

NOTRE DAME STUDENT SENATE  
Executive Summary  
February 6, 2008  
Notre Dame Room, LaFortune

I) **Opening Business**

- a. Maris called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.
- b. Erdina led the invocation.
- c. Rachel, Cipriano, Jim L. and Andrew were absent.
- d. Maris entertained the motion to approve the January 30, 2008 executive summary. Victoria motioned, and Tom seconded. *The January 30, 2008 minutes were approved at 6:06 p.m.*

II) **Podium**

- a. Ashley Weiss – Judicial Council President: Election Update
  - i. Ashley announced that there are 6 tickets this year. As part of Judicial Council to improve voter turnout, created slogan “Vote like a Champion” along with events. Last night was meet and greet with candidates. Tonight is a debate. Friday and Sunday emails through listserv to student body on how to vote, times, etc. This year, which is unique, is it will be on front page of ND site and will be running for entire duration of voting day 8am-8pm. Voting clusters in DeBartolo and Hesburgh, and working on North and South dining halls during peak hours. All will be staffed by Judicial Council reps. Voting day is Monday, Feb. 11<sup>th</sup>. There is no campaigning by candidates and supporters after midnight on Sunday. No campaigning on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors of LaFortune. Candidates will be emailed details about when/how results will be disclosed. Ashley will be back next week to update.
- b. Fr. Sullivan – Catholic Faculty Recruitment and Tenure
  - i. Fr. Robert Sullivan is from department of provost and is knowledgeable about the subject. Prof. Seth Brown will talk about issues involve. Then they will open for questions and answers.

Fr. Sullivan started by saying that over the years, observers have said that it is necessary for an institution to have distinctive practices for recruiting personnel. Alternative to the Harvard-Berkeley model. This is a hard rope to grasp, that most places didn't go for because it is to complex. Notre Dame decided to go for hiring for admission. In 1985/86, 64% of all faculty self-identified as Catholic. In 2004/2005, this number fell to 52% across the board. Any decision to hire for religious reasons is highly unfashionable in higher education institutions. No other major institutions in the first order Catholic or otherwise do this. It is a deeply counter-cultural approach. It is important to understand that when get involved, the available pool varies from subject to subject. Fr. Sullivan gave a few examples. When the Provost was asked to look into this issue about 2 years ago, they came up with four major tasks.

First provide academic rationale, which they did in 62 dense pages on why is this academically serious. What is important is that it is a modern university built on failed prophecy, that modernization equals secularization. Religion is not going away, and while that may be good, bad, or indifferent, it isn't going away. The question for the university is because it is not going away, where does the university go next. Notre Dame has the opportunity to lead in theological teaching. Second part involves data collection and distribution, specifically who is out there and how can you identify them. Third part is trying to articulate how other mission supportive faculty (religious and non religious) fit and serve the mission of Notre Dame. Fr. Jenkins has been working on draft document of this for over a year. The final element is constituting a committee for a way of means to do this responsibly and the committee that has formed represents all schools except architecture.

Prof. Brown said that committee is called Recruitment for Outstanding Catholic Faculty. He asked what the best ways to do that are. They talked to deans and faculty of the various ways/methods, with a generally fairly broad agreement with what is possible. Fr. Sullivan said there were 13 members of committee and everyone signed the document.

c. Seth Brown – Catholic Faculty Recruitment and Tenure

- i. Prof. Seth Brown teaches in chemistry and biochemistry departments. He is the chair of the administrative committee in Recruitment for Outstanding Catholic Faculty committee. He called it an apple pie issue, of what academics do. The report itself has engendered commentary and criticism on aspects, with the main faculty response being about the broader issue that is deliberately sidestepped, which is not how to go about it, but whether we should go about this project. This is driving emotions of faculty. Issue of elision in this issue between Catholic mission of university and Catholic identity among faculty. The mission is much more difficult to define, as compared to the numbers. He is going to talk about some of the concerns the faculty have with combining religious affiliation with hiring. There is a class of problems: can we do this and how do we do this. Predominantly Catholic scholars, as it states in mission statement of university, which they more or less didn't worry about, but instead how the problem has been framed.

