



---

# Notre Dame

---

# R E P O R T

---

## Contents:

April 30, 1993

---

### The University

- 383 *Brokaw Named Commencement Speaker*
- 384 *Aries Technology Gives Software to Engineering*
- 384 *Maritain Center Receives Grant*

---

### Faculty Notes

- 385 *Faculty Honors*
- 385 *Faculty Activities*
- 388 *Administrators' Appointments*
- 388 *Administrators' Honors*

---

### Documentation

- 389 *Board of Trustees Executive Summary*  
*February 11-12, 1993*
- 390 *Faculty Senate Journal*  
*March 1, 1993*  
*March 15, 1993*  
*March 22, 1993*
- 405 *University Committee on Libraries*  
*March 24, 1993*
- 406 *University Libraries' Hours During Intersession*  
*May 8 - June 13 and August 4 - 30, 1993*

---

### The Graduate School

- 407 *Current Publications and Other Scholarly Works*

---

# 16

---

1992-93

## Brokaw Named Commencement Speaker

Twelve religious, political, business and educational leaders from the United States and abroad will join principal speaker Tom Brokaw of NBC News as honorary degree recipients at the 148th Commencement exercises May 16. Degrees will be conferred on some 1,800 undergraduate and 550 advanced degree candidates. Brokaw, anchor and managing editor of "NBC Nightly News with Tom Brokaw," will receive an honorary doctor of laws degree.

The other honorary degree recipients are:

- Shirley S. Abrahamson, justice, Wisconsin Supreme Court, doctor of laws. The first and only woman to serve on Wisconsin's highest court, Abrahamson was elected in 1989 to her second 10-year term. In addition to her judicial duties, she serves in the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation program for Research on Mental Health and the Law, and is a member of the Council of the American Law Institute.
- Blandina Cardenas-Ramirez, Southwest Texas State University, doctor of laws. A leading advocate for minority students in higher education, Cardenas-Ramirez is director of the Center on Values, Achievement and Community in Education at Southwest Texas State University. Prior to assuming her current position in September, she headed the office of minorities in higher education at the American Council on Education. She is in her second six-year term as a member of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.
- Robert P. Casey, governor of Pennsylvania, doctor of laws. First elected governor in 1986, Casey was re-elected in 1990 by a margin of more than 1 million votes, the largest landslide in state gubernatorial history. The country's leading profile Democrat, he has made frequent speeches in opposition to the party's position on abortion. Formerly a state senator and auditor general, as governor he has mounted efforts to create jobs, strengthen families and improve the quality of life for women and children.
- Thomas A. Coleman, senior partner of Adler, Coleman & Co., doctor of laws. A member of the Notre Dame Board of Trustees since 1984, Coleman was elected to membership in the New York Stock Exchange soon after graduation from the University in 1956. A year later he became a partner with Adler and through the years has served on the boards of governors and directors of the NYSE and the New York Futures Exchange.
- Benjamin A. Cosgrove, retired senior vice president of the Boeing Co., doctor of engineering. The 1949 alumnus of Notre Dame is a world-renowned expert on airliner safety

and helped engineer for virtually every Boeing aircraft from the B-47 and B-52 bombers to the 707, 727, 737 and 747 commercial jets. He was chief project engineer and director of engineering on the company's new twin-engine, wide-bodied 767, and is currently consulting on technological aspects of the Boeing 777, due out in 1995. His awards include the Wright Brothers Memorial Trophy for contributions to airline safety and the Notre Dame College of Engineering Honor Award.

- Cardinal Cahal Daly, archbishop of Armagh and primate of all Ireland, doctor of laws. Considered the leading intellectual in the Catholic Church of Ireland for more than 20 years, Cardinal Daly became his country's Catholic spiritual leader Dec. 16, 1990. A leading ecumenist, he holds degrees from Queen's University of Belfast, St. Patrick's College of Maynooth, Ireland, and the Institut Catholique of Paris. He was ordained in 1941 and consecrated bishop in 1967.
- Carla A. Hills, former secretary of housing and urban development and former U.S. trade representative, doctor of laws. As trade representative in the Bush administration, Hills was the nation's principal negotiator on international trade talks, including the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the North American Free Trade Agreement. She served as HUD secretary in the Ford administration and spent two years in the Justice Department as an assistant attorney general. She chaired the Urban Institute from 1983-88 and recently announced the formation of Hills & Company, a consulting firm that will advise businesses on global economic issues.
- Rev. Henryk Jankowski, parish priest of St. Brygida Church in Gdansk, Poland, doctor of laws. Known as the "Priest of Solidarity," Father Jankowski has been the spiritual leader of Poland's Solidarity labor union since its formation at the Gdansk shipyard in 1980. During Solidarity's early years, when the Polish government outlawed the union and imprisoned Lech Walesa and its other leaders, Father Jankowski ministered to workers' spiritual needs and established a committee to provide them with food, medicine, clothing and financial assistance. Ordained in 1958, he has directed the spiritual and physical restoration of St. Brygida Church since 1970.
- Alan C. Page, justice, Minnesota Supreme Court, doctor of laws. In November 1992, after six years as assistant attorney general, Page became the first African-American elected to Minnesota's Supreme Court. He earned his law degree from the University of Minnesota in 1978 and has been a member of that university's board of regents since 1989. His Page Education Foundation assists minority and other disadvantaged youths with postsecondary educational opportunities. An All-America defensive lineman at Notre Dame, he was graduated in 1967 and played for 15 years with the NFL's Minnesota Vikings and Chicago Bears.

- John D. Roberts, emeritus professor of chemistry and director of undergraduate research, California Institute of Technology, doctor of science. A member of the Caltech faculty for 30 years, Roberts has conducted pioneering studies of organic reaction mechanisms and applications of carbon-13 and nitrogen-15 nuclear magnetic resonance spectrometry to organic chemistry and biochemistry. In 1990 he received the National Medal of Science from President Bush and shared the Welch Award in Chemistry. He has been published in hundreds of scientific journals and is co-author of *Basic Principles of Organic Chemistry*.

- Albert J. Raboteau, dean of the Princeton University Graduate School, doctor of laws. After five years as Putnam Professor of Religion at Princeton, Raboteau became dean of the Graduate School in July 1992. His scholarly specialties are African-American religion and American Catholicism, and he serves as one of three annually rotating chairs of the Princeton Center for the Study of American Religion. His 1978 book, *Slave Religion: The "Invisible Institution" in the Antebellum South*, has been honored for its rich research into the religious life of slave communities. Before joining the Princeton faculty in 1982, Raboteau taught and held administrative posts at the University of California at Berkeley for six years.

- Arnold W. Weber, president, Northwestern University, doctor of laws. Weber became Northwestern's 14th president in February 1985 after five years as president of the University of Colorado and seven years as a professor and administrator at Carnegie-Mellon University. An expert on economic policy and industrial and labor relations, Weber taught at the University of Chicago from 1958-73. He is the author of eight books and monographs and has been appointed to several government positions, including executive director of the Cost of Living Council, associate director of the Office of Management and Budget, and assistant secretary of manpower in the U.S. Department of Labor.

## Aries Technology Gives Software to Engineering

Computer software with a commercial value of \$4.7 million has been given to the University by Aries Technology Inc., Lowell, Mass., to enable civil, aerospace and mechanical engineering students to create designs by computer, analyze the designs for strength and deflection and eventually mill the modeled part.

The state-of-the-art software package runs on engineering workstations and will be used in engineering computer laboratories and classrooms during the next academic year. Mechanics of Solids, a course taken each year by 140 civil,

aerospace and mechanical engineering sophomores, and Engineering Graphics, with 90 mechanical engineering sophomores each year, are the classes where engineering students can initially expect to encounter the software.

The Aries software allows exposure to solid modeling as opposed to wire frame modeling, which is significant, because the computer treats the design as a physical entity instead of simply lines and surfaces. This allows the engineer to perform experiments on computer that previously would have required laboratory work and eliminates the need for several stages of prototypes.

## Maritain Center Receives Grant

Notre Dame has received a \$200,000 grant from the Saint Gerard Foundation of Clearwater, Fla., for its Jacques Maritain Center. The grant will support a variety of activities underscoring the importance of St. Thomas Aquinas and the magisterium of the Catholic Church.

It will make possible the establishment of a dissertation year graduate fellowship and a research fellowship for Thomistic projects; production and distribution of a brochure drawing the attention of undergraduate students to the Thomistic courses offered in the University's philosophy department; a two-week conference of Thomist scholars to be held at Notre Dame this summer; and center-sponsored faculty conferences with visiting lecturers during the 1993-94 academic year.

The Maritain Center, directed by Ralph McInerney, will also expand to become an archive of the Thomistic revival in North America. Papers of Jacques Maritain, a French Catholic thinker who taught at Notre Dame and had strong personal and intellectual ties to the University, and those of two other prominent Thomist philosophers, Yves Simon and Charles DeKonick, are already housed in the center.

In addition, the grant will underwrite the inauguration of a projected 20 volume edition of Maritain's writings to be published by the University of Notre Dame Press.

# Faculty Notes

---

## Honors

**Kathleen A. Biddick**, associate professor of history, has been appointed to a three-year term on the American Historical Association Committee of the Medieval Academy of America.

**Ian B. Duncanson**, staff professional specialist in the Radiation Laboratory, received the 1992 Wale Award for best technical poster presented at the 37th symposium and exposition of the American Scientific Glassblowers Society.

**Dennis C. Jacobs**, assistant professor of chemistry and biochemistry, has been named a 1993 Alfred P. Sloan Research Fellow by the Sloan Foundation in New York City. Ninety Sloan research fellowships, with unrestricted grants of \$30,000 each, were given this year to outstanding young scientists and economists involved in basic scientific and technological research throughout the country. Working on a relatively unexplored area in chemistry, Jacobs explores the chemistry of small charged molecules at metal and semiconductor surfaces.

**Catherine Mowry LaCugna**, associate professor of theology, has received the Frank O'Malley undergraduate teaching award for 1992-93. A member of the Notre Dame faculty since 1981, she directs doctoral candidates and teaches masters students and students in the masters of divinity program as well as a popular undergraduate course "Mystery of God."

**Dean A. Porter**, director of the Snite Museum of Art and associate professor of art, art history and design, has been appointed to the advisory committee for the Indianapolis Art League.

**Karamjit S. Rai**, professor of biological sciences, has received a competitive travel award from the Genetics Society of America to attend the 17th international congress of Genetics in Birmingham, England, Aug. 15-21. He has also been invited to participate in the fourth congress of the European Society for Evolutionary Biology and to present a paper in the symposium on "Chromosomes and Evolution" in Montpellier, France, Aug. 22-28. The award by the Genetics Society of America and the invitation by the European Society for Evolutionary Biology are in recognition of the work being done in Rai's laboratory.

**Rev. Timothy R. Scully, C.S.C.**, assistant professor of government and international studies, was elected to membership in the Chicago committee of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations in Chicago, Ill.

## Activities

**Jeffrey H. Bergstrand**, associate professor of finance and business economics, gave a Hesburgh Lecture on "The Changing Distribution of U.S. Income" to the Notre Dame Alumni Club of South Central Wisconsin at Edgewood College in Madison, Wis., April 1.

**Kathleen Biddick**, associate professor of history, gave an invited lecture on the "Politics of Intersection in Medieval Studies" at a symposium held at the University of Rochester in Rochester, N.Y., March 27.

**Joseph Blenkinsopp**, O'Brien professor of theology, delivered the lectures on "The Prophet as Dissident Intellectual," "The Servant of the Lord and His Followers," "A Jewish Sect of the Persian Period" and "Reader Response Theory (Rezeptionstheorie) and the Bible" at the University of Glasgow, Scotland, March 9-12.

**Krzysztof Bobrowski**, associate professional specialist in the Radiation Laboratory, presented the paper "Charge Transfer in Biochemistry Modelled by Radiolysis Methods" at the 1993 Miller Conference in Bowness-on-Windmere, England, April 3-8.

**Sally Brogden**, visiting assistant professor of art, art history and design, had her work presented and reviewed at the annual conference of the Council on the Education in the Ceramic Arts by Gary Erickson, an independent artist and periodic adjunct faculty member at Hamline University in Minneapolis, Minn., as part of a panel discussion titled "Ceramic Abstraction: Inspiration and Interpretation" at the annual conference of the Council on the Education in the Ceramic Arts in San Diego, Calif., March 24.

**Rev. David B. Burrell, C.S.C.**, professor of philosophy and theology, presented the Phi Beta Kappa lecture "Freedom and Creation in Three Traditions" at Northeast Missouri State University in Kirksville, Mo., March 29.

**Robert W. Clausen**, guest assistant professor of biological sciences, presented a lecture on "AIDS and an International Port — Management Challenges" for the Indian Medical Association and the Cochin Harbor Port Trust in Cochin, India, Feb. 9. He presented the lectures "International Guidelines for Management of Asthma" and "Allergies-Immunopathophysiology and Diagnosis" for postgraduate students at Kasturba Medical College in Manipal, Karnataka State India, Feb. 10, 12. He gave the invited lecture "HIV Disease — Crisis in the Indian Subcontinent" for the Association of Physicians of India meeting in Bikaner, Rajasthan, India, Feb. 22.

## Faculty Notes

---

Daniel J. Costello Jr., chair and professor of electrical engineering, presented the paper "A Resynchronization Scheme for Continuous Sequential Decoding of Convolutional and Trellis Codes" co-authored with Fu-Quan Wang and Shu Lin at the 1993 conference on Information Sciences and Systems in Baltimore, Md., March 25.

Norman A. Crowe, associate professor of architecture, served as a guest critic on architectural thesis design juries at Andrews University School of Architecture in Berrien Springs, Mich., March 10. He served as invited respondent and commentator on papers presented at the American Institute of Architect's Urban Design Session at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture annual symposium in Charleston, S.C., March 13.

