



Notre Dame

R E P O R T

Contents:

September 25, 1992

Faculty Notes

- 31 *Faculty Appointments*
- 31 *Faculty Honors*
- 32 *Faculty Activities*

Documentation

- 34 *Opening Mass Homily*
- 35 *Colloquy for the Year 2000*
- 43 *Academic Council Minutes*
April 22, 1992
- 48 *University Libraries' Hours*
October 16-25, 1992

The Graduate School

- 49 *Current Publications and Other Scholarly Works*

3

1992-93

Faculty Notes

Appointments

- Edward E. Augustine Jr., assistant dean, Graduate School
- Douglas E. Bradley, assistant director for business affairs, Snite Museum of Art
- Steven A. Buechler, associate chair, mathematics
- Kevin J. Christiano, chair, sociology
- Edward J. Conlon, chair, management
- Matthew S. Cullinan, assistant to the president
- Stephen M. Fallon, chair, Program of Liberal Studies
- Christopher B. Fox, chair, English
- Sonia Gernes, director, Notre Dame-Australia program (spring)
- Alexander J. Hahn, director, Notre Dame Innsbruck program
- William J. Kremer Jr., chair, art, art history and design
- Howard P. Lanser, director, Notre Dame-Australia program (fall)
- George A. Lopez, John M. Regan Jr. acting director, Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies
- Louis A. MacKenzie Jr., acting chair, romance languages and literatures
- Thomas V. Merluzzi, director, Center for Gerontological Education, Research and Services
- Col. Thomas Nelson Moe, chair, aerospace studies
- Carol A. Mooney, associate dean, law
- Lt. Col. James J. O'Brien Jr., chair, military science
- Sharon L. O'Brien, chair, government and international studies
- Harold L. Pace, University registrar
- Daniel J. Sheerin, chair, classical and oriental languages and literatures
- Roland B. Smith Jr., director, Institute for Urban Studies
- Stephen B. Spiro, assistant director for academics, Snite Museum of Art
- Lawrence R. Taylor, chair, mathematics
- Diane Wilson, assistant dean, Graduate School

Honors

Alan Dowty, professor of government and international studies, was elected vice-chairman of the Regional Advisory Council, Anti-Defamation League in July.

Robert C. Johansen, professor of government and international studies and senior fellow in the Kroc Institute, has been given visiting scholar status during the 1992-93 academic year at Harvard University's Center for International Affairs, and the Program on Nonviolent Sanctions in Conflict and Defense, for his research on how religious traditions sanction and constrain collective violence.

Catherine Mowry LaCugna, associate professor of theology, has received the First Place Award for 1992 by the Catholic Press Association, for *God for Us: The Trinity and Christian Life* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1991). That book was also chosen by the Catholic Book Club as the selection of the month. Seattle University has honored her by naming the award to the outstanding graduating theology major the "LaCugna Award."

James S. O'Rourke, associate professional specialist in business administration and concurrent associate professor of management, has been elected to the Ethics Committee of the Association for Business Communication. He will represent the Midwest Region and will serve a three-year term.

Faculty Notes

Activities

Charlene S. Avallone, assistant professor of English, presented a paper on Margaret Fuller's feminist philosophy and Native American culture and chaired the panel on Canon Transformation and Herman Melville at the annual convention of the American Literature Association in San Diego, Calif., May 30.

Frederick J. Crosson, Cavanaugh professor in the Program of Liberal Studies, gave the invited paper "Show and Tell in Augustine's *De magistro*" at Lectio Augustini meeting in Pavia, Italy, April 23.

Alan Dowty, professor of government and international studies, delivered a paper on "Building a Civic State: Israel's First Decade" at the Rich seminar "Israel: The First Decade of Independence" at the Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies in Oxford, England, July 8-30. He delivered the paper "The Political and Military Implications of the Gulf War in the Emerging New World Order" at a conference on "The New Asian-Pacific Era and Korea" at the Korean Association of International Studies in Seoul, Korea, Aug. 20-22. Dowty delivered a lecture on "The Future of the Middle East and the Peace Process" under the auspices of the Middle East Institute of Japan at the Foreign Press Center in Tokyo, Japan, Aug. 27. He was a speaker at the round table discussion "Focus on Israel: President Bush's Middle East Security Policy in Global and Regional Perspectives" at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association in Chicago, Ill., Sept. 3-6.

Mary Gerhart, visiting professor of theology, presented the paper "Mathematics, Empirical Science, and Theology" co-authored with A. M. Russell at the 10th anniversary conference Building Bridges Between Science and Theology: The Second Decade of the Center for Theology and the Natural Sciences at the University of California at Berkeley, Calif., April 4. She gave the keynote address "Framing Discourse for the Future" at the conference Plotting the Paths Forward: The Future of Women in Religion at the University of Calgary, Canada, Sept. 19.

Sonia Goltz, assistant professor of management, served as a delegate for the People to People International's Citizen Ambassador Program, member of the Small Business and Management Delegation to Russia and the Baltics. The delegation met with Chambers of Commerce, Small Business Associations, and university professors in Moscow, Russia; Riga, Latvia; and Tallinn, Estonia, Aug. 1-13. Discussions focused on the progress being made in small business development and the training currently being provided to managers and entrepreneurs.

Davide A. Hill, assistant professor of chemical engineering, gave the presentation "Study of Flow-Induced Fractionation in Cis-Polyisoprene Melts by Normal-Mode Microdielectrometry" at the eleventh international congress on Rheology in Brussels, Belgium, Aug. 17-21.

Carlos Jerez-Farrán, associate professor of romance languages and literatures, presented "Mari-Gaila y la espiritualización de la materia: Una revaloración de *Divinas palabras* de Valle-Inclán" at the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese in Cancún, Mexico, Aug. 11. He presented "La homofobia internalizada en *El público* de García Lorca" to the Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas at the University of California in Irvine, Calif., Aug. 28.

Robert C. Johansen, professor of government and international studies and senior fellow in the Kroc Institute, served as a discussant for "Religious Perspectives on the Use of Force after the Gulf War" at the U.S. Institute of Peace in Washington, D.C., March 19. He served as chair and discussant for the symposium "Security Policies in the New World Order" co-sponsored by the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies and the World Order Models Project at the University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind., March 20-21. He presented the paper "Tradeoffs Between Military Values and Democratic Values in an Evolving World Order" at the International Studies Association annual convention in Atlanta, Ga., April 1. Johansen gave the keynote address "Building Consensus Among Conflicting Visions of World Order" to the International Consultation, Theology in Global Context Association, co-sponsored by the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States, McCormick Theological Seminary and the Fourth Presbyterian Church in Chicago, Ill., April 26. He was a panelist for the U.S. Institute of Peace Workshop on Perspectives of Multilateral Cooperation "Toward a Collective Response to Common Problems" and chair of the session on "Institutional Forms of Multilateral Cooperation" in Washington, D.C., June 17.

Catherine Mowry LaCugna, associate professor of theology, served as a respondent to the panel discussion of *God For Us. The Trinity and Christian Life* at the Catholic Theological Society of America meeting in Pittsburgh, Pa., June 14. She lectured on "The Church: Icon of the Trinity" and "The Church: Standing on Holy Ground?" at St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn., July 20-21. She preached the sermon "We Have Given Up Everything to Follow You. What Then Will We Have?" at Boe Chapel, St. Olaf College, July 21. Twice she was a panelist at the St. Olaf Theology and Music Conference, July 22-23.

Faculty Notes

Rev. Richard P. McBrien, Crowley-O'Brien-Walter professor of theology, presented "The Future of the Church: Looking Toward the 21st Century" to the North Deanery Adult Education Program at St. Matthew Church in Indianapolis, Ind., April 30. He presented "Our Church Today: Upholding and Challenging our Traditions" at the third annual conference of the Coalition of Concerned Canadian Catholics in Toronto, Canada, May 2. He gave the keynote address "The Future of the Church: Catholic Faith for a New Century and a New Millennium" at the fifth annual conference on Church Renewal (CORPUS) in Chicago, Ill., June 12. McBrien presented "The Future of the Church: Looking Toward the 21st Century" to the Jewish/Catholic Dialogue Group in Chicago, Ill., June 16.

Ralph McInerny, Grace professor of medieval studies, director of the Maritain Center and professor of philosophy, gave the keynote address "Academic Community — The Creative Academic" to the faculty of Evansville University in Evansville, Ind., Aug. 25.

Walter Nugent, Tackes professor of history, presented a paper on "New-World Frontiers: Comparisons and an Agenda" at a conference on the 500th anniversary of the Columbus voyage sponsored by the Historical Society of Israel in Jerusalem, June 30.

Rev. Edward D. O'Connor, C.S.C., associate professor of theology, gave the lecture series "The Christian Life" at the Franciscan Friary in Libertyville, Ill., July 20-24. He lectured on "Conchita, Model of Christian Motherhood" at the conference on Christian Motherhood in Kalamazoo, Mich., Aug. 15. He gave the lecture "Why Theologians Must Look Seriously at Apparitions" at the International Mariological Congress in Huelva, Spain, Sept. 23.

Rev. Thomas O'Meara, O.P., Warren professor of theology, gave the panel presentation "University Doctoral Programs and Seminary Faculties" at the Lilly consultation on the Education of Faculty for Seminaries at the Auburn Theological Seminary in New York, New York, June 20.

James S. O'Rourke, associate professional specialist in business administration and concurrent associate professor of management, delivered an invited presentation on "Critical Thinking and the Writing Process in Government Communication" to the 1992 Public Affairs Conference of the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs in Chicago, Ill., Aug. 26.

James H. Seckinger, director of the National Institute for Trial Advocacy and professor of law, served as program coordinator and a faculty member for the New Zealand Law Society Teacher Training Programme at the Central Institute of Technology in Heretaunga, New Zealand, Aug. 14-16. He gave a lecture to the faculty on Effective Teaching Techniques.

Stephen C. Tegler, visiting faculty fellow in physics, and **Terrence W. Rettig**, associate professor of physics were guest observers at the NASA 3-meter Infrared Telescope Facility on Mauna Kea, Hawaii, April 19-21 and Aug. 2-4. The data resulting from the observations will provide information on the abundance of frozen CO and XCN in precometary disks around young T Tauri stars.