First problem the faculty worry about is the applicant pool issue. If try to hire people, will the best candidate be Catholic 50% of time at Notre Dame. Catholics maybe more likely to apply (attracted) because of the Catholic character. Perhaps with recommendations is the enticement of Catholic scholars to Notre Dame. It is not clear, and there is a number of faculty who are skeptical that this number will be reached. Choosing where one goes to teach/research is a professional decision and often made for professional reasons, and often research is

not based on religion. Over the past 40 years or so, the story of higher education of Catholics is less and less in Catholic higher education. Expectation of affinity of Notre Dame is less and less. Notre Dame is becoming a better university, and thus appealing to more and more people. There is an open question of whether it will be the case that 50% or more of candidates will be the best candidate and be Catholic. If not, what should we do? Not hire the best candidate and hire just based on being Catholic. If do so, they won't be increasing the quality as fast as they could. Another issue is internal opinion. Some fields have an "allergy" to religion, such as biology. There is concern that if it becomes known that Notre Dame will be taking this seriously, then we would not be taken seriously in the academies. This issue is going against the Catholic character of the university, especially in some fields.

The second area of concern is what the proper dimension we should be foregoing is. Importantly, religious diversity and faculty morale. Diversity is an important goal in faculty, and is important to have dialogue about religion on campus. Notre Dame is uniquely ambitious about this – having a strong religious identity but welcoming about faith. It is important to speak to world, not just one religious sect. A preoccupation in hiring can be demoralizing to potential candidates. There is a very real effort from non-Catholic faculty that suddenly if not Catholic, university doesn't value them. It is reducing faculty to being a check in the box, opposed to valuing as an individual. Intrinsicly setting up a reward system that is corrosive to morale – if you leave, better suited for the numbers. People who aren't Catholic would like to feel valued. Catholic faculty feel that maybe they were hired just because Catholic and not because of merit. There is the issue of the Catholic mission and Catholic affiliation. Some are Catholic, but how does that help if just checking the box. There are faculty who aren't Catholic but are greatly improving the Catholic mission.

Prof. Brown asked where the student voice in all of this is. Faculty hiring not usually part the students. One of justifications of hiring Catholics is intent to foster students' development, spiritually and morally, as well as intellectually. They would appreciate feedback from student government and students as to what affect this will have on students and their perception on classroom experience. Prof. Brown posed several questions to the students: Do answers change depending on the discipline? Does it vary with class size? More generally, what are the experiences that have affected intellectual, moral, spiritual development at the university.

- ii. Fr. Sullivan and Prof. Brown opened to questions. Carol started by thanking them for presenting questions and wanting to hear from students, saying that we will pass along when we hear. Carol asked Fr. Sullivan about what does the university think about this issue now, that

is what is its position or is it still deciding, and what is its status. Fr. Sullivan responded that hiring is a very complex process that varies from college to college. In Arts & Letters, have a line (job opening), go to dean and say that you would like to hire someone in the history of India, for example. Then would advertise in specific academic journals and online and start calling people madly. They tried in history of India, but the only excellent catholic professor is at Wesleyan and can't get him. So they went to India to look and brought 3 people out for interviews. They have committees within departments and whole department discussions and they rank the (usually) 3. Then offers are made or not made. It is very hard to impose anybody on a department against the department's will. Now to status, the document that committee produced was a ways of means document and was accepted in early September by the Provost. They are inviting faculty comments on it. No recommendations will be put into effect until faculty has at it. There are lots of discussions between faculty, departments, administration. The commitment remains. Prof. Brown said that in science, they never know what religion the candidates are unless they explicitly say so. The department does hiring because they are the ones knowledgeable about field. It is their priority to have those that can teach classes and do research. The priorities may be different with the administration. Carol asked if a Dean can veto a decision. Yes, they can.