Lawrence S. Cunningham, chair and professor of theology, presented the lecture "The Charism of Monasticism: A Lay Theological View" at Tantur Ecumenical Institute in Israel, March 11. He lectured on "Thomas Merton: Spiritual Master" at the N.D. Encounter Group at the University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind., March 24. He gave the Hesburgh lecture "Dropping Out of the Church" for the Notre Dame Club in Fort Wayne, Ind., March 25.

James T. Cushing, professor of physics, gave invited lectures on Bell's theorem and on the quantum-mechanical measurement problem at the University of Missouri at Kansas City, Mo., April 2. He delivered a public lecture on "Bell's Theorem and the Nature of Physical Reality" at the Linda Hall Library in Kansas City, Mo., April 2.

Ronald Dorris, assistant professor of American studies, chaired a session on "Culture, Bi-Culture, and Tri-Culture in the Works of Chinua Achebe, Doris Lessing, and Olive Schreiner" at the College Language Association meeting in Daytona Beach, Fla., April 1.

William G. Dwyer, professor of mathematics, gave an invited lecture titled "Transfer Maps" in the University of Chicago Mathematics Department in Chicago, Ill., April 13.

Denis Goulet, O'Neill professor in education for justice, economics, spoke on "Reconciling the Two Ethics: Development and Environment" at the International Union for the Conservation of Nature ethics workshop on "Advancing Ethics for Living Sustainably" held in Porter, Ind., April 2-4.

Bei Hu, assistant professor of mathematics, gave an invited colloquium talk "The Profile Near Blow-up Time for Solution of the Heat Equation with a Nonlinear Boundary Condition" at the Department of Mathematics at Loyola University in Chicago, Ill., April 2.

Prashant V. Kamat, professional specialist in the Radiation Laboratory, gave the invited seminar "Photoelectrochemical Behavior of Semiconductor Colloids and Particulate Films" at the University of Wisconsin in Madison, Wis., April 12.

Marjorie Schreiber Kinsey, adjunct assistant professor in the arts and letters core course, delivered a paper titled "Orpheus and the End of History in the Nineteenth Century" at the annual meeting of the Midwest Art History Society held at the Joslyn Art Museum and the University of Nebraska in Omaha, Nebr., March 25-27.

Jay A. LaVerne, professional specialist in the Radiation Laboratory, presented the paper "The Production of  $\text{HO}_2^+$  by 200-800-MeV Carbon Ions" co-authored with Robert H. Schuler, Zahm professor of chemistry and director of the Radiation Laboratory, at the 1993 Miller Conference in Bowness-on-Windermere, England, April 3-8.

Diana C.J. Matthias, assistant professional specialist in the Snite Museum of Art, gave the lecture "Bureau Paintings in Sixteenth Century Antwerp" at the University of Michigan Art Museum in Ann Arbor, Mich., March 18. She presented a teacher workshop as part of a National Endowment for the Humanities grant given to encourage teachers to use objects from the art museum for their class curriculums at the Krannert Art Museum and Kinhead Pavilion at the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, Ill., March 24.

Rev. Ernan McMullin, O'Hara professor of philosophy, lectured on "Was Galileo Guilty? Lessons from the Galileo Case," at the University of St. Thomas in St. Paul, Minn., March 8. He gave the keynote address "Science and Imagination" at the annual conference of the Midwest Undergraduate Philosophy Association at Augustana College in Rock Island, Ill., March 20.

Rev. Donald P. McNeill, C.S.C., director of the Center for Social Concerns and concurrent assistant professor of theology, presented "Hopes for the Next Decade" at the Alumni Social Concerns Forum at the Center for Social Concerns, Notre Dame, Ind., March 27. He presented the lecture "Social Concerns and Future Ministries in the Church" with Katie Glynn at St. Paul's Retirement Center in South Bend, Ind., March 29. He gave the presentation "Social Issues from the Inside" with Craig Anzilotti and Laurie Niemann for the Church Leaders' Program at Wilson Commons, Notre Dame, Ind., March 30. He presented "Christianity and Social Work" at Loyola University of Social Work in Chicago, Ill., April 7.

Rev. Edward D. O'Connor, C.S.C., associate professor of theology, gave the lecture "Signs and Wonders Today" at the Masonic Temple in South Bend, Ind., March 18.

# Faculty Notes

---

**Teresa Godwin Phelps**, professor of law, gave a lecture titled "Keeping the Faith: Women in the Catholic Church" at Stonehill College in North Easton, Mass., March 30.

**Simon M. Pimblott**, associate professional specialist in the Radiation Laboratory, presented the paper "Diffusion-Kinetic Modeling of the Electron Radiolysis of Water at Elevated Temperatures" co-authored with **Jay A. LaVerne**, professional specialist in the Radiation Laboratory, at the 1993 Miller Conference in Bowness-on-Windermere, England, April 3-8.

**Frank K. Reilly**, Hank professor of business administration, presented a paper titled "The High Yield Bond Market — Evidence of Market Segmentation" at the Ecole DeHautes Etudes Commerciales DuNord in Lille, France, Nov. 23. He delivered the Nomura distinguished visiting fellow lecture "Global Investing and the Benchmark Problem" at the University of Exeter, U.K., Dec. 8. He lectured in the Financial Analysts Review Program in Raleigh, N.C., Jan. 29-30. He lectured in the CFA Review Course sponsored by the Security Analysts Association of Japan in Tokyo, Japan, Feb. 5-6.

**Ken D. Sauer**, assistant professor of electrical engineering, presented the invited paper "Fast Numerical Methods for Emission and Transmission Tomographic Reconstruction" at the conference on Information Sciences and Systems at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Md., March 24-26.

**Robert H. Schuler**, Zahm professor of chemistry and director of the Radiation Laboratory, presented the paper "Intratrack Reactions of Cyclohexyl Radicals in the Heavy Ion Radiolysis of Cyclohexane" co-authored with **Jay A. LaVerne**, professional specialist in the Radiation Laboratory, at the 1993 Miller Conference in Bowness-on-Windermere, England, April 3-8.

**Rev. Timothy R. Scully, C.S.C.**, assistant professor of government and international studies, served as a consultant to a Lilly Foundation Project on Religiously Affiliated Institutions of Higher Education in the United States at a workshop at Pepperdine University in Malibu, Calif., Jan. 15-16. He delivered the paper "The Politics of Economic Liberalization: The Aylwin and Post-Aylwin Periods in Chile" at a workshop on Political and Economic Liberalization at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles, Calif., Feb. 18. He presented "The Dynamics of Privatization in Chile's Transition to Democracy" at a conference given with Terry L. Karl at Stanford University's School of Business in Stanford, Calif., Feb. 25.

**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 NITA/Pennie & Edmonds Deposition Program in New York, N.Y., March 19-21. He gave a lecture to the faculty on Effective Teaching Techniques. He was a faculty member for the NITA Teacher Training program at the Harvard Law School in Cambridge, Mass., March 26-28. He gave a series of lectures to both the faculty and participants on Effective Teaching Techniques.

**Mei-Chi Shaw**, professor of mathematics, gave the talk titled "Homotopy Formulas in the Tangential Cauchy-Riemann Complex" at Wichita State University in Wichita, Kans., March 5, and at the AMS regional meeting in Salt Lake City, Utah, April 10.

**Stephen E. Silliman**, associate professor of civil engineering and geological sciences, gave the invited lecture "Reflections on the Non-technical (ethical) Aspects of the Career of an Engineer" to the Department of Electrical Engineering at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo, Mich., March 10. He served as a panel member/presenter on a discussion of "Whether Ethics should be a Required Part of the Curriculum" at the conference on Ethics and the Educated Person in Indianapolis, Ind., March 25-26.

**Andrew J. Sommese**, professor of mathematics, gave the colloquium talks "On the Spannedness of Adjoint Bundles" and "Varieties Covered With Linear Spaces" at the University of Trento, Italy, April 2, 6.

**Arvind Varma**, Schmitt professor of chemical engineering, organized and chaired a symposium in honor of Murphree Award recipient **James J. Carberry**, professor of chemical engineering, at the American Chemical Society national meeting held in Denver, Colo., April 1. He presented a paper titled "Combustion Synthesis of Advanced Materials" at that symposium.

**Dariusz M. Wilczynski**, assistant professor of mathematics, gave a seminar talk titled "Automorphisms of the Hirzebruch Surfaces" at Tulane University in New Orleans, La., March 29.

# Administrators' Notes

---

## Appointments

Charles E. Schnur, a 1978 Notre Dame graduate, has been appointed the regional director of development for Chicago. A native of Evansville, Ind., Schnur studied accounting and management at Notre Dame and worked in sales for the Aluminum Company of America (ALCOA) from 1978-81. At ALCOA he was a member of the 1980 "All Pro" team, which consisted of the company's 10 most successful sales people. For the last 13 years Schnur has worked in sales and management for the 3M Company's electronic products division in Chicago. He was the division's national sales representative of the year in 1985 and its Midwest district sales representative of the year in 1990.

## Honors

Kitty Arnold, director of Career and Placement Services, has been elected to the Board of Governors of the College Placement Council for a three-year term. The Board of Governors is comprised of 14 individual governors, seven representing colleges and seven representing employers, plus four officers. The council is the national professional association of college career services professionals and corporate college relations representatives.

Donald R. Miller, executive chef of the Morris Inn, has earned his professional certification from the American Culinary Federation Educational Institute. Miller, now a Certified Executive Chef, had previously earned the distinction of Certified Culinary Educator. The institute, a subsidiary of the American Culinary Federation, was founded to further the education and training of professionals in the culinary profession. The certification program recognizes chefs who have fulfilled specific requirements in culinary experience, education and skills. The candidates are then evaluated by a committee of other certified chefs to determine their competence and expertise.

William P. Sexton, vice president for University Relations and professor of management, has received an Irish Clover award for outstanding service to the Notre Dame student body by an administrator. Under his direction, Notre Dame in 1987-90 conducted the most successful capital campaign in the history of Catholic higher education, raising more than \$463 million for the University. A board member and advisor of several non-for-profit health care organizations, as well as of the Center for the Homeless, he is an enthusiastic supporter of the Notre Dame student government's lecture series and has assisted student government in its regular reports to the Board of Trustees.



# Documentation

---

## Board of Trustees Executive Summary February 11-12, 1993

The opening afternoon session of February 11 consisted of a presentation on the Department of Athletics by Athletic Director Richard A. Rosenthal; Melissa L. Conboy, assistant director of athletics; Dr. Kate Halischak, special assistant to Father Beauchamp and director of academic support services; Dr. Thomas W. Kelly, assistant director of athletics and director of recreational sports and Joseph F. O'Brien, senior associate director of athletics.

Mr. Rosenthal said the philosophy of the Department of Athletics is based on its being part of the educational mission of the University and is governed by the policy statement on athletics issued by Father Malloy in 1987. The department's budget is in the middle range for peer universities engaged in intercollegiate sports. Ticket prices and television income generate more than 90 percent of revenue, and it is not thought that this income will be sufficient to meet future costs, necessitating a search for additional revenue sources. Marketing holds great potential as such a source and is increasingly being used by universities involved in intercollegiate athletics, including some of the most prestigious. Notre Dame's Department of Athletics has been comparatively inactive in commercial activities. It continues to be concerned with what is appropriate and consistent with the University's image while realizing the revenue potential promotion and marketing have.

Mr. O'Brien described the table of organization for the 139 persons in the Department of Athletics, which includes the operation of the Joyce Athletic and Convocation Center, the golf course/golf shop and lake recreation. (The department no longer supervises physical education.) He then moved on to a discussion of the financial affairs of the department, noting that it not only operates in the black but also over the past five years has contributed some \$6 million to the operating budget of the University. The department has been able to function without the imposition of a student activity fee for athletics and without touching its Athletic Endowment Fund. About three-fourths of all athletic revenue at Notre Dame comes from football, compared to 43 percent at the average College Football Association member institution. However, these revenues are flattening out while expenses are steadily climbing, with the result that a deficit looms as early as fiscal 1995.

Dr. Halischak, in reporting on academic services for student athletes, noted that her office reports directly to the executive vice president, giving it unusual autonomy in ensuring that the University's educational commitment to its student-athletes is fulfilled. She reviewed the academically related services for athletes but stressed that no "babysitting" of them was done; they were treated as adults responsible for their own scholastic success or failure. She cited recent

statistics that point up Notre Dame's success in graduating its student-athletes.

Dr. Kelly reviewed the fast-growing recreational sports area at the University, observing that 82 percent of Notre Dame students took part in organized recreational sports and another 11 percent recreated on their own. That 93 percent figure compared with a 50 percent national average. Despite its superb athletic facilities, the University, he said, needs a dedicated indoor recreational space because the expansion of "RecSports" and of varsity programs at Notre Dame has made the sharing of facilities more and more difficult.

At the conclusion of the presentation by the Department of Athletics, Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, president emeritus, at the invitation of Trustee Chairman Andrew McKenna, summed up the activity of the Knight Commission on the reform of intercollegiate athletics, which he (Father Hesburgh) co-chaired.

Subsequent discussion by the Trustees concerned the public image of the University as it was affected by the enormous media exposure of its athletic program. The quality and integrity of the athletic program are benefits for the University. The challenge is to find the proper means of conveying messages about the academic mission of the institution to an audience largely preconditioned by media preoccupation with athletics.

Chairman McKenna announced the formation of a standing committee on athletics, consisting of no fewer than five members, one of whom shall be the executive vice president of the University. Arthur J. Decio was named to head this committee, with the names of other members to be announced later.