G. N. R. Tripathi, professional specialist in the Radiation Laboratory, presented the papers "Time-Resolved Raman Spectroscopy of Parabenzosemiquinone Radical Anion in Aqueous Solution" co-authored by **Robert H. Schuler**, director of the Radiation Laboratory and Zahm professor of radiation chemistry, "Time-Resolved Raman Study of the Hydration Effects on the O₃ Radical Structure" co-authored by Yali Su, and "Time-Resolved Raman Study of the Initial Chemical Steps in the OH Radical Reaction with Para Dimethoxybenzene. Electron Transfer vs. Adduct Formation" at the 13th international conference on Raman Spectroscopy in Wurzburg, Germany, Aug. 31-Sept. 4.

Eugene Ulrich, professor of theology, as president of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, organized and presided over the 24th meeting of the IOSCS in Paris, France, July 17-18. He gave the invited presentation "What the Biblical Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4 Teach Us About the Bible" as one of the two principal papers at the inaugural meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies at the College de France in Paris, France, July 19. He offered a paper titled "The Palaeo-Hebrew Scrolls from Cave 4" at the meeting of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament in Paris, France, July 21.

Kwang-tzu Yang, Hank professor of aerospace and mechanical engineering presented a paper titled "A Study of Natural Convection in a Rotating Enclosure" and attended several committee meetings at the National Heat Transfer Conference in San Diego, Calif., Aug. 9-12. Yang is the Technical Program Chairman-Designate of the 1993 National Heat Transfer Conference to be held during the summer of 1993 in Atlanta, Ga. He also visited the UCLA new Heat Transfer Laboratory.

Opening Mass Homily for the 151st Academic Year August 30, 1992

by Timothy O'Meara, Provost

Readings

First Reading: Sirach 3: 17-18, 20, 28-29

Responsorial Psalm: Psalm 34: 2-3, 17-18, 19, 23

Second Reading: Hebrews 12: 18-19, 22-24

Gospel: Luke 14: 1, 7-14

My Friends,

We come together this morning to open the new academic year in prayer just as the faculty has always done since the early days of the University. In fact the first opening Mass on record was in 1868 which predated the building of this church. Our celebration is sign and symbol of the essence of Notre Dame — an intellectual life, a spiritual life, an ideal of integrating the two. Faith seeking understanding is in fact characteristic of our tradition. It goes back to Job arguing with God about his lot; to the monastic tradition of the middle ages; to *fides quaerens intellectum* of St. Anselm; to the founding of the first universities in Salerno, Bologna and Paris; to Thomas Aquinas; to John Henry Newman and his idea of a university. In fact it is a constant thread in our relationship with God.

Insofar as we dedicate our lives to seeking truth, to seeking God, our work becomes a holy thing, a sacrament. This is especially evident in a university where through our writings, research, discoveries and inventions we participate in God's creation through building the earth and reaching out to the awesome universe.

There are three readings from scripture in this morning's liturgy. They are not chosen specifically for the opening Mass, but rather for this particular Sunday, and so they are being read this day at churches throughout the world. God speaks to us through scripture, and it is our challenge to understand the message as it applies to us as individuals and on this occasion to us as a university community.

The first reading is from the book of Sirach. We must conduct our affairs with humility. We must humble ourselves. What a concept in an intellectual environment! What a conundrum in a Catholic university! What a temptation to change the readings!

Humility has a miserable reputation in our society. Even the word has been debased. Humility is no longer regarded as a virtue. When did you last see it mentioned in a public

relations document? What role does it play in our own long-range planning? Let us look for the true meaning of humility, not in its synonyms but in its antonyms. Humble is the opposite of arrogant, of boastful, of haughty, of pompous. Humility is not presuming, not pretentious, not proud. Indeed,

*There is no cure for the malady of the proud
since an evil growth has taken root in them.*

And where is this evil growth of the proud? In their hearing. They are so absorbed with themselves, they do not have an attentive ear, they cannot learn, they have no self-knowledge, they do not have knowledge of their own size, they even presume to compete with God.

In the end then humility is knowing who we are. We must have a clarity of vision, a calmness of spirit about ourselves and the human condition. This is important for all, but in a special way for those in positions of authority since pride is an occupational hazard for those with power. Authority can be exercised as a leader in society, in the church, in academe; as a politician, a teacher, a researcher, an author; and of course as a parent. We are warned:

The greater you are, the more you must humble yourself.

So the reading does indeed speak to us about authority. Authority is not the problem, only its misuse. Authority must be just. Authority must not be arrogant, not arbitrary, not self-serving, not based on ignorance, not based on title. It must show no favoritism. Authority must be based on knowledge, on justice, on truth, on understanding, on compassion. Recalling further from the reading that

*The mind of the intelligent will reflect on parables,
an attentive ear is the sage's dream,*

we must continue to grow in knowledge of our faith. In exercising our authority, we must have an attentive ear; we must avoid confrontation; we must be wise, disarming of hostility, concerned with the good of the community.

And what is the community? Let us turn to the second reading which is part of a long discussion in the letter to the Hebrews which describes the perfect community, the new Jerusalem, the coming of the kingdom of God. The reading starts with a summary of what the kingdom is not: It cannot be touched, it is not a blazing fire, it is not gloom turning to total darkness, it is not a storm, not a thundering trumpet, not a great voice booming which makes everyone beg that no more be said. It is not showbiz. Then we are told what the kingdom is. If 20th-century society were the kingdom of God, all of us would have been made perfect with the full and equal status of first borns — Armenians and Azerbaijanis; Serbs and Croats; big nations and small;

Documentation

men and women; blacks and whites. In the university we would find a perfect faculty, with no professorial rank. In this new Jerusalem, Muslims and Jews, Catholics and Protestants, people of all religions and all races would have full and equal status as first borns. Society itself would be classless. In fact, there would be no status at all, not by race, color, creed, gender, connections or pecking order. That of course is not the way it is. But that is the way it will be when we are all perfect in the kingdom to come.

The parable of the wedding feast, in contrast, is much more sensitive to human frailty. There are after all seats of honor at the wedding feast. Just don't go early and rearrange the place cards. So status exists, but we must not seek it for its own sake nor to press our own advantage. Further, even though we live in the secular city with all its pomp and circumstance, we can still be motivated by the vision held out in today's Gospel — of a world in which we are all guests and *all*, regardless of rank, are invited to gather at the banquet table as we are doing at this very moment. So we must not simply wait for the heavenly kingdom. We must constantly be working toward its realization. God has placed the transformation of the world, the building of the earth, in our hands.

I am grateful that preparing this homily has lead me to reflect one more time on the intellectual life, on spiritual values, on authority and leadership, on our sense of community. More importantly, it has made me take some quiet time to think through anew the conundrums presented by our reality and our ideal. All of us present today — Catholics, Protestants, Muslims, Jews, people of all religions and all races, faculty of all disciplines — are united as we sit together as brothers and sisters at this table. Let us pray that during the coming academic year we are responsive to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit as we participate, as we humbly participate, in revitalizing our intellectual and spiritual commitments, in building the earth and in realizing the kingdom of God.

Colloquy for the Year 2000

Committee on Academic Life

May 12, 1992

Prof. O'Meara presented for approval the executive committee's consolidation of the subcommittees into the following: Subcommittee on the Faculty, Academic Mission and Catholic Character; Subcommittee on Students, Teaching and Learning; and Subcommittee on Research, Scholarship and Infrastructure (see Appendix). He explained that the subcommittees are to prepare pre-reports from which the entire committee can draft the final report on academic life. The purpose, he said, of the committee's two open-forum meetings—the first on April 15 and the second today—has been to get everyone's ideas on the table so that they may be taken into account by the appropriate subcommittees. Any further comments or ideas anyone has on various topics should be sent in writing to the chairs of the subcommittees. He said there were questions that he himself intended to raise, including **teaching loads, faculty rewards, and disciplinary procedures**. He also said he would like to visit with each committee. The reports from the subcommittees, he said, would be due by the third week in June. In the meantime, all the reports from the deans and their colleges and the directors and their units would be assembled and distributed to each committee member to be considered, along with the task force reports, in the deliberations of the subcommittees. What are expected from the subcommittees, he emphasized, are sets of recommendations, perhaps detailed, perhaps as brief as a single sentence, that should become the major recommendations of the committee's report. Today, he continued, it would be best that people raise questions outside the province of their own subcommittees, that is, address those issues they will not have an opportunity to address in their own subcommittees. Also, he said, he hoped that in this discussion the committee would hear more from those who had spoken little in previous meetings. The first topic to be considered was graduate studies, he said, and he asked Prof. Van Engen to lead off.

The dialogue proceeded as follows:

Prof. Van Engen: We've come quite a considerable distance in graduate studies in the last five or six years. But we need to set specific goals for what it is that we intend to do in the next 10 to 12 years, what contribution we can make in graduate studies in what specific areas, and how we need to do it. For the sciences and engineering I assume that involves a lot of **infrastructure**. In Arts and Letters it involves a lot of **library and stipend** questions, and it involves our setting for ourselves a **profile** of the kind of student that we want to turn out. What have they written? What are they prepared to teach? How do they fit into where their disci-

Documentation

pline is headed these days? We have to be very keenly aware of these questions, and if we are, then at least in certain areas—I know my own best—we can be very competitive. But we have to have a sharp edge in terms of what we're going to do and where these people are going to fit in, and we must provide the necessary environment and have the funds to make it happen.

Prof. Aprahamian: In physics we're happy with the way things are progressing. Our students are getting better each year and we have a better pool of applicants to choose from and they're going to very good places once they leave Notre Dame. Our recent graduates are going to Berkeley, national labs, good universities, so we've placed our students very well in the three years that I have been here.

Prof. O'Meara: If you had one wish for graduate studies, what would that be?

Prof. Aprahamian: More stipends for graduate students.

Prof. O'Meara solicited Jennifer McRedmond's opinion about a conflict between graduate and undergraduate studies.

Jennifer McRedmond: I don't think there's a conflict. I think they complement each other. I suppose there's potential for conflict, but as long as we're very keenly aware that a conflict could exist and we try to keep undergraduate and graduate studies both on front burners, then no, I don't see a conflict.

