57:1887-1897.

deSerrano, Vesna S.

V.S. deSerrano, N. Manhart and F.J. Castellino. 1992. Expression, Purification, and Characterization of the Recombinant Kringle 1 Domain from Tissue-Type Plasminogen Activator. *Archives of Biochemistry and Biophysics* 294(1):282-290.

Gellene, Gregory I.

K.S. Griffith and G.I. Gellene. 1992. Symmetry Restrictions in Diatom/Diatom Reactions. II. Nonmass-Dependent Isotope Effects in the Formation of O<sub>4</sub>. *Journal of Chemical Physics* 96(6):4403-4411.

G.I. Gellene. 1992. Symmetry Restrictions in Diatom/Diatom Reactions. I. Group Theoretical Analysis. *Journal of Chemical Physics* 96(6):4387-4402.

George, Manapurathu V.

B. Patrick, M.V. George, P.V. Kamat, S. Das, K.G. Thomas. 1992. Photochemistry of Squaraine Dyes: Excited States and Reduced and Oxidized Forms of 4-(4-Acetyl-3,5-dimethylpyrrol-2-ylidene)-2-(4-acetyl-3,5-dimethylpyrrol-2-yl)-3-oxocyclobut-1-en-1-olate†. *Journal of the Chemical Society, Faraday Transactions* 88(5):671-676.

Haller, Kenneth J.

See under Scheidt, W. Robert. 1992. *Inorganic Chemistry* 31:939-941.

Mozumder, Asokendu

See under RADIATION LABORATORY; LaVerne, Jay A. 1992. *Radiation Research* 129:362-364.

Scheidt, W. Robert

W.R. Scheidt, H. Song, K.J. Haller, M.K. Safo, R.D. Orosz, C.A. Reed, P.G. Debrunner and C.E. Schulz. 1992. Characterization of Fe(OEP)  $\pi$ -Cation Radicals. *Inorganic Chemistry* 31:939-941.

Schuler, Robert H.

See under RADIATION LABORATORY; LaVerne, Jay A. 1992. *Journal of Physical Chemistry* 96:2588-2593.

### Physics

Blackstead, Howard A.

H.A. Blackstead. 1992. Phase-Slip Resistivity in Superconducting Crystalline YBa<sub>2</sub>Cu<sub>3</sub>O<sub>7.8</sub>: A Manifestation of Nano-Granularity. *Journal of Superconductivity* 5:67-74.

Garg, Umesh

I.G. Bearden, R.V.F. Janssens, M.P. Carpenter, E.F. Moore, I. Ahmad, A.M. Baxter, Ph. Benet, P.J. Daly, M.W. Drigert, P.B. Fernandez, U. Garg, Z.W. Grabowski, T.L. Khoo, T. Lauritsen, W. Reviol and D. Ye. 1992. Characterization of the Superdeformed Band in <sup>189</sup>Hg. *Zeitschrift für Physik A* 341:491-492.

## COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

### Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering

Powers, Joseph M.

J.M. Powers and D.S. Stewart. 1992. Approximate Solutions for Oblique Detonations in the Hypersonic Limit. *AIAA Journal* 30(3):726-736.

Yang, Kwang-tzu

Y.C. Michael and K.T. Yang. 1992. Limited View Mach-Zehnder Interferometric Tomography for Three-Dimensional Temperature Reconstruction. *Experimental Thermal and Fluid Science, International Journal of Experimental Heat Transfer, Thermodynamics and Fluid Mechanics* 5(2):175-181.

### Electrical Engineering

Choudhary, Krishna M.

K.M. Choudhary, P. Seshadri and J. Bae. 1992. X-Ray Diffraction Studies of Dy<sub>1.1</sub>Ba<sub>1.9</sub>Cu<sub>3</sub>O<sub>7.8</sub>(001) and Dy<sub>1.3</sub>Ba<sub>1.7</sub>Cu<sub>3</sub>O<sub>y</sub>(001) High-Temperature-Superconductor Thin Films. *Physical Review B* 45:4892-4896.

J. Bae, P. Seshadri and K.M. Choudhary. 1992. Molecular Beam Deposition of Dy<sub>1</sub>Ba<sub>2</sub>Cu<sub>3</sub>O<sub>7.8</sub>(001) High Temperature Superconductor Thin Films. *Journal of Vacuum Science and Technology A* 10(2):281-283.

## COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

### Accounting

Ricchiute, David N.

D.N. Ricchiute. 1992. Auditing. South-Western Publishing Company, Cincinnati, Ohio. xxii + 805 pp.

### RADIATION LABORATORY

LaVerne, Jay A.

J.A. LaVerne, R.H. Schuler and G. Foldiak. 1992. Intratrack Reactions of Cyclohexyl Radicals in the Heavy Ion Radiolysis of Cyclohexane. *Journal of Physical Chemistry* 96(6):2588-2593.

See under Pimblott, Simon M. 1992. *Radiation Research* 129:265-271.

J.A. LaVerne and A. Mozumder. 1992. Comments on the Simulation of the Passage of Fast Electrons in Water. *Radiation Research* 129:362-364.

# The Graduate School Research Division

---

Pimblott, Simon M.

S.M. Pimblott and J.A. LaVerne. 1992. Molecular Product Formation in the Electron Radiolysis of Water. *Radiation Research* 129:265-271.

Kamat, Prashant V.

See under COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, Chemistry and Biochemistry; George, Manapurathu V. 1992. *Journal of the Chemical Society, Faraday Transactions* 88(5):671-676.

## UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Havlik, Robert J.

R.J. Havlik. 1992. Engineering and Technology. Pages 424-446 in, B. Katz and L.S. Katz, eds., *Magazines for Libraries*, Seventh Edition. R.R. Bowker, New Providence, New Jersey.

R.L. Buchan and R.J. Havlik. 1992. Aeronautics and Space Science. Pages 49-60 in, B. Katz and L.S. Katz, *Magazines for Libraries*, Seventh Edition. R.R. Bowker, New Providence, New Jersey.

---

# Notre Dame

---

# R E P O R T

---

---

**Volume 21, Number 17**

**May 15, 1992**

**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, Office of the Provost. Second-class postage paid at Notre Dame, Indiana.  
*Postmaster:* Please send address corrections to: Records Clerk, Department of Human Resources, Brownson Hall, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556.

Linda M. Diltz, Editor  
Marten Schalm, Designer  
Willa Murphy, Layout  
Publications and Graphic Services  
415 Main Building  
Notre Dame, IN 46556  
(219) 239-5337

© 1992 by the University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556. All rights reserved.

---