The Trustees reconvened on the morning of February 12, and six new members were elected to a board expanded from 50 to 60 persons. Occupying positions set aside for recent graduates are Catherine E. David '85, a buyer for Target in Minneapolis, and Martin W. Rodgers '88, a legislative assistant to Pennsylvania Senator Harris Wofford in Washington. Three elected to regular positions are Kathleen W. Andrews '63 M.S., Kansas City, Mo., chief executive officer of Andrews and McMeel publishing company and a member of the Advisory Council for Church Life; John W. (Jay) Jordan II '69, New York City, chief executive officer of Jordan Industries, Inc. and The Jordan Company, and a member of the Advisory Council for Business Administration; Phillip B. Rooney, Oak Brook, Ill., president and chief operating officer of Waste Management, Inc., and member of the Engineering Advisory Council, and John F. Sandner '68 J.D., chairman of the board of governors of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange and a member of the Law School Advisory Council. Trustee Bernard J. Hank Jr. was elected to the Fellows of the University.



# Documentation

---

Father Beauchamp presented a report on the endowment spending policy by the Investment and Finance Committee, which concluded that the increase over a prior year's spending be changed from 3.5 percent to 4.0 percent, compounded annually beginning with fiscal 1993-94 and that spendable income include both current yield and capital appreciation, when required, to meet spending objectives.

Vice President for Business Affairs Thomas Mason presented and received approval of the 1993-94 operating budget, which reflected \$1.8 million charge to start funding the future cost of postretirement health care benefits, a charge mandated by the Financial Accounting Standards Board. Undergraduate tuition and room and board will increase 7.5 percent, he reported.

Father Malloy's report covered a variety of matters arising since the last Trustees' meeting, including progress on the "Colloquy for the Year 2000," expansion of international studies programs to Chile, the meeting of the International Federation of Catholic Universities on campus in the summer of 1994, and problems that might arise from a local gathering of a national student right-to-life group whose request to meet on campus had been declined because activities would have interfered with academic life. He also obtained trustee approval for honorary degree candidates in the May Commencement.

Provost Timothy O'Meara concluded the meeting with a summary of the Academic Life Report of his Colloquy committee.

## Faculty Senate Journal March 1, 1993

The chair Professor Richard Sheehan called the meeting to order at 7 p.m. in room 202 of the Center for Continuing Education and asked the co-secretary Professor Willis Bartlett to offer a prayer. The journal of the December 9, 1992, meeting having been introduced, Professor Mario Borelli moved to accept it as written, to which Professor Philip Quinn seconded and the senate concurred.

The chair reported on several matters. He has informed all the deans of the senate's recent action in regard to College Councils and the April Accords. The Academic Council has acted on a couple of issues: The fall semester will start on the next to last Tuesday of August rather than the fourth Tuesday in order to guarantee a minimum of 69 or 70 class days. University institutes and their definition are still undergoing study. The honor code is up for serious discussion at the next meeting. On standing committees, they are only now beginning to function. The president sees them searching out issues rather than reacting to them, but until the Colloquy has finished its work, we probably should not expect too much from these new committees. He reported also on the status of Colloquy 2000. The committee of the whole, of which the senate chair is now a member, has received the final reports of its four committees; the "whole" will work on them in March and the president will have his final report to the Trustees for their May meeting; there is little hope of extending that deadline. The main work remaining for the Colloquy concerns the Mission statement; it has been revised again, is down to one page but still includes a prenote. The chair reflected on his own role as senate chair where he felt this year he was less argumentative and more a facilitator of discussion; in addition he noted that this year the administration has seemed to be more forthcoming with information, more responsive to concerns expressed by the senate, more cooperative in general terms than it appeared last year.

### STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. STUDENT AFFAIRS - the chair Professor George Lopez reported on a recent meeting of his committee and other Senators with Vice President for Student Affairs Patricia O'Hara. Lopez had set up the meeting and presented her with several questions and issues (letter to O'Hara, appendix A of this journal) for the discussion. The meeting was prompted especially by the issue of the rejection of recognition of "Gays and Lesbians at Notre Dame/Saint Mary's College" (GLND/SMC) and a September senate resolution. Prior to the meeting, Lopez and Sheehan had met with O'Hara who asked that she be allowed to meet only with a committee rather than the whole senate; since early fall other issues had arisen and she was asked to comment on these in addition to GLND/SMC.

# Documentation

---

Professor James Collins saw her rejection of GLND/SMC as symptomatic of other issues. He reported her perception of her job was to safeguard the mission of the University as the administration saw it; implementation of change rested on her interpretation of this mission; in effect, if one is outside the circle, he or she need not be listened to. Professor Frank Connolly was not satisfied with her explanation of her rejection of GLND/SMC; he was only a bit more satisfied that the Office of Student Affairs (OSA) truly has the needs of our students at heart. Connolly had reviewed the relative documents (the application and O'Hara's letter of rejection) and found no substance to the charge that GLND/SMC posits a value-neutral approach to lifestyle questions, apparently the basis for O'Hara's rejection, nor does GLND/SMC condone sexual activity. He believed OSA had not done justice to this group. Lopez believed the issue involved not fact but policy and Catholic doctrine; however the OSA did not consult widely in dealing with the theological issues, and O'Hara would not give any indication that specific changes in the application would result in its approval. Professor David O'Connor, noting that the group had existed for several years, questioned the "value-neutral" aspect of the group; is this the real issue here or do we simply ignore the long history of the Catholic Church?

Lopez asked what the senate wished his committee to do as a reaction to this meeting with O'Hara. Should the senate focus on this issue or the broader issue of communication on campus? Professor Michael Detlefsen acknowledged both issues and wished to see the senate note its disapproval of OSA's lack of responsiveness to the needs of our students and the faculty's concern for them. Connolly agreed, saying that the educational and developmental needs of our students are not being met by OSA. Whether recognition is the proper way to do it is only part of the question, but no other way seems open to them with the attitude of OSA. The secretary Peter Lombardo reported on O'Hara's vigorous defense of her position, one with which some may disagree, but she did appear before a senate body to argue her case forthrightly. This is what we had asked her to do, and she did it. Collins further reported her attitude as one of dismissal of the senate's reaction; no matter what we decided or when or how she knew what we decided would have no effect on her decision. Lombardo hoped that the senate would hold O'Hara to her stated view that OSA, through Campus Ministry and the University Counseling Center, would take the concerns evident in GLND/SMC and respond to them. Professor Harvey Bender added that she did not make this decision alone; others in the administration helped her draw it up. Further, she noted to the committee that some times decisions are not made solely in keeping with theological or legal norms (academic freedom and student alcohol use are two examples she gave).

The senate chair asked the Student Affairs Committee to meet and present a resolution or suggestion for possible senate action at the April meeting. Lopez agreed, asking all

senators to present their views to the committee. He also reported that some students have met with him on another issue (a women's center) and have given him the impression that OSA is stalling on their request and handling it in the same way it handled GLND/SMC.

## 2. BENEFITS - no report

3. ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS - the chair being absent, Quinn reported for him that the committee will present a resolution in April on ex-officio administrators on the senate; other resolutions to come include action on the manner of election and/or appointment of faculty to University committees and other bodies.

4. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS - the chair being absent, O'Connor reported that the committee has met to discuss the Catholic identity issue several times and will report to the senate soon.

## NEW BUSINESS

In taking up the Colloquy Report on Academic Life ("report"), the chair proposed spending time on it tonight and agreeing to further meetings as necessary to continue the discussion; the academic affairs committee was asked to present a draft of a response to the senate based on the discussion. The Colloquy Committee of the Whole would want to begin preparing the final report three times in mid-to late- March. The senate agreed to this format. Professor Charles Parnell pointed out that emeritus faculty did not receive copies of the report; emeritus faculty are consistently left out of general faculty mailings.

O'Connor began the discussion by saying this report's mission statement was better than the other one we had received. His general impression of the report's tone was favorable; it reflected many of the structural concerns we wanted to see, such as involvement of the College Councils. Detlefsen objected to the phrase "We on the faculty . . .," since it was not written by elected faculty members; the document was not generated by elected, representative faculty but rather by hand-picked members, often also administrators. Professor Paul Conway pointed out that this committee report would be only one document that will be considered in writing the final Colloquy report; there will be four committee reports so considered. Connolly hoped that the senate's response would be seen as positive and constructive, especially since the chair of the senate is a member of the Colloquy Committee of the Whole; he recalled the April Accords when the senate agreed to lend support to the Colloquy. Detlefsen asked when the senate agreed to that, and Quinn responded that the executive committee agreed to urge support for the process but never indicated that this would involve blanket endorsement of the final product.

The chair having invited to this meeting Rev. Wilson Miscamble, C.S.C., Sheehan asked parliamentarian professor

# Documentation

William Eagan to rule on allowing Miscamble to speak. Following the ruling, Connolly moved, seconded by professor Mario Borelli, a 10-minute recess to allow Miscamble to participate in this discussion. Sheehan had invited Miscamble, a fellow member of the Colloquy Committee of the Whole, because he felt it would be useful for him to hear the senate's discussion and perhaps add to it. The senate stood in recess for 10 minutes. Sheehan allowed Miscamble the privilege of the floor. In his remarks he said he was amazed that the senate would not immediately endorse the report because of the blueprint it set forth for the future of Notre Dame. Disagreement was possible, but its objective was excellent. It was limited though in its implementation especially of Catholic character and hiring policies. The senate should encourage discussion on this issue and be constructive. The last decade has seen actions that have caused us to veer away from our Catholic identity, and we must correct that by fleshing out the report.

O'Connor wanted to move the discussion to chapter two, in particular 2A. Vasta agreed he saw chapter one as benign, while two had substance and represented faculty, students and administrators. Professor Jeff Kantor did not believe chapter one was benign or innocuous at all; Colloquy was not an elected group. Borelli pointed out again that this report is not the final document, and we should move on in our discussion. Let the concerns be reflected in the journal and in our response.

Miscamble saw the issue as one of finding the best way to attract faculty who are committed to the mission of the University. We need some creative thinking on this, and he has suggested some in a paper he has circulated recently. Notre Dame is a different kind of institution, one that we need not be defensive about, but one that is a first-rate institution where everyone of goodwill can contribute to its greatness and help maintain the diversity of American higher education. A first-rate institution of higher learning with a religious character will do that. Professor John Affleck-Graves agreed with Miscamble's and the report's aims, but he wondered about how we would know who was a "dedicated and committed Catholic." Further, was this criterion only for initial hiring, or also for promotion decisions? The provost has said only for appointment, but it is unclear how recommendation one will be implemented and it is worrisome for many. Rev. David Burrell, C.S.C., thought Affleck-Graves' points were important; the report may be poorly written, but it sets goals and they are difficult ones. Implementation is left to the department. Affleck-Graves worried about candidates of equal worth; where would one's Catholicity come in? This is an implementation question and bothers many.

Miscamble responded that the issue was not easy. Looking anew and with a good heart, we can resolve them, but we must address Catholic identity. Ask candidates what they

can bring to the discussion. We shouldn't be defensive. The senate resumed its meeting.

Detlefsen spoke of his support for the document, especially for its attempt to broaden the Catholic Christian character. But it was a leap to believe that having Catholics "predominate in numbers" will achieve it. It may, but it may not. It will certainly present problems in finding these dedicated Catholics with the scholarly qualification to recruit for Notre Dame, certainly in his department. We should look hard at this. O'Connor believed the discussion of this would be most useful at the departmental level. "Predominate in number" is a clear statement and very demanding; he may agree with it. The faculty is really a self-perpetuating body; it does its own hiring. Over a long time frame we will see these concerns reflected. Quinn said while the report presupposes a need for Catholics to predominate on the faculty, the document does not establish that as a fact. Is it true that we will become a secular institution if we don't go along with this assumption? There are other views we should examine, such as those reflected in Professor James Turner's (University of Michigan) paper.

Professor Jean Porter saw recommendation one as affirmative action for Catholics, and that's really how we operate in practice now. Catholics are not marginalized here, and it is unusual to see affirmative action for such a group. She thought it would be an interesting exercise to substitute "women" or "African-Americans" in that recommendation. Later in the report, she found the analogy for academic leadership to be one like clergy — laity in the Church to be very disturbing because of the laity's lack of power and influence. Further the "personal and professional conduct" section was written very generally and could be seen as quite intrusive; it should be rewritten to emphasize the prohibition on sexual harassment. Collins agreed generally with her first point and objected to any kind of quota system.

Lopez urged our committee to draft a response that is specific and not generalized as the report is. For example, if Notre Dame wants a statement on academic integrity, what is inadequate about the AAUP guidelines? Does "dedicated and committed Catholics" mean with respect to doctrine or something else? Will we simply be seen as doctrinaire? If we have no model to follow, how can we be sectarian without this being taken in a pejorative sense? He came to Notre Dame because he saw it as a place for the Church to do its thinking, but often bickering precedes good thinking. How can we, Catholic and non-Catholic faculty, contribute to the way the Church does its thinking?

Burrell, disagreeing with Porter's affirmative action analogy, nevertheless saw Catholic identity in hiring one other way to look at how a candidate can contribute to Notre Dame. There are other ways to engage this conversation, such as saying there should be a "significant number" of Catholics on the faculty. O'Connor connected recommendation one

## Documentation

---

with recommendation seven — how can scholars be found whose work is informed with the tradition of Catholic intellectual life? Departments should have a strong hand here. Porter expressed a discomfort with the report's failure to watch out for the intellectual life of the University. O'Connor disagreed, saying the document balanced Catholic identity and intellectual character. Professor Edward Vasta saw a great emphasis on academic strength in the report, especially in the section on graduate education. The University must meet generally-accepted standards for all universities to be a great university; it must meet further standards to be a great Catholic university. These are two separate items, and we have to find the grounds to do both. This will be very difficult, but it can be done. One danger is secularism, but another is sectarianism or a certain kind of Catholic university. The report sets an encouraging, even keel for the future.