Prof. O'Meara: You don't share the fear of some that undergraduate studies are threatened by an increased emphasis on graduate programs?

Jennifer McRedmond: I think there are things that must be dealt with. If class sizes continue to increase, then that's a threat, and the same will be true if most students are taught by adjuncts—and I know there are very good adjuncts, but I think we're becoming increasingly dependent upon them.

David Lutz: I don't see a big conflict between the two, although I do think, as almost everybody agrees, we're going to need to hire more faculty in order to keep the size of undergraduate classes reasonable. My only serious problem with the graduate versus undergraduate, or research versus teaching, issue is what our motives are in trying to become a national research University and whether they are in fact the right motives. But I think research rightly understood, or graduate programs rightly understood, certainly are compatible with an outstanding undergraduate program.

Prof. O'Meara: Where did you come here from?

David Lutz: I earned my undergraduate degree at West Point.

Prof. O'Meara: After your army service, you applied to our philosophy department. Why did you pick us?

David Lutz: I think all the Christian philosophers in the country know that Notre Dame is the best Christian Ph.D. philosophy program.

Prof. O'Meara: Why did you go to the business school then?

David Lutz: I think there's a great need to bridge the gulf that now exists between philosophy as an academic discipline and management as a profession, and for historical reasons going back for centuries, there has been a wedge that has widened and widened until now it's almost two different worlds. So I think it's divine providence that has led me, but what I'm trying to do is combine those two fields of study in such a way that one can enrich the other.

Dean Michel: In terms of graduate studies, we are a small University, so therefore it is very important that we utilize our resources very efficiently in research and graduate studies. This to me means that we should be looking at opportunities for interdisciplinary efforts much, much more than we now do, and the reason perhaps that we are not doing that is because of structural obstacles. Of course, speaking as an engineer, my interests would be in our college interacting much more with the College of Science. We have made progress in this area, but I think we can do much more. Some of the finer private universities really excel in this area. I think it's very important, terribly important, in this Colloquy that we address our needs across college boundaries.

Prof. Van Engen: I've heard some humanities faculty say that we could never produce top 10 departments in science and engineering at Notre Dame because of the sheer cost of infrastructure, and that such rankings could only happen in some of the humanities departments where the cost of infrastructure is relatively less.

Dean Michel: Just the opposite has happened at Notre Dame. Some of the best departments in fact are in the College of Science and the College of Engineering. If the thesis is that it costs as much to educate a historian as it does an electrical engineer, then let's just be a liberal arts college. It is true that there are certain costs associated with science and engineering that you do not have with arts and letters. But consider, for example, some relatively small schools such as Cal Tech, Brown or Johns Hopkins, that are very good schools in a lot of things including science and engineering. In other words, they have managed. The question for us is, what is it that we want to do?

Prof. O'Meara: The way I read John's question is, to what extent can we succeed in climbing in the set of all electrical engineering departments in the country, given our limited

Documentation

resources, as distinct from our prospects in history, where the resources are not as necessary.

Dean Michel: I hate to talk about ranking, but if you aim to be in the top five in a discipline, it's very, very tough because you are going to have to be something to almost everybody. But I think—and it's true of any discipline—you certainly can aim for the top two dozen. What we have done in our college—and I believe the same is true in science—is that we have selected very carefully within a given discipline certain areas which are very important. You're not going to cover all areas in mechanical engineering here at Notre Dame, so you cover a few, and you decide you're going to be as good in those areas as anybody, and that can be done. But that also means, because of the way rankings are arrived at, that if you do not cover the entire spectrum, you are going to be hurt in these rankings. But the point is if we cover important areas, the few right areas, we are going to be very well respected and we will be up there.

Prof. Schmitz: I'm not sure it would be infrastructure that would hold us back, although in some areas that may be the case. More likely it would be the size of the operation that makes it more difficult, and therefore the focus has to be more intense. When Tony Michel mentioned the size of the faculty, we may have 25 electrical engineering faculty and certain large and distinguished state universities I know will have 125—but they wouldn't have more than 25 outstanding faculty or superstars. This means that we have to be very careful in faculty selection and promotions so that every single person in our faculty contributes. Then a faculty of 25, I would say, could compete with the impact nationally of a faculty of 100. It's not necessarily the cost, it's the intensity of the efforts and the sharpness of focus. A good starting point would be, what is the profile of an excellent department in the various disciplines we're talking about? What characterizes an excellent department? If you describe the top five around the country, what characteristics do they exhibit that those in the mediocre ranks don't have? Where are our shortcomings, so that we can compare ourselves? I think we would get different answers in different disciplines. We shouldn't say that there are priorities that spread across the whole University. We have to be more specific on priorities within colleges or departments. At one time we said **chaired professorships** are the highest priority for everyone. That may not be so anymore. By the same token, **endowed fellowships** may still be a top priority for everyone, or maybe not. In some departments there may be other things that make the crucial difference between where the department is now and where it could be. **Faculty development** might be the difference in some departments. And what does that mean? Some departments haven't a single faculty person who has ever been associated with a top-10 school. For that department to rise to top-10 status, does it mean that the faculty should be encouraged to take leaves of absence at a top-10 place? I think those answers vary from one department to another.

Prof. O'Meara: Suppose I were to raise the question of chaired professors. Have they been a good thing? Have they been a good thing in arts and letters?

Dean Attridge: I think they have overall.

Prof. O'Meara: Do you think so too, John?

Prof. Van Engen: Yes.

Prof. O'Meara: Naomi?

Prof. Meara: Yes.

Prof. O'Meara: Have they been a good thing in business?

Dean Keane: By and large yes, but now the financial strain being imposed by them is really beginning to tell. But they have been good additions.

Prof. Murphy: Some faculty view chaired professors as not really rolling up their sleeves and working with others, and of course there's always some of that, but I think there's also some merit to the argument. And it's a communication issue too.

Prof. O'Meara: What do you think in law, Tex?

Dean Dutile: Overall very positive. Some would not be here but for chairs. In any event, the chairs, even though I agree with Jack that not all are funded as well as others, have liberated money for other appointments that have had a great impact on the Law School.

Prof. O'Meara: Tony, what do you think about the chairs in engineering?

Dean Michel: I think it's been a tremendous resource to help us to improve, but we are now at the stage where our current philosophy on chairs, getting back to what Jack said, is such that we probably need about double the resources.

Prof. O'Meara: In science too there have been healthy developments, but we have tried to hire many, many individuals for chairs and they simply would not come because the resources weren't adequate. That might be the kind of question we should consider—the role of chairs, the funding of chairs. Chairs should be funded at the **\$2-million level**, not \$1 million. By and large, the University has done very well. It's been sporadic, but it's been a powerful force and, I think, has acted as a magnet in attracting other faculty as well. I personally believe, though, if we're going to continue to talk about chairs, that the Princeton model in which chaired professors teach undergraduates and freshmen as well as graduates, is what we should continue to be striving for.

Documentation

Prof. Meara: I think that the chairs have been very positive, and I think one of the biggest needs in graduate instruction here is the **intellectual infrastructure**. We don't have any **endowed post-doctorates**. The only post-docs we have are grant post-docs. I'm not saying we don't have some very good graduate students in some very good graduate programs, but I think the chairs were the first step and now I think we should have **endowed assistant professorships** and **endowed post-doctorates** that allow people to come for three years, maybe teach a course a term, get their research started, and it would help them in the job market.

Prof. O'Meara: We are beginning to get endowed assistant professorships.

Prof. Hatch: I would hate to see the University back away from chairs because I think in terms of being magnets for graduate students, they're superb. Certainly in the next campaign we need to endow assistant professorships as well. But we also need to continue the program with chairs.

Prof. Meara: I agree with that and also with Roger's point about faculty development. One way to do that is to bring good post-doctoral people through. That's a lot cheaper than sending people away who may or may not get retooled. To return to one of the original questions, I don't think there's an inherent conflict in graduate and undergraduate studies, but that certainly is the perception in a lot of quarters, and one of the things we need to do is make clear you cannot have a class undergraduate university without class graduate programs. You can have a class in a liberal arts college, but if we're going to say that we're a university, then the benefits for undergraduate students need to be spelled out.

Joanne Bessler: If we're trying to be a quality teaching institution, a strong undergraduate and research institution, then we do have to identify what we want to be strong in, and we can't please everybody. We have to decide what areas we want to target to be nationally famous for so that we can target our resources. Also, I would like us to find some **space for graduate students**. When we talk about creating a better intellectual climate at the University, I think that you can use space to help provide that, for seminar rooms and reading rooms and for graduate students in specific disciplines to get together. That use of space encourages intellectual discussions in other universities, and I would hope that we could do the same.

Deborah Grismer: I would recommend more of an **emphasis on teaching**, perhaps more rewards for good teaching.

Victoria Ploplis: I can only speak in terms of the College of Science and even within that, biology, biochemistry and chemistry. I was a graduate student back in '75 and I've seen a great change occur—an increase in young faculty in some of the sciences like molecular biology that has improved the

quality of the graduate students. Of course, what's always going to be a big issue is the question of stipend, but I see clearly that the quality of graduate students that we're getting now has a lot to do with the type of faculty we're paying and I've seen a big change in the last 15 years in that area.

Prof. O'Meara: We've got to be concerned about getting the word out that we've got good faculty here, and you can't do it in a totally PR way. You've got to have good faculty in fact, not just pretend you do. And then we also have to spread the word that we're turning out good Ph.D.s, and hope that they will find their ways into some of the better universities.

Dean Kolman: In graduate studies do we have **targets of opportunity** in departments or do we want all of our departments to be in the top 25, and how do we decide which areas we want to get ahead in, or are some so weak that it's not worth the effort to bring them up. There have to be one or two departments that are not verging on greatness.

Prof. Hatch: What I intend to propose is a two-fold strategy that the University have at least **four of its departments which are nationally ranked** in the next decade. At the same time, our base of graduate education is very limited. We have 23 doctoral fields; Vanderbilt, Duke and Brown, comparable schools, all have between 35 and 40, so I don't think it's a question of narrowing much. Rather, I think the **overall base has to be lifted**, even as one does have to find ways to have flagship departments. This is a process which is both entrepreneurial, that is, what departments can do, and it's a working between the administration and departments. The department alone can't decide, nor can the provost or anyone else decide by edict that a department is going to be great.