Quinn remarked on another concern: Quantitative measures of teaching quality should note the possibility of gender bias and guard against it. Lopez went further: What is a quality teacher? There was no recommendation on teaching or professional development as teachers or a new way of looking at the teacher/scholar dimension of our life. This was a missed opportunity. Burrell thought recommendation four addressed some of this, but was not nearly strong enough. O'Connor, in section 2F, thought putting more power into the hands of departmental chairs had both good and bad points; here especially faculty input on the parameters of this power and its reshaping would be welcome. Professor Paula Higgins seconded Porter's comments, especially in regard to "personal and professional conduct," asking if the University were now about to investigate the private lives of faculty and students; this is a dangerous section. She noted that the senate's previous discussions of the administration's refusal to recognize the gay/lesbian student group have treated the matter as if it affects only undergraduate students. And yet the issue of "Catholic character" with regard to homosexuality must surely have larger implications for faculty and other members of the University community. Does a clause like this mean, for example, that a person known to be homosexual will be denied tenure, promotion or reappointment? Sheehan reminded the senate that its resolution on criteria to be considered in promotion (limited to teaching, research and service and restricting consideration of private issues) is still on the table for Academic Council action. Higgins acknowledged that this may well be the case, but wished to underscore that the wording of the clause opens the door to potential abuses. Lombardo pointed out that several sections of the report seemed to indicate that adjunct and professional specialist faculty members do not teach effectively in a wide variety of courses across colleges, and a suggestion that only teaching-and-research faculty were qualified to do so should be rejected. Borelli endorsed this position. O'Connor moved to end the evening's discussion of this report at 9:30; Bartlett seconded, and the senate agreed.

The senate then considered chapter three of the report. Detlefsen pointed out that funding for graduate school development and the College of Business Administration was equal; he believed it was inappropriate and should be justified. Professor Robert Vecchio said that business administration had no doctoral programs; this funding would be to start them in five areas. Detlefsen, as director of his department's graduate studies, thought such new programs at this time ought to be the subject of wide discussion across the University, and Connolly agreed.

For Lopez, section 3B presented problems. Currently we struggle with funding for graduate students, so why are we seeking to start new programs without funding properly the existing ones? We have a small graduate program here, already underfunded. It makes no sense to start others. Burrell agreed. Quinn further remarked that expanding the existing programs from 1,400 students to 2,000 without an expanding job market also makes no sense; we should fund the current ones better. In addition the report does not explain how and why the University Press should be brought closer to the center of academic life; the idea is correct but should be clarified.

O'Connor moved to recommendation 14, on improved undergraduate student aid especially for merit and talent scholarships; he favors them but sees them as controversial. Further discussion may help resolve the controversy. Detlefsen was surprised that in 3A there was no mention of our students' inability to compete for major national fellowships; he didn't know why this was the case, but thought our students were bright enough to compete; perhaps faculty can help them to be more successful. Conway said this came up in Colloquy discussions. Vasta saw the recent remarks pointing out something Notre Dame does not have: an academic culture that produces the best in our students, and the report does not really address this failing. He believed that increasing the number of graduate students will help us to improve the academic culture, and the intellectual intensity of the place. We are too oriented to undergraduates. Burrell agreed with Vasta's general point on intellectual culture, but having equal numbers of graduate and undergraduate students would not help; section 3D addresses some of these concerns but not nearly enough.

In other comments, Porter noted that the report is largely silent on increasing social and gender diversity on campus, and also on expanding counseling services and financial aid. Sheehan said some reference to the latter two issues would be in the "Student Life Report" of the Colloquy; Porter welcomed this news but added that the Academic Life Report should also include them, especially if curriculum is to be addressed. Parnell thought section 3C on international programs needed teeth. Connolly thought that expansion of the Graduate School to 2000 was a good idea; expanded funding for departments which produce the best students was too limited; departments which are improving

# Documentation

should be better funded too. O'Connor thought a teaching center was not the best way to use \$2 million; faculty members are skeptical of something not informed by faculty views. Do we want to have another DeBartolo situation?

Affleck-Graves worried again about an implementation issue. What are the consensus criteria for recognizing a good department or program? The good ones get money, but how can they to be measured? The debate has to be campus wide, and an open discussion on criteria needs to be held. Conway pointed out that only three University departments have high national rankings; all are under review, and some have significant troubles; open discussion is needed. Lopez commented that 3C is very important; if we want to be highly counted, international programs are needed, and a major task force should be formed to look into the situation.

The chair called the discussion to a close. Connolly asked senators to write their comments to the Academic Affairs Committee to assist in their drafting our response. O'Connor said even with the press of time we should look at the whole report; we should have another meeting to continue this kind of discussion. Let's do the job right! Conway asked if we have time to do any good. Both Sheehan and Miscamble indicated that the committee of the whole will have only a rough outline, and comments on this report will be valuable. The mission statement and expansion of the stadium will also be discussed by the Colloquy. Detlefsen wondered if the president's timetable would allow any flexibility, and the answer appeared to be no; his final report would go to the Trustees for their May meeting. Connolly supported O'Connor's idea of special meetings and added that the provost ought to be invited to attend to hear the discussion.

The senate then debated on the best way to have its voice heard. Detlefsen moved to ask the president for more time to give a formal response to the report; he suggested mid-April as an appropriate extension. Borelli seconded. Lopez believed this would not do us any good; the president was committed to having his report finished earlier than that. Connolly, as a friendly amendment, asked to invite either the provost or the vice president for graduate studies to our next meeting. Detlefsen agreed. Conway said we should be more worried about an opportunity to review the final report before it goes to the Trustees than about this one. Borelli responded that we voted last month for such a motion. O'Connor believed we needed at least one more meeting before we invite an officer to join us; we made progress tonight and should continue this way. Agreeing with him was Affleck-Graves. Porter agreed too, and asked that the motions be separated; Higgins seconded. Borelli called the question, and the senate agreed to vote separately. Neither motion passed.

O'Connor moved, and Quinn seconded, that the senate schedule two special meetings (March 15 and March 22) to continue the discussion of the report and draft our response; the Academic Affairs Committee would write the response and present it to the senate for action March 22. Lopez supported the motion as did Conway, but he urged again a review of the final Colloquy report. Eagan thought this was the opportunity of a generation to have a voice in the University's future and we ought to take all the time we need to have an impact. Bender and Borelli agreed.

Eagan moved a substitute motion, which Burrell seconded, to empower the senate chair to schedule whatever meetings are necessary to accomplish the goal. O'Connor agreed. Connolly called the question, and the senate concurred. The chair called meetings for March 15 and March 22 at 7 p.m. in the Center for Continuing Education.

Conway moved to adjourn, Lombardo seconded, and the senate agreed at 10:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter J. Lombardo Jr.  
Secretary

**Present:** Affleck-Graves, Bartlett, Bender, Borelli, A.C., Borelli, M., Burrell, Coll, Collins, Connolly, Conway, Detlefsen, Eagan, Goetz, Higgins, Jordan, S.K., Kantor, Lombardo, Lopez, McDonald, O'Brien, O'Connor, Parnell, Porter, Quinn, Sauer, Sheehan, Sporleder, Tidmarsh, Vasta, Vecchio, Yoder, Schorn

**Absent:** Borkowski, J.G., Bruns, Chang, Fallon, Garg, Hayes, Herro, Jenkins, Jordan, M.D., Lamberti, Leighton, Litzinger, Martin, Miller, Plantinga, Power, Powers, Serianni, Shephard, Tageson

**Excused:** Cashore

## Appendix A

February 17, 1993

Professor Patricia O'Hara  
Professor of Law  
Vice President, Student Affairs  
315 Main Building

Dear Patty:

This is to confirm your meeting with the members of the Faculty Senate Committee on Student Affairs on Monday, February 22, from 3:30-5 p.m. in Room C-102 of the

# Documentation

Hesburgh Center for International Studies. I know I speak for all Faculty Senators in expressing our thanks for your willingness to come and chat with us about various matters in student affairs.

I see the meeting one in which you might want to take some time at the outset to tell us what you want us to know as the faculty group examining student issues. This will be followed by a period of conversation and questions from faculty in attendance.

As you may know, we have found it helpful in the senate meetings with other University officers to provide some questions to them before the meeting in order to provide a general sense of what is on the senate's mind. I supply these below.

1. Would you outline what you have seen as your philosophy (and that of your office) of student affairs at Notre Dame. Could you illustrate how this philosophy has come to bear on particular issues or instances in campus life, such as the Gay/Lesbian issue, or dealing with student underage drinking on campus, would be useful.
2. When Tim O'Meara came to the senate, some of our questions focused on the general perception about the increase in "suits" who work in the administration. We take this term to be a somewhat non-praising denotation of an increase in staff who do not have academic or faculty background. In your office, the perception is that "we have a lot of lawyers over there." What are your views on the appointment and review of staff in your office?
3. When faculty hear from students about Student Affairs, not surprisingly it is often in a complaint mode. While understanding the skewed nature of much of what we hear, the senate Committee does have a sense that students believe the appeals process in various offenses is virtually non-existent. Could you help us with this perception.
4. What do you see as activities in which faculty ought to be engaged in order to play a role in student development at Notre Dame?

Please do not construe from these questions that I see our meeting as an investigation! Rather, they summarize what I believe we have heard in dealing with our tasks this year.

I look forward to seeing you on Monday.

Cordially,

George A. Lopez, Acting Director  
Chair, Faculty Senate Committee on Student Affairs

## Faculty Senate Journal

March 15, 1993

### Special Meeting

The chair Professor Richard Sheehan called a special meeting of the senate to order at 7:05 p.m. in room 202 of the Center for Continuing Education and asked Professor Edward Vasta to offer a prayer. Following the prayer Sheehan explained the purpose of the meeting: to continue the discussion of the Academic Life Report to the Committee of the Whole of Colloquy 2000, and to examine a draft response prepared by the senate's Academic Affairs Committee. He said our aims should be to have maximum impact on the Colloquy's final report and to raise concerns that may be independent of this forthcoming report. The senate Executive Committee recommended a course of action for tonight's meeting in a prepared resolution: to meet as a committee of the whole for discussion of the report and our response. Such a procedure would permit a free-flowing conversation, an airing of views and concerns, but would not permit motions or votes. The senate concurred, and repaired to a committee of the whole.

Sheehan stepped down as chair in favor of vice-chair Professor David O'Connor; Sheehan as a member of the Colloquy Committee of the Whole felt it would be proper to do this. O'Connor deferred, and the senate urged Sheehan to continue to conduct the meeting. O'Connor suggested that the senate discuss section 4 of the report first (which it had not done previously), then take up the draft response where additional concerns and views about all sections might be presented. Professor Sonja Jordan began the discussion with remarks about the University Libraries based on a meeting of the Library Faculty. The major issues concerned: budget recommendations for serials, acquisitions, services and staff are they adequate to better our position relative to other major research universities; the strategic placement of the director of libraries in academic planning for the future of Notre Dame, for instance as a member of the expanded Provost's Advisory Committee; and the placement of the discussion of the libraries see the report as "infrastructure." In particular, when academic programs are planned how is the library involved? To date, it has been only in a peripheral position, often well after the fact. O'Connor recalled that this specific issue has been debated in the senate often lately and we have made recommendations to the Academic Council to overcome this. One additional recommendation we could make for the Colloquy would be to involve the library in every discussion the Graduate Committee of the Academic Council undertakes; the question of library participation is vital and we should push for it, as we have in the past. Professor Frank Connolly mentioned that the senate defeated a recommendation two years ago which would have mandated a specific review of library resources before any department proposes a new or expanded program. Jordan said this would be needed; in fact deans and chairs in-



stitute programs, then tell the library what the needs are. This causes frustration and decimates any decent planning, especially budgetary. Connolly maintained it was the responsibility of the deans to do this.

Professor Philip Quinn, without commenting on the details, pointed out that the Academic Life Report's recommendation 23 aimed at some of what Jordan was seeking; the senate should urge the Colloquy to broaden and expand this with specific examples (perhaps the senate might suggest some). Jordan agreed, but added the library director should be a member of PAC; this would be an appropriate senate recommendation. Professor Paula Higgins asked if the budget presented was adequate only for current programs or if it allowed for expansion and new ventures. Jordan replied the former was correct not the latter. Higgins supported a larger budget and Jordan's points. Professor George Lopez reported that many reviews of graduate programs have already pointed out library inadequacies in collections, serials and staffing, but this information has been brought out only in a diffuse manner and is not collected anywhere so its cumulative impact has not been felt across the University. More generally, our discussion was leading us to the draft response's section on "academic culture"; we cannot upgrade that culture without recognizing the integral place the library would occupy in it, and the report does not show it.

Professor Michael Detlefsen turned to the addition of faculty members. Is there any way we can find out how much in the expense of adding a faculty member is devoted to including funds for additional library resources to support that member? Sheehan said the report on "Finances" showed us something about this, but each college figured the funding in a different manner, and comparisons would be difficult. As a specific example, Detlefsen said a new romance language Ph.D. program is being contemplated. Is there some way to find out if any of the proposed budget reflected this proposed new program, and whether any library funding was included. Jordan offered to find out and report back to the senate. Professor Mario Borelli supported Quinn's idea of strengthening recommendations 23, and suspected we were right to assume that new programs were not included in the budget proposals.

Higgins wondered why it was that it took the report's authors until section 4 to mention the library. Especially in arts and letters, library resources are totally inadequate, and yet the report waited so long to get to the library, and then only as "infrastructure." O'Connor agreed and suggested some reorganization could take place by putting important references to the library in section 2C, "quality faculty." Professor Clark Power said position in the document was very important, and he was surprised that it took so long to get to the topic of the library. Professor Albert Miller suggested that certain accounting overhead costs, for instance negotiated indirect costs in Officer of Naval Research contracts with the University, might shed some light on the

value which Notre Dame places on the library. Usually library costs are part of the factors which determine that charge, and Notre Dame's Research Office might be able to supply the information. Jordan offered to follow up on this also. Quinn thought a mention of the library ought to be made in 3B, "Graduate and Professional Studies."

In talking about priorities and budget allocations, Professor Frank Connolly saw an imbalance between the library figure of \$8 million and \$20 million suggested for the London Program. Professor Stephen Fallon pointed out that much of the London Program figure is for purchase of a new facility there. Detlefsen objected to such an expense in light of the inadequacy of our library holdings. Sheehan asked if the senate believed that the library should be a priority in our response, and the senate agreed. Quinn thought of all of section 4, the library is the highest priority, absolutely central to our mission as a university. Detlefsen believed there should be some balance between the rating of a university's endowment and the rating of a university's library.

O'Connor commented favorably on the London Program for undergraduates in contrast to what he perceived as a weak MBA London Program. He supported adequate funding for the undergraduate London Program. Professor Robert Vecchio said the MBA program makes very little use of the London facility, but would benefit some from a better one; internationalization of business and globalization of markets make it important to have a presence overseas. While not hostile to the London program, Connolly nevertheless objected to the amount of money involved and the relatively small number of students. Professor Jay Tidmarsh said the Law School made use of the London building for its students there. Would the University re-allocate funds for use on campus if the Law School ended its overseas program? He doubted it.

More generally, Tidmarsh bemoaned the lack of priorities in the whole report. Section 4 was a wish list, and even an avoidance of tackling real problems. Not all the programs will be funded. Who sets the priorities, and will this be an open process, acceptable to the faculty? Borelli, thinking a foreign experience was good for students, still did not believe the numbers presented reflected any prioritization. This is a serious deficiency. Professor John Affleck-Graves called the figures "add-ons" not real priorities; some were for one-time only purposes. He urged care in looking at such numbers. Quinn added the London Program number was a one-time only figure, to purchase a facility. Affleck-Graves wanted some prioritization. Professor Charles Parnell pointed out that the Colloquy committee knew section 4 was a wish list; he added it was a poorly-written one too.

In other remarks on section 4, Quinn supported the idea of a "graduate center" for social space available to graduate students in all disciplines; the report was not strong enough here. Detlefsen added that office space for graduate stu-



# Documentation

---

dents was not strong enough here, either; this should be a priority too. He proposed that thought be given to situating graduate students and faculty in close proximity to facilitate the scholarly exchange we all know is so important for both. O'Connor, referring to section 3B, remarked on how full-formed the proposal for doctoral programs in business was, given the little discussion that has occurred within our academic community about it. Big money is involved, but what are the criteria we have used to determine it is a good thing to do, i.e., where would such students get jobs, what are the priorities? The discussion should be open and public. Vecchio replied that it has been talked about in the business school since the 1970s; the PACE report recommended it. The goal would be to place our students on the top 20 business school faculties in the country. A doctoral program would be the next step in Notre Dame's development.

Borelli wondered if the senate was going to examine each item on the wish list and register objections. Connolly agreed that the discussion had been diffuse thus far. He offered in summary two points: The senate should lead the discussion on priorities and seek faculty involvement; and we seem to have isolated the library and the graduate program as areas of weakness in the report. Sheehan urged senators to focus on priorities and the criteria we ought to use in determining them. Fallon offered an example for consideration: We have a large building for business that has to be filled, so let's have a doctoral program, for which we have donors on line. Sheehan said in some instances for items proposed that was true: Donors were on line. The question he posed was to what extent should donors be allowed to dictate priorities? Affleck-Graves pointed out that both the Academic and Graduate Councils must approve any new doctoral programs. The real question was criteria for prioritization.

Lopez looked at the report's "bold new ventures." Notre Dame's history has not been good at supporting ones already begun. Planning, budget, library infrastructure and more have to be carefully considered for long-term success to occur. This report does not address these areas. The senate should recommend immediate attention to past failures for corrective action and should support new ventures only if proper consideration is given to the factors which would produce long-term success. A second dimension not addressed: What is the balance in these new ventures of the impact on undergraduate life; there is concern for graduate enhancement here, but no concern for the undergraduate dimension. Parnell noted that section 4 lacked any concern for the Catholic identity of Notre Dame. Detlefsen asked if we should strengthen weak programs or start new untried ones? The new doctoral programs in business, described in some detail, seem to be already a fact, even if the formalities have not yet been accomplished; why else would there be plans to construct a building bigger than DeBartolo? Professor Donald Sporleder expressed concern about the strategic plan envisioned in recommendation 19. Who develops it?

Who acts on it? Detlefsen responded that it would make more sense to wait for the strategic plan to evolve before any actions were taken. Sheehan reminded the senate that the wish list, in this report and the other reports of the Colloquy, would form the basis of the next fund drive. The question remains: Who sets priorities? The donors or a University strategic plan? Vecchio noted that the new business building should not be the same size as the current one, with or without a doctoral program. Quinn urged the senate to recommend that the strategic planning committee proposed be one that should stay within the University and should include elected faculty members.

Professor Anthony Serianni questioned the reports' reference to NMR research on campus. It was the first time he had seen it, but such a recommendation makes no sense because we do not use to full capacity the instrument we currently have in his laboratory. The people most concerned in science and engineering seem not to have been consulted. In addition the proposed centers of research, if established, would have substantial impact on faculty hiring; this facet has not been discussed. Technology is changing so rapidly, we almost cannot keep up. The approach in the report will not work. We should emphasize and focus on what we can do best. Lopez suggested we try to envision that all of these new ventures were established, and then see what the budget profile looks like in the year 2023. What happens to science and engineering undergraduate instruction after 30 years? Let's be more careful.

O'Connor suggested that the discussion on section 4 had proceeded to the point where we could see what our recommendations will be. The library, its interface with faculty on new programs and its prominence or status within the institution, certainly will be one. Sheehan added that priorities and their criteria will be another; bold new ventures or existing programs, undergraduate vs. graduate instruction, how the faculty can be involved in implementation, especially of recommendation 19 are others. Professor Jean Porter urged that all procedures be open, and that input be sought from all constituencies within the community. Detlefsen said input was not enough, that significant faculty decision-making power be involved too. Quinn supported that.

The senate then turned its attention to a draft response prepared by its Academic Affairs Committee. It listed its approval of the report's tone and direction, four areas of concern, and two reservations. Lopez urged the senate to be less defensive about time constraints and more collegial; he thought our section on "academic culture" should be expanded and more assertive, especially in regard to the library and undergraduate education. On implementation, a structured elected faculty role in University governance in light of the April Accords was necessary. O'Connor wanted the Colloquy to clarify the report's section on "personal and professional conduct"; this area must be clarified.

# Documentation

Professor James Collins, referring to section 2A, asked for more honesty in the report. In an atmosphere of growing mistrust between the faculty and the administration, openness and truth were essential. The figures in the report, especially the add-ons, do not seem to reflect either of those. There seems little consistency between recommendations one and eight. The administration was trying to centralize, but at the same time they wanted more power placed in the hands of department chairs. If one used the example of the issue of Catholic identity and hiring, try to imagine what the outcome would be. Anecdotal evidence suggests even now that Catholic identity is a problem. There are governance issues here too. Who determines Catholic character? And how? O'Connor believed it was crucial for the senate to get these issues clarified, especially recommendation one. The report made a mistake in separating the goal from the process. Now, the report leads to centralization and hierarchical power. Our response has to be to connect these as a step toward collegial sharing. Porter did not think that the administration had any notion of collegial-sharing on the Catholic identity issue. She added that the hiring problem will only hinder the drive toward gender and minority inclusivity. Detlefsen objected to the statement in recommendation one that there is a "need for dedicated and committed Catholics to predominate "on the faculty; this is an undocumented assertion that we must challenge. Connolly thought our response had a far better wording which ought to be used in place of the report's: sufficient to foster the Catholic intellectual tradition." Detlefsen related how an appointment of a very senior scholar had been held up for two months and then forwarded only after the department had certified that such an appointment would foster the Catholic identity of Notre Dame. Serianni was worried about the effect any such policy would have on recruitment.

Lopez proposed adding to our response several lines indicating the difficulty we or anyone would have in identifying and judging a "dedicated and committed Catholic"; also we should underscore our concern that the tone of recommendations one and eight would be counter-productive to the creation and recruitment of Catholic faculty. Following up both Lopez and O'Connor, Quinn said we simply cannot tell whether this goal was appropriate in the abstract; only in its implementation will we know. Let's have the implementation spelled out. Fallon reflected about the way his department constantly faces this issue, in a very ideological way. Do we want to see this spread to the rest of the University?

It would be an odd institution, for O'Connor, if a Catholic university could not discriminate in favor of Catholics. We should decide if we object to the notion that having denominationalism as a factor in hiring is appropriate. We have a special interest in building a community committed to striving for the Christian view. How does denominationalism fit into that interest? Higgins noted a great deal of po-

litical agitation on this topic by her colleagues, many of whom are non-Catholics. Porter's point on recruitment of women was very important. It is a problem for Catholic professional women to hear this debate. Few people disagree with the claim of a Catholic university to hire Catholic faculty, according to Porter. But a stronger claim is being made in this report. Many worry that Catholicism is necessary and overrides quality and competence. Another worry is on the implementation — who and how; is it top down? A third one is the difficult question of just who is a Catholic? Fourth, there is a perceived problem with discrimination after hiring in promotion, granting chairs, and so on; this only hurts faculty morale. All of these factors contribute to the discomfort of many people on this issue. Connolly thought that perhaps we were taking the recommendation too seriously; it is rather weak in fact.

O'Connor in remarks about the issue of Catholic character made several points. A year ago the administration's actions and attitudes had so poisoned the well that discussion of the issue could not proceed without some notion of authoritarian imposition. The institutional means for faculty participation in thinking about the future of the University had all been short-circuited and were useless. He got involved in trying to change these perceptions because of his concerns. He shares Porter's worries. We have advanced since last April. He was impressed with the arguments of Professor George Marsden and of Fr. Jim Burtchaell, C.S.C., that formerly religious schools went secular not from an external force but rather through internal development. We need an explicit policy to prevent such drift here. A policy on the Catholic identity would fit well but not if it is imposed top down. Only one that is mutually trustful will, perhaps department by department. We must have this recommendation tied to the way it is to be implemented. Then we can judge it. Affleck-Graves disagreed with Connolly; the recommendation is in fact in force now. Porter agreed, and such implementation has hurt us. She disagreed with O'Connor's Marsden/Burtchaell analogy. Notre Dame is not Yale or Vanderbilt, and the Catholic Church is not the Congregational or United Methodist Church. Our greatest danger here is a drift toward a certain kind of Catholic character, more sectarian and less inclusive. Vasta agreed that the kind of policy envisioned was already in effect and recounted as episode about it from his college. He objected to the use of a numerical formula in the senate's draft response. Would we face legal problems with a so-called quota system? O'Connor did not believe so. Borelli supported O'Connor's motion about maintaining the University's Catholic character, although he doubted Notre Dame would ever lose its Catholic identity. Serianni reported anecdotal evidence that the Catholic identity issue has been used in certain medical insurance cases.

Power expressed his worry about defining "dedicated and committed Catholics." What was the problem for which

# Documentation

---

recommendation one is the cure? Moral issues, if they are the test, presented serious problems of definition. The report did not emphasize the Catholic intellectual life enough. Detlefsen saw greater dangers than drifting toward Yale. He urged the senate to turn back the language of recommendation one; already appointments are being jeopardized and the claims of recommendation one are insufficiently demonstrated. He wanted to see the Catholic identity of Notre Dame deepened, but the report did not address the real issue.

Professor Dave Burrell, C.S.C., recalled the events of last spring. There were breakthroughs made at that time, and we ought to seize this moment to continue them. Let's talk and debate and discuss what it means to be in a Catholic university. It would be wrong to leave the Catholic character issue to the administration. It is important for the faculty to see it as their issue and we should say that. The draft response attempted to do so. The paranoid fears expressed tonight should be raised again and again in every forum until they were adequately answered. Collins followed up by saying the fears reflected the fact that no structure existed here to resolve them. Our response to the Colloquy should also say what we don't like: quota systems and the vagueness of the report. The senate may have to formulate a specific recommendation to deal with the anecdotes we've heard tonight. Porter spoke of events in her field of academic theology, where a debate similar to one on Catholic identity has raged for years: What is the balance between magisterium and academic theology? Her field has been badly politicized, and scholarship does not flourish in such an atmosphere. Borelli objected to the second sentence of recommendation one, even if the document was meant for an audience wider than the faculty.

Lopez thought senators had come to some general ideas about their feelings on the report, but urged the senate to be positive and constructive in its response. It should not recount opposition or anecdotes only. How can we effect the debate on Catholic identity in a positive manner within this scholarly community? Connolly supported Lopez, and asked for leadership of the senate in proposing alternative statements. The draft response was an excellent choice for this.

Sheehan drew the senate's attention to the hour, asked how the senate's views should be forwarded to the Colloquy, and reminded senators that we should conclude our work at a special meeting Monday, March 22. Detlefsen urged that the senate's response should anticipate certain "perversions"; for instance, to be clear we should say our rephrasing of recommendation one is specifically not to be read as a quantitative measure. Quinn supported Lopez and urged the senate to be positive in its response. Serianni saw a danger in the issue of Catholic identity as prioritizing research on campus; some would be "better" than others. Suspicion

and authoritarianism were dangers, for O'Connor, that would defeat the progress in collegiality we have made. We should state this forthrightly. This would not be a negative response, but would be very constructive in simply acknowledging such dangers.