Prof. O'Meara: We're talking about graduate studies, and I'm wondering where in our subcommittee structure it fits.

Prof. Murphy: I think it fits in Research, Scholarship and Infrastructure, but I also just made a note that the type of faculty we have influences very much the emphasis on graduate programs. Actually, I think the subject is the responsibility of all three subcommittees.

Prof. Schmitz: There's no fundamental reason why every **single department couldn't be top ranking**. I don't believe from top down we would say we're going to put a big bang in resources here and make this department superb. I think with the right combination of hiring good faculty, recruiting good graduate students, making the best use of resources, and careful promotions, any department can rise. I don't believe we'd find that great universities around the country establish great departments by dumping a large quantity of their resources in certain spots. I don't think it works that way.

Documentation

Prof. Hatch: Well it certainly has worked that way at Duke in literature. It was one of the areas where their provost said, okay, there's a possibility here, and they got several new chairs and recruited big stars. It's very controversial, but they've gotten a lot of national attention by emerging in that field.

Prof. Schmitz: I'm sure there are instances of that, but there probably are many other instances where departments emerge as excellent due to departmental leadership.

Prof. O'Meara: An example of that here, to cite but one, is Romance Languages. Nobody encouraged them particularly, but they moved forth most significantly on their own initiative.

Dean Kolman: Roger, you mentioned at a previous meeting that one problem that hadn't come up in the task forces was **departmental leadership**—basically, that it's hard to get good department chairs. Can you define that issue as it relates to this question of building excellence?

Prof. Schmitz: Over my years at the University, I've seen a very strong trend away from long-term department leaders. Being chair is more difficult now; there's more hassle and more work. But a couple of decades ago you would find chairpeople around for 20 years or so, and departments could really develop with that kind of long-term commitment from an individual. Chairpeople now turn over in three to six years or so, and with this more rotating style I'm sure the attitude often is, I'll take my turn at this job and then let someone else deal with it. I believe that's a problem for the long-term development of departments. I would prefer longer-term chairs.

Prof. O'Meara: Whatever system is better, I doubt the current arrangement could be changed today, could it?

Prof. Schmitz: Not easily. But another factor arguing for change is that not everyone is highly qualified to be a department leader, yet if we turn chairpeople over every three years, practically everyone on the faculty eventually will serve as chairperson whether they're qualified for the position or not.

Prof. Meara: I would suggest that for all the outstanding chairs who served for 20 years, there also may have been a lot of losers ensconced for 20 years and incapable of being got rid of. If you want your chairs to be scholars, then they can't be chairs for too long, and that wasn't true 20 years ago. The second thing is we've done everything we possibly can in academe to make the chair a crummy job because chairs used to have many, many more **degrees of freedom**, I mean in terms of budget, and I don't care who you are and how much clout you have and how good you are at persuading people, you can't solve problems without resources. I think that's another reason for turnover. As far as making

a difference in a department, the chair probably is one of the best places you can do it in terms of the graduate programs and the quality of undergraduate instruction, that is, the faculty hires. But I think when we went to the rotation, we took back some trust from department chairs. When someone had it 15 years, you knew what they were going to do and you knew how much running room everybody could have and how much you had to hold them back.

Prof. Lent: I just want to second the idea of the **importance of department chairs**. It does, from where I sit, look like a very difficult job that has lots of negative aspects, and maybe there are ways that we can counteract that, make the job more attractive to keep people in who actually are good at it. The other thing I wanted to say was about targets of opportunity. I think it's possible to be compact and focus in on what people are really good at without trying to dissipate their energies. So I think it's possible to be excellent in all kinds of different departments, not expecting any one department to be as broad as possible.

Dean Michel: In a University such as ours where we are evolving in quality, there are reasons why some departments are better than others. The best strategy, is to provide positive feedback and accelerate the development of good departments, because as they become better, these departments will have the effect of pulling other departments along. Just throwing money at lesser departments is not itself going to help them, so I would like to see us try to get good departments to float to the top as fast as possible and really raise heck with the rest of the University. Also, earlier we were talking about conflict between graduate and undergraduate education. I think a very good statement was made the other day by one of the members of the Academic Council (Prof. Kenney), who wondered if in all instances we have the **right undergraduate students** here. That is, do we have students who want to learn physics from a physicist or from a physics teacher? There's a big difference. So perhaps we also have to get the **admissions office** intimately involved in what kind of students we are looking for. As it often has been observed, at least in engineering, the students we get are pretty good solid students, but we don't get many who are going to make a name in the field. We get the ones who'll make a name for themselves because they are good managers or good business types, rather than the scientist types.

Prof. Scully: Our main goal now has to be to catch up to our rhetoric. I think that the chairs have been a successful strategy, however I would recommend that we think now a little more in terms of **associate professors**. I worry about chairs just because of the competing goals we have. One of them is to augment the amount of teaching that's going on and if resources are finite, which they tend to be, then we need to hierarchize our goals and it just seems to me that in the short term we have to respond to the **teaching deficit**. All of these questions are tied to resources, so it is a question of

Documentation

what do we have. If we have infinite resources, then I've got a list as long as anyone in this room.

Kathleen Sullivan: About a week ago we had all the alumni leaders on campus and among the comments we heard was, are the efforts toward research taking away from undergraduate education. The perception is almost as if every dollar going to graduate education is a dollar taken away from undergraduate education. It would be superb if there were a way to demonstrate the concrete benefits that undergraduates gain from attending an institution with a strong graduate program, and also the kind of strategic planning that goes into determining how and which graduate programs are strengthened.

Prof. Schmitz: Once our alumni include a higher concentration of people who hold advanced degrees, we'll see these comments about graduates versus undergraduates subsiding. I think it shows very strongly how very few hold advanced degrees from Notre Dame.

Prof. O'Meara: Somewhere along the line in our deliberations we've got to develop a rationale that expresses clearly why certain things should or should not be done. One of the things that Jack Keane concentrated on from the beginning in the College of Business was the rationale for a Ph.D. program. His persuasive argument is that we are concerned with certain values in the business profession, we believe that we represent some of those values, and so what is our best way of influencing the business community? Answer: Through teachers of business, which means we should be involved in teaching the teachers, and where do you normally teach teachers? In a Ph.D. program. Which Catholic universities now are doing this? Answer: None. Conclusion: We should be doing it. It's not good enough to say we have a Ph.D. program, we need all these dollars and all these people. Somewhere the rationale has got to come into it too.

Prof. Meara: There's something I'd like the Faculty, Academic Mission and Catholic Character subcommittee to consider. When we're making decisions about who's going to get what, then I think those who create the best vision are the ones who should be leading the process. Whoever exercises departmental leadership needs to create that vision, and I think that's what we've been lacking in terms of getting some departments to move forward. As Tony said, there are reasons why some departments don't go forward, and I have a suspicion that's sort of what he meant, that they're too busy fighting themselves to get the job done. I don't know how we develop people with vision, but I think that's what we ought to be doing in faculty development.

Dean Attridge: I have two items for the subcommittees. One issue that has come up a number of times has been the

question of intercollegiate relationships at the undergraduate level. There are some programs that are well in place, for example, the arts and letters engineering program. There are some others where there are difficulties, and I would hope that those things will not fall through the cracks, the relationships for instance between preprofessional students in arts and letters and those in science, and their access to courses, or business and arts and letters and certain kinds of courses. There are problems that I think we need to address systematically on a University-wide basis. Another thing I think we need to worry about is what kinds of accommodations we make for students who are here on a fifth-year basis for other than academic reasons.

Prof. Hatch: This is really for the Faculty, Academic Mission, and Catholic Character subcommittee, but I think our expectations for faculty should be upward. I think our minimum standards for whom we want on this faculty should be higher than they were when the P.A.C.E. report was prepared. I think given what we pay, given the kind of University this is, and given our aspirations, we should expect that people are going to be leaders in their fields. Departments cannot be content to hire people who will do barely enough to get tenure; the standards for what we're looking for need to be very high.

Prof. Van Engen: We're pretty strict here about faculty being tenured in a department, period. At the same time, we talk about interdisciplinary studies or interdepartmental units as being special areas of excellence and so on. Is there a way that we could address this without throwing the whole faculty document up in the air and creating a hundred exceptions? People who don't fit precisely or who fit in two places, or whatever? Some people argue on the humanities side—a little differently than Tony Michel did—but also saying this is the wave of the future, that we're not going to be straight historians or literary people, or whatever, but people who fit into a number of cross-cultural studies. The question is, have we a way of fitting such people in and allowing them to function in different places. Maybe our present programs—Medieval Studies, History and Philosophy of Science, Gender Studies—do this or maybe they don't. The difficulty that arises for us is, who becomes the peer group which judges hiring, promotions and tenure, and who decides where the person teaches, or when or what programs.

Prof. Hatch: I think the document should call for administrative flexibility, because I think the same thing is true in spousal hiring. I think there are a lot of reasons in current academic life that call for administrative flexibility. With spousal hiring, I think it's possible to have another category of appointment, say at a dean's level, where an appointment is made because the University believes the overall 'package' of a couple is helpful to the University, even though one may be much stronger than the other.

Documentation

Prof. Meara: I think the credentials still have to go through the appropriate C.A.P. committee and if they say no, then that's it. I don't think you can have that much flexibility. I've been involved in spousal hiring from lots of points of view, and I think with reasonable people you can work it out, but you can't change the tenuring process.

Prof. Hatch: Yet, I think there are more flexible ways to make spousal appointments. Departments can agree that they will grant some kind of teaching status even if tenure is not possible.

Dean Kolman: Our centers of excellence have tended to be departments, but there are questions that are beyond departments, and if we're going to build great centers or great colleges, then there must be a notion of the common good. I get interested in the common good because nobody will teach freshman unless it's part of the common good. If all we care about are majors and graduate students and specialties, then we will never be a great university, and I think that same thing comes into play here, that is, we'll never have good interdepartmental programs or things that cross the lines if the lines are so primary in the departments. I can't see how we can have a great university if it's simply a lot of great departments glued together.