Porter suggested these items: Whatever was decided in a procedural manner should be implemented at the departmental level, not top-down. Second, we should not tie the issue of Catholic identity to any sort of number of denominational Catholics for both academic and religious reasons. Third, implementation should respect the plurality of the Catholic community and the wider community too.

Professor William Eagan objected to the statement in the draft response which gave approval to the Academic Life Report. The discussion at this meeting indicated little approval. Our response did not refer to a basic fault of the whole Colloquy process, the fact that no member was elected and all were hand-picked by the president. For Eagan, the mission statement was unacceptable, and the application of Catholic principles here was highly selective; many in the administration don't seem to believe in the principles of Leo XIII.

Quinn asked if the Academic Affairs Committee would revise the draft response and prepare another for action at our special meeting on March 22. Burrell agreed, and welcomed comments in writing from others to guide the committee. He set the committee meeting for Thursday at 4:15 p.m. in room 202 of the Center for Continuing Education.

The chair heard a motion to adjourn and the senate did so at 10:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter J. Lombardo Jr.  
Secretary

Present: Affleck-Graves, Bender, Borelli, Burrell, Coll, Collins, Connolly, Detlefsen, Eagan, Fallon, Goetz, Higgins, Jordan, S.K., Leighton, Litzinger, Lombardo, Lopez, McDonald, Miller, O'Brien, O'Connor, Parnell, Porter, Power, Powers, Quinn, Serianni, Sheehan, Sporleder, Tidmarsh, Vasta, Vecchio, Yoder

Absent: Bartlett, Bruns, Cashore, Chang, Conway, Hayes, Herro, Jenkins, Jordan, M.D., Kantor, Lamberti, Martin, Plantinga, Sauer, Shephard, Tageson

Excused: Borkowski, Garg

## Faculty Senate Journal

March 22, 1993

### Special Meeting

The chair Professor Richard Sheehan called a special meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. in room 202 of the Center for Continuing Education and asked Professor Michael Detlefsen to offer a prayer. After this, Professor Philip Quinn (seconded by Professor Edward Vasta) moved to approve the journal for January 21, 1993, which had been previously distributed. The senate concurred. Vasta then moved approval of the journal for February 9 (seconded by Quinn), also distributed. The senate concurred with modifications as noted by the secretary.

Sheehan then turned to the business of the special meeting: further discussion of the Academic Life Report of Colloquy 2000 and the senate's draft response to it. Professor Sonia Jordan asked to report the responses to several questions from our meeting of March 15: The University could not supply her and the senate with the library overhead portion of the general indirect costs charge for grants, especially those from the Office of Naval Research (ONR); it is not itemized. Generally, she found out, overhead charges are not returned to a specific facility; they become part of the general fund. Nor, she continued, is there a formula to determine what percentage of tuition is intended for the library; Notre Dame does figure in rough numbers 5 percent of tuition for library acquisitions. Detlefsen suggested that ONR might be a better source for some of the information we seek. She had also been asked to attempt to determine if the library budget proposed in the Academic Life Report was adequate for the future. The answer she received from the director of libraries was that it was adequate to continue the status quo; dropped serials would not be recovered, and cuts in serials in the future would continue only more slowly; the library would concentrate on interlibrary loan and sharing of resources among libraries not acquisitions. Minimal needs would be met. For new programs there is some money (\$1.2 million for acquisitions, \$.8 million for filling gaps), but for new centers, there was no specific library funding. New faculty hires each would have, within this budget, \$5-10,000 for acquisitions. The chair thanked Jordan for her report.

Detlefsen moved to accept the draft response as presented by the Academic Affairs Committee, and Quinn seconded. The senate proceeded to discuss, modify and amend the response (the final draft passed by the senate is printed as appendix A of this journal), section by section. Professor David O'Connor suggested a grammatical change (seconded by Quinn) in the section on "The Catholic Character of Notre Dame," which was accepted. Also in this section, Vasta proposed an additional and specific recommendation (seconded by Professor William Eagan and printed as appendix B of this journal). Intended to be more positive than

the original report, and with the understanding that fostering Catholic character is not solely the faculty's responsibility, his recommendation sought to demand adequate funding for institutes, journals, centers and programs — new and old — that engage in the study and transmission of the Catholic intellectual tradition. Professor Joseph Powers agreed with the idea behind the motion but feared the creation of new entities in a haphazard manner; we have seen too much of this in all disciplines. Vasta believed the burden should be placed on the administration to foster Catholic identity. O'Connor thought the motion was premature and moved to table discussion of it until the senate reaches the "priorities" section of its draft response, Detlefsen seconded and the senate concurred.

Professor William Eagan asked the senate to emphasize in the first paragraph of its response the essential and direct involvement of faculty in the hiring process. O'Connor and Sheehan suggested wording to accomplish this, and Professor Paula Higgins stressed the importance of this idea. The senate agreed to this change. Professor James Collins noted that the senate's recommended version of recommendation one was the best he has seen, and probably the best we can hope for. But he was worried that the senate's extensive discussion at its last meeting of a *de facto* quota system in hiring was not reflected in the draft response. He thought, since many senators felt strongly about this, that a statement expressing the senate's displeasure was in order. Professor David Burrell, C.S.C., said the topic had been broached in the drafting sessions, but the committee drafters questioned whether such anecdotal evidence, as extensive as it was, should be the basis of a senate recommendation; the issue better belonged to the expanded Provost's Advisory Committee (PAC). Collins acknowledged this, but believed the issue should not slip away. Sheehan agreed with Collins that the senate should take this up. Professor Donald Sporleder, speaking on behalf of his architecture faculty colleagues, said that our Catholic character cannot be guaranteed by numbers alone, even by a Catholic majority. Our mission would be best served by a culturally diverse faculty committed to open discussion and specifically Catholic ideals. He felt the draft response was appropriate. Quinn, seconded by Jordan, moved that the issue of a quota system be taken up by the Academic Affairs Committee and be reported back to the senate this term. Other senators spoke strongly of the mistrust and suspicion that exists among faculty on the hiring issue, but there was a feeling that the draft response addressed to the Colloquy required immediate action. The senate referred the issue to committee and asked for quick action.

The chair returned the discussion to the draft response. Sheehan, as a member of the Colloquy Committee of the Whole, gave the senate a brief overview of the work thus far, saying that a very tentative draft final report was in preparation. Professor John Affleck-Graves recalled that the provost had told the senate that the faculty would receive

# Documentation

---

copies of all four committee reports before the committee of the whole began its work and in sufficient time to allow for comment. Yet the Colloquy already has begun a final report and the faculty has just within a day or two received the two final committee reports. He was dissatisfied with this process and asked Sheehan to convey this sense to the Colloquy. Sheehan replied that he already has done that, and forcefully. Detlefsen voiced his concern too, and promised to introduce a resolution to reject the findings of the Colloquy if the senate's recommendations are not substantially incorporated into the final report. O'Connor and Affleck-Graves proposed wording changes to the Catholic Character section of the response, which were accepted. The senate then moved on to section 2, "Academic Culture at Notre Dame."

Burrell urged the senate to toughen our recommendation on the Notre Dame Press, especially to urge a University subvention commensurate with the scholarly aspirations of Notre Dame. Quinn seconded, and noted his astonishment that the press has been so good without such a subvention, the only one he believed without such support. The senate agreed unanimously.

Vasta questioned the wording on the library recommendation, as did O'Connor who proposed alternative phrasing, which the senate assented to. Sporleder and Higgins urged even stronger language to indicate the centrality of the library to the academic community. After some discussion, in which several members made suggestions, the senate adopted a different version of this sentence. Professor Jeff Kantor was not comfortable with the example cited about undergraduates and their inability to win national awards; he saw this as a symptom of a much wider problem. Burrell agreed, but thought the example was a good one for political reasons as well as one that drove home the point. Quinn believed this was also an effect of the lack of a true and passionate academic culture on campus. Detlefsen agreed, yet reminded the senate that the sentence did not deny we have had some success, only that we don't have adequate success. O'Connor proposed that the senate link this idea to faculty research and scholarship; this linkage would improve the climate and help our undergraduates in their quest for national recognition. The senate concurred with this alternative wording, then moved to consider section 3, "Priorities."

The Vasta recommendation was taken off the table and debated. O'Connor thought that the idea behind the motion was excellent. But since we were criticizing the Colloquy for putting too much of a "wish list" flavor to its report, the senate should not do the very same thing at this time. Professor John Yoder welcomed Vasta's motion, as asking us to do something creative about the Catholic identity issue. Also on "priorities," what is it that is Catholic about wanting to have five new Ph.D. programs in our college? What is the basis, as far as Catholic character is concerned, of

wanting to be in the Top 10? Our priorities determine our Catholic identity. Burrell thought that Catholic character was one large element in priorities but not the sole one; Yoder agreed, saying he used the example to make a point. Burrell also agreed with O'Connor. Detlefsen thought the Vasta recommendation was so detailed that it should be given more consideration than time would permit at this meeting; it was one he thought he might agree with, but was not sure. Vasta elaborated on the reason for his recommendation: So many existing programs here in this area struggle because of the University policy that they be self-supporting; if we were serious about promoting Catholic intellectual life, this would not be the case. His motion would seek to change this situation, as well as improving the Catholic identity and the academic culture of Notre Dame. Professor Charles Parnell pointed out that recommendation 19, the strategic plan idea, would be the place to bring up Vasta's idea. O'Connor called the question. The senate voted not to assent to the Vasta motion.

Also on priorities, O'Connor asked that the first sentence of the last paragraph be italicized. Detlefsen thought "elected" should be added to that sentence. Both changes were accepted by the senate. The body then moved on the section 4, where there were no changes. The senate's "two additional concerns" elicited comment from Eagan who urged that the senate clearly state that faculty members on the Colloquy were hand-picked not elected. Detlefsen, Burrell, Sheehan, Affleck-Graves, Kantor and Sporleder also suggested changes in the section on the mission statement. The senate concurred with these modifications of the draft response.

The senate then voted to accept the draft response as modified and amended. The body congratulated its chair for his skillful writing and handling of the response. Sheehan asked the senate for its guidance on presenting the response to the Colloquy. Detlefsen repeated his earlier statement about non-acceptance of the Colloquy report. Professor Bill McDonald asked if such a sentiment was in the spirit of the April Accords. Both O'Connor and Sheehan thought that the senate had fulfilled whatever agreement its executive committee had made a year ago: to encourage participation in the process, but there seemed never to be a commitment to a blanket endorsement in advance of the final result.

In returning to Sheehan's request for guidance, Affleck-Graves pointed out that the Colloquy report would not be ours; it will be the president's report, his prerogative. He believed the chair should forcefully state the views of the faculty as expressed in the senate, without making threats. If the faculty's voice is not listened to, we will know where we stand and can consider what action we might have to take. O'Connor thought it would be best to say that the senate, having reviewed the report in several lengthy meetings and in a very open discussion, has made a nuanced, carefully-considered response which is due attention. We very much want to do the same for a penultimate report, without the

# Documentation

---

intense pressures of time we were under for this document. It would be to everyone's advantage to take the time necessary to do this correctly. Burrell wanted the Colloquy to know that time has not permitted us to examine in depth the other three committee reports; they should know how long and how often we have met on the Academic Life Report; and they must be made aware of the furor raised by the Miscamble memo. Affleck-Graves said we should hold open time at our April 5 meeting for comment on the other three. Detlefsen feared that time was a grave problem.

One way the senate might serve the faculty, according to Bender, might be for it to design a mechanism to encourage open discussion and elicit views across college and department lines, a kind of open forum for faculty opinion. Quinn endorsed such an idea and suggested that our just-approved response be circulated to the faculty and a public meeting be held; this would be a mechanism for accountability. Quinn so moved and Eagan seconded. Kantor as a friendly amendment requested publication of our response in *The Observer*. Professor Thomas Cashore objected to such publication as rude before the members of the Colloquy to whom it is directed receive it. Parnell did so also because our document is not a whole piece; it is a response to something else and cannot be read apart from the Academic Life Report. It is somewhat negative in tone, besides. O'Connor, while thinking these were valid points, thought our response was intelligible on its own and should be both mailed to the faculty and published. Bender thought the chair in a short introduction would be able to clarify the purposes of the document.

O'Connor asked Quinn to divide the motion into two parts: first, hold a faculty forum after our response has been mailed to the faculty; such a forum would be based on the Academic Life Report and our response. Second, publish our response in *The Observer*. Quinn agreed, and discussion continued on the first motion. Kantor asked what the value of such a forum would be. Sheehan thought it would serve two purposes: as guidance for the faculty who are members of the Colloquy and as a way to educate the whole faculty about what the senate's response to the Colloquy has been. Vasta believed the forum was a good idea, but worried that with so many other events taking place the faculty might not have time to effect the outcome. O'Connor thought such forum should be organized by college. Yoder called the question. The senate passed the motion to distribute the response and hold a forum.

The senate proceeded to consider Quinn's recommendation. Burrell did not think it wise to go back to ads in *The Observer*, as we saw last spring. Eagan countered that we wanted to influence a wider audience, especially the students. Affleck-Graves agreed, but he urged the senate to make sure the Colloquy members have it first and they know it will be published soon. The senate then voted to publish its response in *The Observer*.

Kantor asked about the Colloquy's overall mission statement and whether the senate would make any response to it. Sheehan hoped the senate would. Kantor questioned whether it needed to be part of the Colloquy's final report at all, and Sheehan replied that it would be, not only because such a statement was part of COUP and PACE but also because it was appropriate in some form. Detlefsen thought we should examine it especially because an unsupported claim appears in it, "depends upon the continuing presence of a predominant number of Catholic intellectuals." We objected to something similar in the Academic Life Report's recommendation one and wrote a substitute version. We should do the same for this. O'Connor, reflecting on the time we took to draft a good response to the report, wondered if we had the time and commitment to do the work needed on the mission statement; if we did not, we should not take it on. Besides, our response to the report's section 2A implies that we do not accept the language of the mission statement, and we have proposed better wording in several instances on this issue.

Sheehan noted that he has already made four points to the Colloquy on the mission statement, based on senate meetings and other faculty input. First, the draft proposed by professor Craig Lent was superior to the Colloquy's draft mission statement. Second, the senate's phrasing of the "sufficient" clause over "predominate" in recommendation one was better. Third, the last paragraph of the draft statement was unclear and problematic. Fourth, the "prenote" was unnecessary if one was Catholic and incomprehensible if one was not; it should be eliminated. Detlefsen moved to endorse Sheehan's four points in reaction to the mission statement, and O'Connor seconded. There being no further discussion, the senate voted unanimously to endorse the chair's statement.

Bartlett, seconded by Quinn, moved to adjourn and the senate agreed at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter J. Lombardo Jr.  
Secretary

**Present:** Affleck-Graves, Bartlett, Bender, Burrell, Cashore, Collins, Detlefsen, Eagan, Garg, Goetz, Higgins, Jordan, S., Kantor, Lamberti, Lombardo, McDonald, O'Connor, Parnell, Power, Powers, Quinn, Serianni, Sheehan, Sporleder, Vasta, Yoder

**Absent:** Borelli, A.C., Borelli, M., Borkowski, Bruns, Chang, Coll, Connolly, Fallon, Hayes, Herro, Jenkins, Jordan, M., Leighton, Litzinger, Lopez, Martin, Miller, Plantinga, Sauer, Shephard, Tageson, Tidmarsh, Vecchio

**Excused:** Conway, O'Brien, Porter



## Appendix A

March 22, 1993

### Faculty Senate Response to the Report of the Committee on Academic Life

The Faculty Senate discussed the report of the Committee on Academic Life at its meetings on March 1, March 15 and March 22. In the wake of those discussions, the Academic Affairs committee of the Senate has drafted this response. It is essential that elected faculty members be directly involved in this process. The Senate is aware that many hours of discussion underlie the current document, based on numerous meetings with various constituencies on campus, including faculty. We must stress at the outset, given the time constraints imposed on the Senate, that the Senate's response is necessarily very selective. We deliberately focus on the primary areas of concern and recognize that this focus overshadows wide areas of agreement and support.

The Faculty Senate concurs with the tone and direction of the report of the Committee on Academic Life. That concurrence, however, is subject to the concerns and reservations noted below. These concerns fall into four general areas: the Catholic character, the academic culture at Notre Dame, the issue of priorities, and implementation. The remainder of this response summarizes briefly some of the major issues regarding each of these areas, concluding with two additional items of concern.

**THE CATHOLIC CHARACTER OF NOTRE DAME.** The Senate concurs with the report's concern to maintain the Catholic character of Notre Dame, recognizing that the task of fostering that Catholic character will fall increasingly to the faculty, and that it is appropriate that it do so. Nonetheless, the Senate is concerned that sections 2A and 2B do not adequately articulate the complementary relationship of the intellectual and Catholic character of Notre Dame. Some are concerned that the emphasis in recommendation 1 could be read as stressing the Catholic character in isolation from our intellectual mission. It is imperative that these concerns be addressed simultaneously. Thus, we recommend that the second sentence be replaced by the following:

All who participate in hiring faculty must be cognizant of and responsive to the need to recruit a faculty that achieves the highest level of excellence and that includes a proportion of Catholics sufficient to foster the Catholic intellectual tradition.

This formulation attempts to address why Catholics might be more likely to help foster the Catholic character of the University. Moreover, the use of the phrase "proportion . . . sufficient" to accomplish such a task recognizes that the matter of numbers could significantly vary from discipline to discipline. This wording also better captures the spirit of the preceding section.

The implications of Recommendation 1, as currently stated in the report on Academic Life, and the procedures to implement Recommendation 1 provoked substantial heated discussion in the Senate. The sources of concern: First, how is the recommendation to be implemented? In the past six months we believe we have seen substantial progress in terms of communication and cooperation with the administration in many areas. The Senate wants this spirit to extend to this dimension as well. Rather than suggesting that a policy be implemented by the administration and simply executed by each department, the Senate thinks it would be more fruitful for each department to initiate the process and for the administration to work with each department in implementing the policy. Second, the Senate is concerned that the word "predominate" implies a focus principally on numbers. While it may be necessary for some departments to have a majority of Catholics and some departments perhaps to have a predominant number, it also is possible that some departments may have few. The number of Catholics should be tied to the goal of fostering and deepening the Catholic character of Notre Dame rather than being tied to a simple numerical formula. Third, the Senate is concerned that this recommendation be implemented in a way that respects the pluralism within the Catholic community itself as well as within the broader community. The vitality of Catholic intellectual life must not be compromised by political considerations. And finally, the Senate is concerned that the difficulty — some argue the impossibility — of recognizing "dedicated and committed Catholics" at the entry level could lead to abuses in the process.

**ACADEMIC CULTURE AT NOTRE DAME.** To reiterate an oft-cited faculty concern, there appear to be a number of ways in which the campus culture does not always contribute and sometimes may actually impede the pursuit of academic excellence. For example, the Colloquy report on Academic Life does not mention the library until Section 4 on infrastructure, although the library is a key component of the academic life of a university. The library is no more infrastructure than is the faculty, and a focus on the academic culture would suggest a central role for both. Second, undergraduates are not sufficiently integrated into the research and scholarship of the faculty. One symptom of this lack of integration is that the University's undergraduates recently have had too little success in competing for national fellowships. These two examples suggest that the academic culture at Notre Dame needs to be examined in substantially more detail so that we can take steps to enhance and improve the educational experience at Notre Dame.

We are encouraged by the section on internationality and recommendation 18, especially its emphasis on enhancing faculty presence in residential life and establishing a bookstore commensurate with the University's needs and aspirations. We further urge that the University Press be subvented in a manner commensurate with the scholarly aspirations of this University.



# Documentation

---

**PRIORITIES.** There are two issues under the heading of priorities: What does the Colloquy report imply about priorities among all the proposed projects? and what should be the process of determining those priorities?

First, on the priorities themselves. Section 4 of the Academic Life report appears to be merely a wish list of the academic units' major desires, and says nothing about what priorities should exist among the centers, structures and new initiatives given that we do not now have the funds to undertake all and may not achieve that level of funding even with the next funding campaign. The Senate urges that the library be high on the list of priorities and that the library be explicitly included in all aspects of future strategic planning. The Senate further judges that graduate education needs substantial additional funding to compete at the level the University has targeted. The Senate notes that while section 4 details initiatives for research and graduate education, this section largely is silent on undergraduate education. We view this omission as a major oversight of this report.

The Senate also is concerned about a certain tension within the report that follows directly from the lack of priorities. What is the relative priority of undertaking "bold new ventures" *versus* enhancing existing "centers of strength"? The report is unclear on this crucial point. For example, page 4 of the report notes those centers of excellence that need to be adequately supported while page 38 details the recommendation for a Ph.D. program in the College of Business Administration.

*Elected faculty need to be involved directly in determining priorities.* The Senate applauds Recommendation 19 to "commission a comprehensive strategic plan for enhancing research and scholarship at Notre Dame." The Senate calls for elected faculty representatives to participate in such a planning process in the continuing spirit of communication, cooperation and collegiality. In addition, procedures involving consensual discussion after bona fide attempts to measure quality would help departments to put their particular plans in context — the context of their college as well as of a Catholic university. The Senate presumes that the expanded PAC committee will concern itself with such questions in a continuing fashion.

**IMPLEMENTATION.** A clear weakness of this report is the lack of focus on implementation. We have seen too many task force reports and studies fail in this regard. Our concerns focus on two issues. First, the ambiguity of language in places: (recommendation 1) how do we assess "dedicated and committed"? (recommendation 4) how do we "encourage such excellence by offering appropriate incentives"? how do we recognize and reward good teaching? Secondly, these are calls for specificity which understandably cannot be spelled out in such a report, but will need to be so in practice — a practice that must be shared and developed

into a living tradition. It is imperative that the various consultative bodies be galvanized in this effort. Simply stated, the faculty need a structured and central role in the implementation of this report, in keeping with a proper interpretation of Recommendation 19.

Two additional concerns were of significance to the Senate. The first stems from the tone of the mission statement, and specifically with the phrase "We on the faculty . . ." in the first sentence of paragraph 5 of the Academic Life report. While the thrust of this mission statement is acceptable and while many on the faculty have made substantial contributions to the process of the Colloquy, this document is not itself of the faculty because the faculty participating in the Colloquy were not elected by the faculty.

The second concerns the section on "Personal and Professional Conduct" on pp. 4-5. At one level, it is incontestable that "teachers and scholars must maintain a high standard of personal and professional conduct." Nevertheless, there remains concern regarding the range and inclusiveness of the language here. If Notre Dame intends its guidelines on such matters to be at variance with those of the AAUP then the points of disagreement should be made clear. If Notre Dame's guidelines are the same as the AAUP's then that also should be made explicit. In addition, the Academic Articles should be cited at this point to give a specificity which this document need not have. These concerns are in the spirit of clarity on matters which may indeed involve some delicate points of conflict between professional practices and, say, Catholic teaching and practice, so vagueness can invite a certain trepidation.

## Appendix B

The University must make positive efforts to promote the study of the Catholic intellectual tradition at Notre Dame by arranging for strong priority funding for: 1) the existing institutes, centers, journals, and programs currently engaged in the study and transmission of the Catholic intellectual tradition, 2) the creation of new institutes, centers, journals, and programs that will expand current work in the study and transmission of the Catholic tradition, and 3) the establishment of scholarships, fellowships, and grants that bring Catholic students and scholars from abroad, and particularly from third-world countries, to undertake study and work in the University's disciplines, departments, and programs.

March 22, 1993  
presented by: Senator Vasta  
seconded by: Senator Eagan  
action: Not agreed to.

# Documentation

## University Committee on Libraries March 24, 1993

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. in the office of the director of libraries by the chairman, Robert Scheidt. Also in attendance were Harvey Bender, Maureen Gleason, James Kohn, Robert Miller, Michael Morris, Dan Sheerin and secretary Melodie Eiteljorge.

The minutes of the meeting of February 10 were approved as written.

Robert Scheidt and Robert Miller met with the Provost's Advisory Committee (PAC) on the afternoon of March 24 to discuss the Resolution of this committee that was sent to Father Malloy. A more general discussion of library issues ensued, with indications that some PAC members were previously not aware that the library is in such a critical financial state. In discussions on library implications in hiring new faculty, O'Meara asked the director how he learns about new faculty. Miller replied that, with the exception of arts and letters, he learns only through the distribution of "Incoming Faculty" lists, which are after the fact.

Ultimately PAC members suggested that before the library undertakes any cuts in serials, it should be confirmed that additional funds are not available. Miller was asked to provide to the provost by April 16 a figure for what would be necessary to avoid a serials cut. The provost was not optimistic, however, that the necessary additional funds could be provided.

Miller next distributed copies of ARL rankings and comparisons. In some ways the numbers are satisfying, due in part to the dire state of some other institutions. Still, Notre Dame's libraries are understaffed and facing another serials cut. Miller suggested that the definition of research libraries in general needs re-thinking.

Harvey Bender reported that, as the Faculty Senate has been working through the question of the "Catholic mission," Sonia Jordan has expressed concerns on behalf of the library faculty. Miller noted that these concerns were raised at a library faculty meeting with the provost on February 26, at which time the Report of the Committee on Academic Life of the Colloquy was reviewed.

Scheidt distributed copies of an article from the February 26 issue of *Science* magazine titled "Publication by Electronic Mail Takes Physics by Storm." Electronic publishing is growing in popularity and may eventually replace pre-prints, but it is in its early stages with many issues to be resolved. Miller observed that the culture is changing in all disciplines but at different rates.

The main topic of discussion was a possible restructuring of the library budget. Miller reported that two actions seem imminent for 1993-94. First, it appears that there is no way to avoid freezing monographic allocations. Second, in looking for ways to avoid deficits through establishing more control, it seems beneficial to eliminate the continuations line in the budget and to transfer continuations to book funds for individual series decisioning.

In the case of serials, cuts have been anticipated for some time. Miller will submit to the provost by April 16 a figure for what would be needed to avoid cuts. There is also pressure for new orders. If cuts were avoided, there is a possibility that departments could "cut and replace" serials. Maureen Gleason explained that any cuts made would be across-the-board, using quotas based on "share of total serials expenditures."

Scheidt suggested the possibility of asking parties requesting the continuance of a journal subscription to provide proof that they cited the journal in a recent publication. Miller agreed that this might be valid.

Bender asked if cuts are being made in areas other than serials. Both Miller and Gleason explained that all areas have been assessed and that "belt tightening" has been done across-the-board. The necessity for serials cuts is not based on cuts in serials allocations, which in fact have been consistently increased. The problem is that increases have not been sufficient to offset rising serials costs.

Bender suggested that in announcing any serials cuts, examples of other "belt tightening" should be cited. Sheerin stated that this would be a "misfocus" and that the library does not need to justify the lack of adequate funds, which are the responsibility of the University. Gleason added that letters to chairmen and deans are already detailed and lengthy and that further explanation/documentation might be counterproductive. Sheerin suggested that hypothetical examples of the process could be used to replace lengthy explanations. Miller noted this.

Miller will prepare for the next meeting a review of various categories of the library budget and how they have been assessed. Budget figures will be for the use of the committee and will not be published. He will also draft a letter to department chairmen and deans, explaining the pending serials cut. Because of the urgency of this matter, another meeting was scheduled for next Wednesday, March 31, 4 p.m.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Melodie Eiteljorge  
Secretary

# Documentation

## University Libraries' Hours During Intersession May 8 - June 13 and August 4 - 30

### HESBURGH LIBRARY

	Building	Public Services
Saturday	9 a.m. - midnight	9 a.m. - 5 p.m.*
Sunday	1 p.m. - midnight	Closed
Monday through Friday	8 a.m. - midnight	8 a.m. - 5 p.m.