Prof. Van Engen: You spoke of departments, but one of the striking things on the humanities side is that the institutes have actually been the engines of excellence. Whether it has been the way we've placed Medievalists, the way we've placed historians of science, the people the Kellogg and Peace Institutes have brought into government and sociology, the question is must we more formally recognize this and find ways to channel additional resources in these directions. That question came up in all the social science task force reports, as well as Kellogg and Peace. Usually, the entity that has the say regarding resources is the entity with the money; perhaps some of that money needs to be split in recognition of joint appointments.

Dean Michel: This is precisely the point. I think having institutes may be one way of bridging the gaps between departments and colleges, and maybe we ought to have more of this because we have, for example, in the College of Science and the College of Engineering, several groups such as the people in the solid state area or in applied mathematics where there now is some cooperation, but not enough. It could be much greater, and I have the feeling that the departmental and college boundaries are getting in the way here. Perhaps institutes are the answer in that an institute is a vehicle that just brushes over these boundaries. I don't think it's an accident that the institute-affiliated departments in arts and letters are flourishing.

Dean Attridge: I think that institutes function in different ways. Some of them have been very positive for us, and others, somewhat divisive.

Dean Keane: In business, interdisciplinary cooperation is happening in a number of places like Chicago and Southern Cal, where there aren't department heads in the formal sense. We need to break down the barriers, because in business the problems are interdisciplinary and that's what most of our students, certainly the undergrads and the professional school people and the MBAs, are going to be dealing with. So if we sectorize them in the curriculum, then they go out there thinking that finance rules the world or marketing rules the world, and they wind up in interdisciplinary kinds of meetings and aren't very productive. Departments must defer to the common good of the college, as in the final analysis, the college must defer to the common good of the University, if we're going to spend our resources well and be cohesive as an institution. Also, I too would like more flexibility guidelines for appointments not involving the tenure track.

Dean Kolman: I would like to ask what is meant by this issue of, give us more nerds, which I take as dissatisfaction with the composition of our present student body?

Prof. Lent: The perceived problem is that we have extremely well-rounded people, who were class officers in high school, varsity sports captains, and things like that, but that we don't have the people who have a particular passion in a particular area—maybe they were chairmen of the science clubs or something—who really are very smart and very motivated in this particular area. These people seem to not appear. There's an assumption that they are not viewed as the type of well-rounded students that we would like to have. So I think the suggestion is, let's get those people, we'll round them out, but let's get people who have a particular passion for a particular area.

Prof. Hatch: I've talked to Kevin Rooney quite a bit, and I think a lot of this is myth among the faculty. Kevin's philosophy does not involve turning down any quality students academically. If you get the scores and you've done well, your being admitted has to do with the applicant pool that chooses Notre Dame as against Harvard. It's something to look into, but I don't think that we are not admitting people who have 800 scores and straight A's.

Prof. Schmitz: That's right. The real question is, what is it about the nature of this University that attracts an applicant pool that perhaps doesn't contain as many of a certain type of student as we would like. That is worth addressing among other things having to do with admissions. We're just dealing with the admissions for next year, and the question of transfer students versus freshman admissions often comes up. What are the consequences of enlarging one group as opposed to the other? Where is the best quality student? Most people would say we should admit freshmen rather than transfer students, and that brings up questions of housing, overloaded freshman courses and so forth.

Documentation

Prof. Murphy: One of the things, Eileen, that your committee might look at is the **student culture** here. My sense is that we get good, academically-oriented students who somehow don't view academics as the number one priority once they're here. How is that connected to the culture? Secondly, to follow up on Roger's point—we've talked about it in the College of Business—really look closely at that question of **freshmen versus transfer students**.

Prof. Schmitz: I should add the subject of financial aid. Kevin would say we lose a lot from that, because there are plenty of universities that will give scholarships to all students who have a financial need.

Dean Attridge: The question of curriculum ought not be neglected. I know we can't be a curriculum committee, but two large-scale questions that I would like to see this committee tackle are whether we should have a **freshman year** and whether the **fundamental shape of our curriculum**, its heavy core emphasis, is the correct way.

Jennifer McRedmond: As we're stating our final thoughts for the day, I would like to state my final thoughts as a member of this Colloquy committee. I guess these mostly go to the Students, Teaching, and Learning subcommittee. As you're writing this report—and I'm sure you'll do this anyway—keep in mind the life of the undergraduate student here. Three things in particular come to mind to me: First is the trouble that so many undergraduate students have **getting into courses**, even within their majors and even as upperclassmen. Second is the **number of students** they find in these courses when they get there, some well in the hundreds. Third is that many students **never write a paper** after their freshman writing courses here.

Prof. McCarthy: I asked someone who is going to graduate as an undergraduate on Sunday about the freshman year of studies, and she said exactly what you're saying, Jennifer, that the reason she liked the freshman year of studies was because in that year she could take courses that would otherwise be barred to her unless she registered as a major in a particular department. So, for example, she could take some government courses that would have been closed to her if she were a sophomore not of that major.

Prof. Lent: To the Faculty, Academic Mission and Catholic Character subcommittee, some of this is what I said and what I wrote. I think it would be very helpful to see some ideas for the **interdisciplinary and broader intellectual life of the faculty** being nurtured, some ideas for seeing that as a priority and doing something to bring it about, to encourage people's crossing some of the barriers we have between colleges and just talking to each other and trying out things on each other.

Prof. Schmitz: We're still in a growing mode, we're getting new, fresh faculty in simply by expanding the faculty. But once that's slowed down before the turn of the century, we're going to have faculty who are no longer leaving at the other end, and therefore not as many opportunities to bring in new young faculty. So I think early **retirement incentives** and related programs of various sorts for the faculty should be discussed.

Prof. O'Meara agreed to devote the final minutes of the meeting to individual gatherings of the subcommittees to plan their respective meeting schedules.

Appendix

Academic Life Committee of the Colloquy
Subcommittees
(revised)

Executive Committee

Eileen Kolman; Craig Lent; Jennifer McRedmond; Naomi Meara; Dennis Moore; Patrick Murphy; Timothy O'Meara, chair; John Van Engen

The Faculty, Academic Mission and Catholic Character

Harold Attridge; Francis Castellino; David Lutz; Sabrina McCarthy; Patrick Murphy, co-chair; Victoria Ploplis; John Van Engen, co-chair

Students, Teaching and Learning

Ani Aprahamian; Paul Conway; Fernand Dutille; Amy Houm; Kate Halischak; John Keane; Eileen Kolman, chair; Naomi Meara; Kathleen Sullivan

Research, Scholarship and Infrastructure

Deborah Grismer; Nathan Hatch; Craig Lent, chair; Anthony Michel; Robert Miller; Roger Schmitz; Timothy Scully

Academic Council Minutes April 22, 1992

Members in Attendance: Edward A. Malloy, C.S.C., Timothy O'Meara, E. William Beauchamp, C.S.C., Roger Schmitz, Patricia O'Hara, Francis Castellino, Fernand Dutille, John Keane, Eileen Kolman, Anthony Michel, Paul Conway, Jennifer McRedmond, Kathleen Biddick, Frank Bonello, David Burrell, C.S.C., Cornelius Delaney, Suzanne Marilley, Maria Rosa Olivera-Williams, Thomas Werge, Morton Fuchs, Robert Hayes, V. Paul Kenney, 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 and Roger Skurski were substitutes for Robert Miller and Harold Attridge, respectively.

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

Guests: William Dailey, Michael Griffin, Karen Stohr, members of the Academic Code of Honor Committee (Stephen Batill; Kamila Benson; John Coffey, current chair of the committee; Edward Kline; Gary Larson; Kevin Misiewicz; Kevin Schroeder; Raymond Sepeta and Oliver Williams, C.S.C.), and members of the Committee on Structures and Processes (a subcommittee of the Committee on Mission, Challenges and Opportunities of the Colloquy for the Year 2000)

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

1. **Minutes.** The minutes of the meeting of February 25, 1992, were approved as presented.

2. **Continuation of discussion of the report by the Faculty Committee on Governance.** Fr. Malloy expressed appreciation for the fruitful and positive exchange of opinions regarding faculty participation in governance that had occurred since the council's February 25 meeting. He commented briefly on each of the nine elements of an agreement that had been concluded with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. (The agreement has been published in minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of April 22. See *Notre Dame Report*, No. 19, 1991-92, pages 493-494.) He stated that the Executive Committee of the council would meet during the summer to implement the formation of standing committees of the council. He also indicated that a procedure would be developed for the election of five elected members to the Provost's Advisory Committee (PAC) to ensure representation of each major academic area on the PAC. Fr. Malloy agreed with the need for better understanding by the faculty and other members of the University of the processes and priorities that lead to the

University budget. He said that Prof. O'Meara is preparing a letter to the faculty describing the current financial situation of the University and the future challenges. He added that the Finance Committee of the Colloquy and other groups are also receiving information concerning investments and the various components of the University's budget. Continuing to address the elements of the agreement, Fr. Malloy stated that the fairly regular turnover of leadership on the college councils and the Graduate Council makes essential a serious commitment by deans and academic vice presidents to use those council meetings for discussion of academic priorities and other academic matters. He said that he was dropping the proposal for a University Forum, at least for the present, and he expressed hope that the Colloquy work at the committee and subcommittee level will allow for a maximum of faculty participation. He plans to form an administrative/faculty working committee to work through the summer to explore avenues for further faculty participation in University life. He concluded by reiterating his appreciation for the progress made concerning faculty participation in governance, and by pledging that the momentum established will continue.

Prof. O'Meara added that the Executive Committee of the council had discussed ways to improve the quality of discussions at council meetings. Some items, the committee felt, should be studied by a committee of the council after an initial presentation. The committee's purpose would be to study all sides of an issue, to lead a discussion on the council floor and perhaps to make recommendations before a council vote would be taken. Prof. O'Meara added that the next two items on this meeting's agenda lend themselves to such process.

Speaking from the Faculty Senate perspective, Prof. Conway expressed his satisfaction with the manner in which Fr. Malloy and the provost had dealt with the issues of concern to the faculty. He felt confident that the senate would withdraw its request for a vote of no confidence.

3. **Report by Student Government to the Board of Trustees: *Back to Basics, Undergraduate Education at a "National Catholic Research University."*** Prof. O'Meara reiterated the Executive Committee's recommendation that a brief presentation and discussion of the report take place at this time and that a committee of the council prepare a program for council discussion and possible action at a future meeting. He first asked for the council's approval of that recommendation, which would have three non-student members elected by and from the council members, one student elected by the council from the student membership, and three members appointed by the Executive Committee to ensure balance. Mr. John Coffey suggested that the student representative on the proposed committee be the chair of the student standing committee on the "Back to Basics" report. Fr. Malloy concurred and recommended incorporation of that change into the proposal. Prof. Biddick

Documentation

asked how the work of the ad hoc committee formed by Prof. Schmitz, which was cited in "Back to Basics," would interact with the committee formed by the Academic Council. Prof. Schmitz replied that the ad hoc committee, developed initially from the need to coordinate classroom technologies for the DeBartolo building, would pass information on its work and conclusions to the proposed committee. The recommendation of the Executive Committee, amended regarding the student representative, was approved by voice vote. In subsequent balloting Profs. Bonello, Delaney and Varma were elected.

Ms. Karen Stohr, chair of the "Back to Basics" student committee presented the report. She stated that the committee's purpose was not to pit teaching against research, but to argue that the process of becoming a "national Catholic research university" is having an undesirable effect on undergraduate education. The students, she said, question the priorities which the process seems to have established. A Student Government survey of every faculty member and 1,500 randomly selected undergraduate students revealed that both groups define ideal class size as 25 students — a size seldom found in the College of Arts and Letters. Even though large classes are the norm, Ms. Stohr continued, undergraduates find it extremely difficult to register for desired courses, even when those courses are in their academic majors. The problems of class size and availability are exacerbated, in the students' views, by what they see as an increasing reliance on adjunct professors. Ms. Stohr emphasized that this is not a criticism of the teaching ability of the adjunct instructors; instead it is a criticism of the reliance on adjuncts as a remedy for the problem of increasing faculty shortages. The result of this reliance is distance between faculty and undergraduates rather than the opportunities for interaction which the students sought when they entered Notre Dame. The "Back To Basics" report argues that regular faculty share the students' perceptions: Only 25 percent of those surveyed feel Notre Dame adequately rewards undergraduate teaching. Ms. Stohr closed by reiterating the primary recommendation of the report: Given the increasing importance of research and advanced studies to the University, undergraduate education requires a significant increase in the size of teaching faculty.

Prof. Biddick, echoing the students' concerns over large class sizes, pointed out that a partial solution might be to focus on interdepartmental concentrations rather than on single departments as areas of study.

Prof. Kenney expressed appreciation for the student committee's efforts but argued that the position adopted by the report ignores the difference in focus between a four-year college and a university. The former, he said, values classroom teaching as its primary purpose; in the latter, faculty are professionally committed and expected to teach to a larger audience while conducting research and publishing in their fields. In a physics course, for example, in the

former, students are usually taught by a "teacher of physics"; in the latter by a "physicist." The four-year college offers small classes; the research university offers experts in a field and a degree which is more widely recognized. By emphasizing research and advanced study, he continued, Notre Dame moves to a position of preeminence among the approximately 250 Catholic colleges and universities in the United States. Students select a college or a university based on whether they want to be taught by teachers who read the books and keep abreast of developments in the field, or by the people who wrote the books and articles which defined those developments. Many of the students who are unhappy about undergraduate education at Notre Dame, he concluded, may have simply selected the wrong type of place.

While agreeing with most of Prof. Kenney's comments, Ms. Stohr questioned whether the philosophy he described might not lead to a stratified faculty, divided between those who engage in research and those who teach. Undergraduate students, she said, perceive in this philosophy a gap between what Notre Dame promotes itself to be and the reality of undergraduate learning here.

Fr. Burrell argued that the truth inherent in Prof. Kenney's remarks does not mean that the status quo must continue. Three tensions outlined in the report can be adjusted, he said: that between teaching and research, that between undergraduate and graduate teaching, and that between Catholic and secular ideals of a university.

Speaking from the perspective of a student in the combination arts and letters/engineering program, Mr. Yang offered that Notre Dame's emphasis on being a family suggests a close interaction between faculty and students. There is no inherent reason why a research university must have large classes. It is simply a matter of commitment and prioritization of resources. Prof. O'Meara added that the necessary budgetary commitment is large indeed.

Responding to a request by Prof. Fuchs for clarification of the students' definition of interaction, Mr. Coffey said that interaction means the opportunity throughout a course to discuss ideas and develop positions. When large class size or extensive research commitments foreclose such opportunities, students have no choice but to "regurgitate what the teacher wants to hear" in order to pass an examination. Ms. Stohr added that the survey results showed that faculty are doing their best to be available outside the classroom; it is within the large classes, she said, that questions go unasked and ideas remain undeveloped. Essay tests and papers, which might provide a basis for comment, feedback and interaction, are not administered because of the time required to grade the large number.

Dean Castellino asked whether a system exists in the College of Arts and Letters that allows students to work on research along with their professors. Ms. Stohr replied that

Documentation

some departments have instituted a senior thesis which permits such interaction, but that time and staffing preclude widespread adoption.

Prof. Olivera-Williams noted that classes are routinely small in the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures because of the nature of the instruction, and she agreed that the resulting interaction has been beneficial to undergraduate development. But while she agreed with the need for smaller classes throughout the University, she emphasized the significant benefits that undergraduate students derive from a strong graduate program and from their interactions with graduate students. She also emphasized the outstanding contributions that adjunct faculty make to teaching in the department.

Dean Castellino remarked that even if every faculty member taught three courses per semester, each course consisting of 30 students, large courses such as introductory mathematics, chemistry, biology, and freshman writing programs would require a multiple of the faculty we currently have. Even assuming faculty could be hired under such circumstances, the character of the University would be altered significantly. Ms. Stohr responded that the undergraduates realize that a strict limit of 30 students per class is both impractical and unnecessary. What is needed, she said, is a mix in which size is appropriate to the subject being taught. Prof. Skurski agreed, remarking that large classes probably work well in several areas, and that these classes free faculty to teach more small classes. In order to have a sufficient number of small classes to meet undergraduate needs, however, a significant increase in the number of faculty is required.

4. Discussion of the Report on the Academic Code of Honor. Prior to the discussion of this report, the council approved a motion to select a committee to study the report further and to formulate a structured discussion for future council meetings. This committee should also consist of three non-student members elected by and from the council membership, three members appointed from the council by the Executive Committee, and one student member. Fr. Oliver Williams suggested, and the council concurred, that the student member be one of the co-chairs of the Academic Code of Honor Committee; the specific selection would be made by the Executive Committee. Subsequent balloting elected Prof. Fuchs, Dean Kolman and Prof. Marilley.

Fr. Williams began the presentation by introducing the members of the Academic Code of Honor Committee who were present at this meeting as guests. He noted that the main argument presented in 1987 for adopting the Code of Honor was that it would be the most effective way to foster the development of honesty and other virtues. This, rather than any attempt to resolve issues of academic dishonesty, was the primary purpose of the code and the yardstick by which its success should be measured. He argued that, at its best, a fully implemented code of honor does function as

the council had envisioned by providing students with the opportunity to develop and internalize important moral values. Even when a code is less than fully operative, he continued, it still serves an important function by offering faculty and students the opportunity to raise issues of academic integrity. The committee realizes that the culture required for a full honor code does not yet exist at Notre Dame. This realization has led to great debate concerning proctorship of examinations — debate finally resolved in favor of a slower approach which would allow that culture to permeate the University. That process takes time, and the guiding rule of the committee during the past four years has been to allow for that time. Consequently, the Academic Code of Honor Handbook permits an instructor to remain in the classroom during examinations and requires him or her to process any observed instances of academic dishonesty through the Honesty Committee. Instructors are asked, however, to avoid active and continuous surveillance in order to give the spirit of the honor code a chance to permeate our academic culture. The committee, chaired by an elected student, has accomplished a great deal in the past four years. In addition to developing the handbook, which has been revised and is in its second edition, the committee conducts student-run orientation sessions for all freshmen students and has prepared a commercially produced video which is shown to all incoming students during orientation. Finally, the committee is responsible for monitoring the progress of the University community and its acceptance of the honor code.

Mr. Coffey observed that during the past four years, the council has seen the code of honor change, grow and become part of Notre Dame. He expressed the hope that the Academic Code of Honor Committee will continue to make changes and recommendations on related issues, with the goal of having a code that is fully student directed in all facets. The code asks students to put into practice the values and principles they discuss, thereby raising expectations so that students and faculty ultimately demand honesty from each other and will not tolerate academic dishonesty. In this way, he said, the code provides students an excellent means for building the values and ethics that will shape their lives.

Prof. Conway observed that despite these claims for the honor code and the stated purpose for which it was established, one rarely hears it mentioned in any other context than as a means to prevent or report cheating. Mr. Coffey responded that change on the Notre Dame campus takes a very long time, especially the kind of cultural change that will permeate the whole campus. Prof. Kline added that the code is at least as much about educating as about cheating. He referred to specific language in the handbook that requires faculty to discuss the honor code with their students so as "to educate the students about the issues related to ethical and moral behavior in the particular discipline." Prof. Nichols stated that by requiring faculty to address the

Documentation

issue of honorable behavior at the beginning of a course, the code has made people behave in a more honorable fashion. He also expressed confidence in the effectiveness of the judicial process. This process, however, has had to rely on faculty members because students have not come forward. Fr. Williams substantiated this concern with the statistic that only about 13 percent of reported cases of academic dishonesty were reported by students.

Prof. Conway asked whether it was contradictory to discuss the need for an honor code in a Catholic university. Mr. Coffey replied that the fact that Notre Dame is a Catholic university does not mean that all students share equally in Catholic values and faith. It follows, then, that the University's role is to educate them to a level where they can assume roles as Catholic leaders in society.