\*The following public services will be open:

Circulation

Current Periodicals/Microtext

Reference

\*\*Current Periodicals/Microtext will be open until 10 p.m., Monday - Thursday

Computing lab will be closed May 8 - June 21

ALL LIBRARIES WILL BE CLOSED MAY 31 IN OBSERVANCE OF MEMORIAL DAY

### BRANCH LIBRARIES

	Architecture	Chemistry/Physics	Engineering	Life Science	Mathematics
Saturday	Closed	Closed	noon - 4 p.m.	Closed	Closed
Sunday	Closed	Closed	1 p.m. - 5 p.m.	Closed	Closed
Monday through Friday	10 a.m. - 3 p.m.	8 a.m. - 5 p.m.	8 a.m. - 8 p.m.*	8 a.m. - 5 p.m.**	8 a.m. - 5 p.m.

\*Engineering will close at 5 p.m. on Friday

\*\*Life Science will be open until 9 p.m. on Monday

Tuesday, August 31, all libraries return to regular schedules

ALL HOURS ABOVE ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE — CHECK UNLOC FOR UPDATE ON HOURS

# The Graduate School Research Division

## Current Publications and Other Scholarly Works

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

### COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS

#### English

Fox, Christopher B.

C.B. Fox. 1993. Of Logic and Lycanthropy: Gulliver and the Faculties of the Mind. Pages 101-117 in, R. Porter and M. Mulvey Roberts, eds., *Literature and Medicine during the Eighteenth Century*. The Wellcome Institute Series in the History of Medicine. Routledge, London, United Kingdom.

C.B. Fox. 1993. Review of *The Unbalanced Mind: Pope and the Rule of Passion*, by R. Ferguson. *The Eighteenth Century: A Current Bibliography* NS 12:495.

#### History

DeSantis, Vincent P.

V.P. DeSantis. 1992. America and Europe, 1775-1992. *Organization of American Historians Magazine of History* 7(2):16-21.

Dolan, Jay P.

J.P. Dolan. 1993. Betrayed by Their Protectors. *New York Times Sunday Book Review* (2/28/93):20.

#### Philosophy

Burrell, David B., CSC

D.B. Burrell, CSC and N. Daher, trans. and annots. 1992. *Al-Ghazal: The Ninety-Nine Beautiful Names of God*. Islamic Texts Society, Cambridge, United Kingdom. x + 205 pp.

McInerny, Ralph M.

R.M. McInerny. 1993. Reflections on Christian Philosophy. Pages 256-279 in, L. Zagzebski, ed., *Rational Faith*. University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Indiana.

McMullin, Ernan

E. McMullin. 1993. Rationality and Paradigm Change in Science. Pages 55-78 in, P. Horwich, ed., *World Changes: Thomas Kuhn and the Nature of Science*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

E. McMullin. 1993. The Sciences and the Humanities. *The NAMTA Journal* 18(1):49-63.

### Romance Languages and Literatures

Cachey, Theodore J., Jr.

T.J. Cachey, Jr. 1992. Il pane del grano e la saggina: Pietro Bembo's 1505 Asolani Revisited. *The Italianist* 12(1992):5-23.

De Fazio, Marina R.

M.R. De Fazio. 1993. Purgatorio XXIX. *Lectura Dantis: A Forum for Dante Research and Interpretation* 12(Supplement):433-447.

#### Theology

Egan, Keith J.

K.J. Egan. 1993. Carmelite Spirituality. Pages 117-124 in, M.J. Downey, ed., *The New Dictionary of Catholic Spirituality*. Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota.

K.J. Egan. 1993. Darkness, Dark Night. Pages 247-248 in, M.J. Downey, ed., *The New Dictionary of Catholic Spirituality*. Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota.

Ford, J. Massynbaerde

J.M. Ford. 1992. The Call Girl in Antiquity and Her Potential for Mission. *Mid-Western Journal of Biblical Literature* 12:106-116.

Gerhart, Mary

M. Gerhart, W.M. Thompson, S.A. Ross and J. Koenig. 1992. Review Symposium: The Revelatory Text, by S.M. Schneider. *Horizons* 19(Fall):300-303.

Porter, Jean

J. Porter. 1993. Basic Goods and the Human Good in Recent Catholic Moral Theology. *Thomist* 51(1):27-49.

White, James F.

J.F. White. 1993. *A Brief History of Christian Worship*. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tennessee. 192 pp.

Yoder, John H.

J.H. Yoder. 1993. *Body Politics: Five Practices of the Christian Community Before the Watching World*. Discipleship Resources, Nashville, Tennessee. xi + 88 pp.

### COLLEGE OF SCIENCE

#### Chemistry and Biochemistry

Smith, Bradley D.

B.D. Smith, M.-F. Paugam and K.J. Haller. 1993. A Comparison of the Structures of N-Chloroacetylindigo and N-N<sup>1</sup>-Bischloroindigo in the Solid and Solution State. *Journal of Chemical Society, Perkin Transactions 2* 165-169.

#### Mathematics

Sommese, Andrew J.

M.C. Beltramenti and A.J. Sommese. 1993. On the Preservation of K-Verly Ampleness under Adjunction. *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 212:257-284.

# The Graduate School Research Division

## Physics

Bishop, James M.

P.L. Frabetti et al., Notre Dame (J.M. Bishop, N.M. Cason, C.J. Kennedy, G.N. Kim, T.F. Lin, E.J. Mannel, D.L. Puseljic, R.C. Ruchti, W.D. Shephard, J.A. Swiatek and Z.Y. Wu). 1993. Measurement of the  $\Lambda_c^+$  Lifetime. *Physical Review Letters* 70:1755-1758.

P.L. Frabetti et al., Notre Dame (J.M. Bishop, N.M. Cason, C.J. Kennedy, G.N. Kim, T.F. Lin, D.L. Puseljic, R.C. Ruchti, W.D. Shephard, J.A. Swiatek and Z.Y. Wu). 1993. Measurement of the Mass and Lifetime of the  $\Xi_c^+$ . *Physical Review Letters* 70(10):1381-1384.

Cason, Neal M.

See under Bishop, James M. 1993. *Physical Review Letters* 70:1755-1758.

See under Bishop, James M. 1993. *Physical Review Letters* 70(10):1381-1384.

Cushing, James T.

J.T. Cushing. 1993. Review of Doing Physics, by M.H. Krieger. *Physics Today* 46(3):87-88.

Ruchti, Randal C.

See under Bishop, James M. 1993. *Physical Review Letters* 70:1755-1758.

See under Bishop, James M. 1993. *Physical Review Letters* 70(10):1381-1384.

Shephard, William D.

See under Bishop, James M. 1993. *Physical Review Letters* 70:1755-1758.

See under Bishop, James M. 1993. *Physical Review Letters* 70(10):1381-1384.

## COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

### Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering

Atassi, Hafiz M.

H.M. Atassi, ed. 1993. Unsteady Aerodynamics, Aeroacoustics and Aeroelasticity of Turbomachines and Propellers. Springer-Verlag, New York, New York. 889 pp.

Gad-el-Hak, Mohamed

M. Gad-el-Hak. 1992. Splendor of Fluids in Motion. *Progress in Aerospace Sciences* 29(2):81-123.

Huang, Nai-Chien

N.-C. Huang and J.G. Swadener. 1993. An Investigation of Hydraulic Fracturing. Part I: One-Phase Flow Model. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Fracture Mechanics* 18:89-102.

J.G. Swadener and N.-C. Huang. 1993. An Investigation of Hydraulic Fracturing. Part II: Two-Phase Flow Model. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Fracture Mechanics* 18:103-113.

Mueller, Thomas J.

A. Farukh and T.J. Mueller. 1993. Visualization of Tip Vortex/Airfoil Interaction. *Journal of Flow Visualization and Image Processing* 1(1):35-42.

Thomas, Flint O.

F.O. Thomas and H.C. Chu. 1993. Nonlinear Wave Coupling and Subharmonic Resonance in Planar Jet Shear Layer Transition. *Physics of Fluids A* 5(3):630-646.

### Civil Engineering and Geological Sciences

Spencer, Billie F., Jr.

L.A. Bergman and B.F. Spencer, Jr. 1992. Robust Numerical Solution of the Transient Fokker-Planck Equation for Nonlinear Dynamical Systems. Pages 49-60 in, N. Bellomo and F. Casciati, eds., *Nonlinear Stochastic Mechanics*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Germany.

### Computer Science and Engineering

Henry, Eugene W.

See under Uhran, John J., Jr. 1993. Pages 2B7-2B10 in, *Proceedings of the American Society for Engineering Education IL/IN Spring Conference*, March 5-6, 1993, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Lumsdaine, Andrew

A. Lumsdaine and M.W. Reichelt. 1993. Wave Form Iterative Techniques for Device Transient Simulation on Parallel Machines. Pages 237-245 in, R.F. Sincouec, et al., eds., *Proceedings of the Sixth SIAM Conference on Parallel Processing for Scientific Computing*. SIAM, Norfolk, Virginia.

Uhran, John J., Jr.

J.J. Uhran, Jr. and E.W. Henry. 1993. Combining Communication, Research and Design for the Undergraduate. Pages 2B7-2B10 in, *Proceedings of the American Society for Engineering Education IL/IN Spring Conference*, March 5-6, 1993, Terre Haute, Indiana. Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology, Terre Haute, Indiana.

J.J. Uhran, Jr. and R. Szczerba. 1992. Dynamic, Optimal Path Planning for Autonomous Vehicles. Pages 1285-1292 in, *Proceedings of the Modeling and Simulation Conference*, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

J.J. Uhran, Jr. and M.K. Sain, guest eds. 1992. Theme of the issue, *Engineering Education Across the Globe*. *IEEE Communications Magazine* 30(11).

J.J. Uhran, Jr. and M.K. Sain. 1992. The editorial, *International Engineering Education: Where Are We?* *IEEE Communications Magazine* 30(11):14-16.

### Electrical Engineering

Alcock, Charles B.

C.B. Alcock. 1993. Electrochemical Oxygen Sensors. *Revue Internationale des Hautes Temperatures et des Refractaires* 28:1-8.

O. Kubaschewski, C.B. Alcock and P.J. Spencer. 1993. *Materials Thermochemistry: Sixth Edition*. Pergamon Press, Oxford, England.

# The Graduate School Research Division

Das, Biswajit

D.C. Diaz, M. Osmanski, H. Guan and B. Das. 1993. An Improved Fabrication Technique for Porous Silicon. *Review of Scientific Instruments* 64(2):507-509.

Huang, Yih-Fang

V.C. Soon and Y.-F. Huang. 1992. An Analysis of ESPRIT under Random Sensor Uncertainties. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* 40(9):2353-2358.

A.K. Rao and Y.-F. Huang. 1992. Analysis of Finite Precision Effects on a Recursive Set Membership Parameter Estimation Algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* 40(12):3081-3085.

Y.-F. Huang and J.R. Deller, Jr. 1992. On the Tracking Capabilities of Optimal Bounding Ellipsoid Algorithms. Proceedings of 30th Annual Allerton Conference on Communications, Control and Computing, Urbana, Illinois 50-59.

McGinn, Paul J.

S. Sengupta, D. Shi, Z. Wang, M.E. Smith, S. Salem-Sugui, Jr. and P.J. McGinn. 1993. Magnetic Relaxation and Intrinsic Pinning in a Single Crystal of  $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_x$ . *Physical Review B* 47(9):5414-5418.

S. Sengupta, D. Shi, Z. Wang, M.E. Smith and P.J. McGinn. 1993. U-j Relationship in Type-II Superconductors. *Physical Review B* 47(9):5165-5169.

A. Zanota, D. Perry, E. Kvam, P.J. McGinn and D. Balkin. 1992. Preparation and Examination of Y-Ba-Cu-O Wire Sections. Pages 400-402 in, G.W. Bailey, J. Bentley and J.A. Small, eds., Proceedings of the 50th Annual Meeting of the Electron Microscopy Society of America. San Francisco Press, San Francisco, California.

Sain, Michael K.

See under Uhan, John J., Jr. 1992. *IEEE Communications Magazine* 30(11).

See under Uhan, John J., Jr. 1992. *IEEE Communications Magazine* 30(11):14-16.

## COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

### Management

Crant, J. Michael

J.M. Crant and T.S. Bateman. 1993. Assignment of Credit and Blame for Performance Outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal* 36(1):7-27.

J.M. Crant and T.S. Bateman. 1993. Potential Job Applicant Reactions to Employee Drug Testing: The Effect of Program Characteristics and Individual Differences. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 7(3):279-290.

T.S. Bateman and J.M. Crant. 1993. The Proactive Component of Organizational Behavior: A Measure and Correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 14:103-118.

## RADIATION LABORATORY

Carmichael, Ian C.

I.C. Carmichael. 1993. Ab Initio Quadratic Configuration Interaction Calculation of Indirect NMR Spin-Spin Coupling Constants. *Journal of Physical Chemistry* 97(9):1789-1792.

Ferraudi, Guillermo J.

G.J. Ferraudi. 1993. Magnetic Field Effects in the Charge Transfer Photochemistry of Co(III) Complexes. *Chemical Physics Letters* 203(5,6):487-489.

## UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Miller, Robert C.

R.C. Miller. 1992. Ludzie i zarzadzanie bibliotekami. *Bibliotekarz* 9:11-14.

---

# Notre Dame

---

# R E P O R T

---

---

**Volume 22, Number 16**

**April 30, 1993**

**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) 631-5337

© 1993 by the University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556. All rights reserved.

---