Responding to a question from Prof. Varma, Mr. Coffey said there appear to be two principal reasons why many students dislike the existing code: The nontoleration clause, and the argument that as good Catholics/Christians we do not need an honor code.

In response to a question from Prof. Fuchs concerning the effectiveness of the code's nontoleration procedures, Mr. Coffey admitted that because the total weight of the University is not yet behind the code, people are somewhat hesitant to report others. Mr. Yang, stating that the code did give him the moral support to report a violation of academic integrity, admitted that many students perceive the honor code in a negative light. He added that this perception does not stem from any endorsement of cheating, but from a belief that the honor code is not working effectively to promote integrity. Changing this perception, he said, is essential if the honor code is to be successful.

Mr. Coffey felt that greater student participation in the management and control of the honor code is required for the culture to change. The existing system of shared responsibility between faculty and students makes it too easy for students to avoid taking responsibility. This view was supported by Ms. Benson, who said that one of the principal reasons freshman students are reluctant to embrace the code is that they perceive it as something controlled by the faculty and administration. Honesty committee membership has moved from a 3-2 faculty-student ratio four years ago to a 1-1 ratio today. The aim, she said, should be eventually to have a totally student run honor code.

5. Proposal by the Student Government to increase the number of study days preceding final examinations.

Prof. O'Meara informed the council that this proposal, which entails scheduling the last two class days of each semester as study days, comes to the council with the Executive Committee's recommendation for approval.

Mr. William Dailey, counselor to the Student Body President, introduced the Student Government proposal by discussing the issue of fairness as the primary factor motivating its origination. He cited the difference between exam schedules that give some students much of the exam period to prepare while grouping the exams of others at the beginning of the period. Adding two extra study days, he said, would bring an element of fairness to the final exam schedule. He argued that the additional study days are consistent with the obvious importance the University places on final exams. This rationale is even more compelling in the Spring semester, when residence halls must be restored to their normal working order during the exam period. He noted that rectors he had contacted were not concerned that a couple of extra study days might lead to inappropriate behavior in the residence halls. Evidence from other universities, he added, does not indicate that any kind of mass chaos results from this type of extra study time. It seems to be standard practice at other universities that these days can count as academic days devoted to study.

Prof. O'Hara wondered whether those universities that have a greater number of study days also give greater weight to final exams for course grading. Mr. Dailey responded that there is no evidence to indicate any such relationship.

Prof. Fuchs expressed concern that adoption of two study days would serve to encourage cramming and discourage keeping up with course material during the semester. Prof. Bonello asked whether a relief mechanism does not already exist for students who are scheduled for three exams in a 24-hour period. Responding to these questions, Mr. Dailey said that although such a relief mechanism is in place, it does not address the problem faced by students who have two difficult tests on the first day of the final exam period. With respect to cramming, he argued that most Notre Dame students want to do well and are smart enough to realize that a 48-hour cram will not substitute for a semester's worth of study.

Ms. Vogt related her personal experience from the past semester of having four exams in the first two days of the exam period. She commented that she would have benefited considerably from two extra study days.

Prof. Biddick expressed appreciation for the motivation behind this proposal and the "Back to Basics" report, both of which testify to sincere undergraduate calls for intellectual rigor and responsibility in scholarship. Prof. Marilley offered the concept of self-scheduled examinations, under which undergraduates — governed by a strict honor code — are responsible for scheduling their own finals. She acknowledged that such a procedure demands significant management and logistical support, but said she had seen it work very effectively for the students.

Documentation

Responding to a question from Mr. DeBoer concerning the potential loss of time available for review sessions if two class days were converted to study time, Mr. Dailey said that such sessions could still be offered on an optional basis. This procedure has been followed in the past, he said, by several professors who offer review sessions during finals week. In subsequent remarks, he made it clear that no single course would lose more than one class meeting period as a result of this proposal. Two days would mean the loss of one Tuesday/Thursday and one Monday/Wednesday/Friday class day.

Responding to a question from Prof. Fuchs about the rationale behind a length of two days for the study period, Mr. Dailey referred to an informal poll of several other universities which indicated that most have a week of study days. There did not appear to be great demand for that kind of time here, he said.

Prof. O'Hara said there may be some concern by rectors over the potential for difficulty when students have the majority of exams scheduled at the end of the exam period. Two additional days would give such students up to a week before their first exam, and therefore a lot of uncontrolled time. A high level of student commitment to the good use of this period of time and to quiet hours would be necessary to alleviate potential problems, and not all students share that level of commitment.

The proposal was approved by voice vote.

6. Progress report on the Executive Committee's study of issues surrounding the governance and definitions of institutes and centers. Prof. O'Meara reported that, in response to the council's request at the meeting of December 4, the Executive Committee attempted first to sort out which units are truly "institutes" and should have a charter. When it became clear that this would be a time consuming task, the committee agreed to meet during the summer to continue work on this matter.

7. College of Engineering proposal for a new undergraduate degree program in engineering and environmental science. Dean Michel informed the council that the new Department of Civil Engineering and Geological Sciences, formed by the merger of the Departments of Civil Engineering and Earth Sciences, currently administers undergraduate and graduate degree programs in civil engineering and a bachelor's degree program with a major in geological sciences. The undergraduate program in civil engineering is accredited by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET). A departmental internal study indicated that a new degree program focused on environmental matters would be appropriate, and a proposal for such was approved by the Engineering College Council. Dean Michel stated that the proposal, which was distributed

to council members in advance, now is brought to the council for approval.

Dean Michel pointed out that many graduate programs in the United States attract students with backgrounds in civil engineering, chemistry and biological sciences to study environmental issues. However, the stringent and specific requirements established for accreditation by ABET deny standard civil engineering programs the flexibility to equip students well for many such graduate programs. He argued that a new undergraduate program, which would have a strong base in geological sciences, chemistry and life sciences, would prepare students very well for either a career in environmental engineering or graduate study. The unique structure of the Department of Civil Engineering and Geological Sciences makes possible the development of an excellent program in this area, which would fulfill a need without requiring new courses. At the same time, the new program would increase enrollment in traditionally under-subscribed geological science courses.

Speaking as a Freshman Year adviser, Mr. DeBoer said he had already seen a fair amount of student interest in this program. Mr. Yang agreed that several civil engineering students with whom he is familiar would appreciate the opportunities such a program would provide.

Following some discussion of the interdisciplinary aspects of such a program and the ethical issues that could be included, the proposal was approved by the council.

8. Second-major program in environmental sciences. Dean Castellino informed the council that the College of Science had prepared a proposal for a second major program in environmental sciences, but timing was such that it could not be included at this meeting. He described the program briefly, pointing out that it could be used by students in the other colleges of the University. He asked whether an additional meeting of the council could be scheduled so that this program, if approved, could be included in the next issue of the University's *Bulletin of Information*. Pointing out that scheduling another meeting so late in the semester would be difficult, Fr. Malloy suggested that the proposal be sent to council members along with a ballot on which members could indicate approval, disapproval or abstention. The council concurred. (The proposed program was approved by subsequent mail voting by a 30-to-1 margin with no indicated abstentions. Five ballots were not returned.)

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger A. Schmitz
Secretary of the Academic Council

Documentation

University Libraries' Hours During Midsemester and Fall Break October 16 - 25, 1992

| | Hesburgh Library | | University Branch Libraries |
|---|--|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| | Building | Public Services | |
| Friday, October 16 | 8 a.m.-midnight | 8 a.m.-5 p.m. | 8 a.m.-5 p.m. |
| Saturday, October 17 | 9 a.m.-midnight | 9 a.m.-5 p.m. | Closed*** |
| Sunday, October 18 | 1 p.m.-midnight | Closed | Closed*** |
| Monday, October 19 through Thursday, October 22 | 8 a.m.-midnight | 8 a.m.-5 p.m.** | 8 a.m.-5 p.m. |
| Friday, October 23 | 8 a.m.-midnight | 8 a.m.-5 p.m. | 8 a.m.-5 p.m. |
| Saturday, October 24 | 8 a.m.-midnight | 8 a.m.-5 p.m.* | Closed*** |
| Sunday, October 25 | All libraries return to regular schedule | | |

*The following public service units will be open on Saturday:

Circulation
Current Periodicals/Microtext
Reference

**Current Periodical/Microtext will be open until 10 p.m.

***The Engineering Library will be open the following times:

Monday - Thursday 8 a.m.-8 p.m.
Saturday noon-4 p.m.
Sunday 1 p.m.-5 p.m.

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

American Studies

Schmuhl, Robert P.

R.P. Schmuhl. 1992. Handling (and Mishandling) Judicial
Choices: Review of Advice and Consent, by P. Simon.
Chicago Tribune 146(237):Sec. 2, 3.

R.P. Schmuhl. 1992. The Unsettling of America. *Notre
Dame Magazine* 21(2):30-33.

Economics

Dutt, Amitava K.

A.K. Dutt. 1992. Stagnation, Growth and Unproductive
Activity. Pages 91-113 in, J.B. Davis, ed., *The Economic
Surplus in Advanced Economies*. Edward Elgar,
Aldershot, England, United Kingdom.

English

Matthias, John E.

J.E. Matthias. 1992. Three Poems: The Singer of Tales,
The Silence of Stones, Dedication. *Image* 1(2):58-62.

O'Rourke, William A.

W.A. O'Rourke. 1992. Review of Trombone, by C. Nova.
The South Bend Tribune (August 23):Sec. F, 8.

Classical and Oriental Languages and Literatures

Amar, Joseph P.

J.P. Amar. 1992. Byzantine Ascetical Monasticism and
Greek Bias in the *Vita* Tradition of Ephrem and Syrian.
Orientalia Christiana Periodica 58:123-156.

Theology

Cunningham, Lawrence S.

L.S. Cunningham. 1992. Five Theological Reflections.
Lectionary Homiletics November-December:1-2; 7-8;
14-15; 21-22; 28-29.

L.S. Cunningham. 1992. Gladly Wold He Lerne and
Gladly Teche: The Catholic Scholar in the New
Millenium. *The Cresset* LV(June):4-10.

L.S. Cunningham. 1992. The Professor Invades the Clois-
ter: Reflections on A Study Week at Gethsemani.
Cistercian Studies Quarterly 27:161-165.

L.S. Cunningham. 1992. Review of Rediscovering the Sa-
cred, by R. Wuthnow. Page 717 in, *The Christian Cen-
tury* CIX.

L.S. Cunningham. 1992. Religious Booknotes: Matters
Historical and Spiritual. *Commonweal* 119(June 5):27-29.

L.S. Cunningham. 1992. Thomas Merton Spiritual Master:
The Essential Writings. Paulist Press, Mahwah, New Jer-
sey. 347pp.

L.S. Cunningham. 1992. Vatican II. Pages 504-508 in, D.
Musser and J.L. Price, eds., *A New Handbook of Chris-
tian Theology*. Abingdon, Nashville, Tennessee.

LaCugna, Catherine M.

C.M. LaCugna. 1992. The Practical Trinity. *Christian Cen-
tury* (July 15-22):678-682.

McBrien, Richard P., Rev.

Rev. R.P. McBrien. 1992. Academic Freedom and the
Catholic Theologian. Pages 126-142 in, G.S. Worgul, Jr.,
ed., *Issues in Academic Freedom*. Duquesne University
Press, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Rev. R.P. McBrien. 1992. Conflict in the Church: Redefin-
ing the Center. *America* 167(4):78-81.

Rev. R.P. McBrien. 1992. Ecclesiological Themes: The
Church of the Future. *Origins* 22(2):27-30.

VanderKam, James C.

J.C. VanderKam. 1992. Achior. Page 1.55 in, D.N. Freed-
man, ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Doubleday, New
York, New York.

J.C. VanderKam. 1992. Ahikar/Ahiqar (Person). Pages
1.113-115 in, D.N. Freedman, ed., *The Anchor Bible Dic-
tionary*. Doubleday, New York, New York.

J.C. VanderKam. 1992. Ahiqar, Book of. Pages 1.119-120
in, D.N. Freedman, ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*.
Doubleday, New York, New York.

J.C. VanderKam. 1992. Calendars, Ancient Israelite and
Early Jewish. Pages 1.814-820 in, D.N. Freedman, ed.,
The Anchor Bible Dictionary. Doubleday, New York,
New York.

J.C. VanderKam. 1992. Dedication, Feast of. Pages
2.123-125 in, D.N. Freedman, ed., *The Anchor Bible Dic-
tionary*. Doubleday, New York, New York.

J.C. VanderKam. 1992. Jubilees, Book of. Pages
3.1030-1032 in, D.N. Freedman, ed., *The Anchor Bible
Dictionary*. Doubleday, New York, New York.

J.C. VanderKam. 1992. The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christi-
anity. Pages 181-202 in, H. Shanks, ed., *Understanding
the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reader from the Biblical Archaeol-
ogy Review*. Random House, New York, New York.

J.C. VanderKam. 1992. The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls:
Essenes or Sadducees. Pages 50-62 in, H. Shanks, ed.,
*Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reader from the
Biblical Archaeology Review*. Random House, New York,
New York.

J.C. VanderKam. 1992. Weeks, Festival of. Pages
6.895-897 in, D.N. Freedman, ed., *The Anchor Bible Dic-
tionary*. Doubleday, New York, New York.

The Graduate School Research Division

White, James F.

J.F. White. 1992. Liturgical Movement. Pages 296-298 in, D.W. Musser and J.L. Price, eds., A New Handbook of Christian Theology. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tennessee.

Yoder, John H.

J.H. Yoder. 1992. What Would You Do? Herald Press, Scottsdale, Pennsylvania. 144 pp.

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE

Biological Sciences

Adams, John H.

J.H. Adams, B. Kim Lee Sim, S.A. Dolan, X. Fang and D.C. Kaslow. 1992. A Family of Erythrocyte Binding Proteins of Malaria Parasites. *Proceedings National Academy Science USA* 89(August):7085-7089.

Chemistry and Biochemistry

Haller, Kenneth J.

H. Nasri, K.J. Haller, Y. Wang, B.H. Huynh and W.R. Scheidt. 1992. Reactions of Bis(nitro)[α , α , α , α]-meso-tetrakis(o-pivalamidophenyl)porphinatoiron(III) with 2,3,5,6-Tetrafluorothiophenol and 2,3,5,6-Tetrafluorothiophenolate. EPR and Mössbauer Spectra and Molecular Structures. *Inorganic Chemistry* 31:3459-3467.

Mozumder, Asokendu

See under RADIATION LABORATORY; LaVerne, J.A. 1992. *Radiation Research* 131:1-9.

Nasri, Habib

See under Haller, K.J. 1992. *Inorganic Chemistry* 31:3459-3467.

Scheidt, W. Robert

See under Haller, K.J. 1992. *Inorganic Chemistry* 31:3459-3467.

Mathematics

Faybusovich, Leonid

L. Faybusovich. 1992. Toda Flows and Isospectral Manifolds. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 115(3):837-849.

L. Faybusovich. 1992. Reduction to Generalized Hessenberg Form and Inverse Spectral Problems. *Linear Algebra and Its Applications* 165:71-92.

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering

Yang, Kwang-tzu

Y.C. Michael and K.T. Yang. 1992. Three-Dimensional Mach-Zehnder Interferometric Tomography of the Rayleigh-Benard Problem. *Journal of Heat Transfer* 114(3):622-629.

F.J. Hamady, J.R. Lloyd, K.T. Yang and H.Q. Yang. 1992. A Study of Natural Convection in a Rotating Enclosure. Pages 9-17 in, P.G. Simpkins, R.S. Figlio, J.G. Georgiadis, eds., Natural Convection in Enclosures-1992. American Society of Mechanical Engineers, New York, New York.

Chemical Engineering

Chang, Hsueh-Chia

C.-C. Chen and H.-C. Chang. 1992. Accelerated Disturbance Damping of an Unknown Distributed System by Nonlinear Dominant-Mode Feedback. *AIChE Journal* 38:146.

See under McCready, M.J. 1992. *Chemical Engineering Science* 47:3289.

McCready, Mark J.

M. Sangalli, T. Prokopiou, M.J. McCready and H.-C. Chang. 1992. Observed Transitions in Two-Phase Stratified Gas-Liquid Flow. *Chemical Engineering Science* 47:3289.

Civil Engineering and Geological Sciences

Makris, Nicos

N. Makris and M.C. Constantinov. 1992. Spring-Viscous Damper Systems for Combined Seismic and Vibration Isolation. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 21(6):649-664.

Spencer, Billie F., Jr.

J. Suhardjo, B.F. Spencer, Jr., M.K. Sain and D. Tomasula. 1992. Nonlinear Control of a Tension Leg Platform. Pages 464-474 in, N.K. Srivastava, A.N. Sherbourne and J. Roorda, eds., Innovative Large Span Structures, Volume 1. Canadian Society for Civil Engineering, Montreal, Canada.

Suhardjo, Johannes

See under Spencer, Billie F., Jr. 1992. Pages 464-474 in, Nonlinear Control of a Tension Leg Platform. Innovative Large Span Structures, Volume 1.

Electrical Engineering

McGinn, Paul J.

J.G. Chen, D. Shi, C.M. Wayman, P.J. McGinn, W.H. Chen and N. Zhu. 1992. A TEM Study of Grain Boundaries in Zone-Melted YBa₂Cu₃O_x. *Material Letters* 14:177-181.

The Graduate School Research Division

- C. Varanasi, D. Balkin and P. McGinn. 1992. The Chemical Stability of BaSnO_3 in the Melt of $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{6+x}$ during Solidification. *Materials Letters* 13:363-367.
- D. Balkin, C. Varanasi and P. McGinn. 1992. The Effect of $\text{Er}_2\text{BaCuO}_5$ Additions on the Microstructure and Magnetic Properties of Zone Melt Textured $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{6+x}$ Wires. Pages 158-161 in, Proceedings of the International Workshop on Superconductivity. Materials Research Society, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
- Porod, Wolfgang
H.K. Harbury, W. Porod and S.M. Goodnick. 1992. Lateral p-n Junctions between Quasi Two-Dimensional Electron and Hole Systems at Corrugated GaAs/AlGaAs Interfaces. *Journal of Vacuum Science and Technology B* 10(4):2051-2055.
- Sain, Michael K.
See under CIVIL ENGINEERING AND GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES; Spencer, Billie F., Jr. 1992. Pages 464-474 in, Nonlinear Control of a Tension Leg Platform. Innovative Large Span Structures, Volume 1.

LAW SCHOOL

- Phelps, Teresa G.
T.G. Phelps. 1992. Review of Narrative and the Legal Discourse: A Reader in Storytelling and the Law. *Journal of Legal Education* 42(1):143-146.

RADIATION LABORATORY

- Kamat, Prashant V.
S. Hotchandani and P.V. Kamat. 1992. Charge-Transfer Processes in Coupled Semiconductor Systems. Photochemistry and Photoelectrochemistry of the Colloidal CdS-ZnO System. *Journal of Physical Chemistry* 96(16):6834-6839.
- P.V. Kamat and B. Patrick. 1992. Photophysics and Photochemistry of Quantized ZnO Colloids. *Journal of Physical Chemistry* 96(16):6829-6834.
- LaVerne, Jay A.
J.A. LaVerne and A. Mozumder. 1992. Differential and Integral W-Values for Ionization in Gaseous Water under Electron and Proton Irradiation: Consistency of Inelastic Collision Cross Sections. *Radiation Research* 131:1-9.
- A. Hitachi, J.A. LaVerne and T. Doke. 1992. Effect of an Electric Field on Luminescence Quenching in Liquid Argon. *Physical Review B* 46(1):540-543.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

- Fuderer, Laura S.
L.S. Fuderer. 1992. Early Illustrated Botanical Books. *AB Bookman's Weekly* 90(4):221-224.
- Miller, Robert C.
R.C. Miller. 1992. Resource Sharing: A Personal Perspective. J. Cargill and D.J. Graves, eds., *Advances in Library Resource Sharing*, Volume 3. Meckler Publishing, Westport, Connecticut.

Notre Dame

R E P O R T

Volume 22, Number 3

September 25, 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, Gerard Jacobitz, 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.