Ryan asked if there was any talk about giving preferential status to any departments about being exempt. That is, are there any qualifications that college X is exempt, but college Y has to have this many. Fr. Sullivan responded that not yet, but emphasized Prof. Brown's distinction between can and should is not only valid but necessary. Right now, don't even know if they can answer. It will most likely be based on success and failure. For should, all points that Prof. Brown put on the table need to be engaged, with some more reasonable than others. It will be mostly through trial and error representation. Prof. Brown responded that the problem is that the question is what is the rationale. Is it just a number, is it field by field, discipline by discipline. Pools are very different. Arts and Letters doesn't want to "carry the burden." Sometimes it matters in how we teach subjects, others it doesn't. Politically, doing it that way would be unpopular. Liz followed up by asking if it is more of a discussion now of should we pursue this or is it not there yet. Fr. Sullivan responded that isn't on the table yet. There is no real model that is currently acceptable. It is a matter of kind of making it up as you go along. The can question will be answered empirically. That is the next step. Prof. Brown responded that don't know what "this" is yet. Things are going on, such as the Keough and Hesburgh chairs that will contribute substantially to the Catholic character/mission of university. There are encouragements to hire Catholic faculty, but in sciences it is

orthogonal to hiring practices. Liz asked for clarification that right now it is soft encouragement, not numerical. Fr. Sullivan said that Fr. Malloy had written in the constitution in 1993 explicitly for more than 50%, which has been there for 15 years. The problem started when the numbers started going south. Liz asked if it is across the university or in departments. Fr. Sullivan responded yes it is across the university. Prof. Brown responded that it is a goal, not a need.

Sheena asked if they felt that a lot of faculty that would actively pursue other universities if something were to move on this issue and if that was a concern. Prof. Brown responded that faculty decisions to move to other universities are usually very complicated and would probably not be the single issue, but it would be significant. There are many faculty members who feel alienated by this issue. Liz asked both for inputs of what is the best mechanism for input from students. Prof. Brown responded that the Faculty Senate is discussing this issue and hoping sometime this semester to produce some sort of commentary/report on the issue. They would appreciate feedback for the report in some sort of timely way. Fr. Sullivan responded to be vigorous with town hall meeting with lots of participation. Part of this is that lot of the work that should be done by religious can't be done without numbers. Faculty aren't prepared to do this due to lack of experience. They want to know what would you like to see faculty do for you that you can see them doing. Please inform Faculty Senate with this, as he is a believer in having as many voices as possible and/or necessary. Maris said that the goal from here is to get both sides out to student body, which is not extremely well educated about the details of this issue). It is important to welcome dialogue and educate the student body on this issue.

### III) Officer Reports

- a. Ms. Liz Brown, Student Body President
  - i. Liz said that she, Sheena, and Maris will be presenting to Board of Trustees soon. Friday the committee on sexual assault awareness will be meeting. Has a meeting scheduled with Fr. Poorman discussing final draft/copy of the Good Neighbor guide. First meeting of CCAC is scheduled for Feb. 20<sup>th</sup> in the afternoon.
- b. Ms. Maris Braun, Student Body Vice President
  - i. Maris encouraged everyone to attend Majors Night for support. Additionally, town hall meeting is scheduled for Mon. Feb. 18<sup>th</sup> at 7pm DeBartolo 101. Attendance is mandatory as elected official and more information on that coming soon.
- c. Ms. Sheena Plamoottil, Chief Executive Assistant
  - i. Sheena doesn't have too much to report. She is working on the student forum for immigration. Tara asked about the airport shuttle issue. Sheena responded that what ending up happening was they have done it in the past, but from reports from the past, not sure if it is efficient to do it again. For the cost of buses, there wasn't as much student

interest as they wanted. Liz said that the initial plan was to work through Transpo. After that wasn't a possibility, they looked into renting buses for certain dates around breaks, but decided that was not most cost-effective way of doing this. Instead putting money in things such as the student forum. Sheena said there is an indirect route through Transpo through downtown if students are interested.

- d. Mr. Thomas Noble, Faculty Senate Liaison
  - i. Prof. Noble said that the Student Affairs committee voted unanimously for the clocks in classroom issue. He will bring it up more in Faculty Senate. Last week's meeting of Faculty Senate spent 2 ½ hours developing/refining what will be a survey for all faculty on this issue of recruiting Catholic faculty. He said it is important to get this on the table. He invited everyone to communicate ideas through himself and encouraged inviting faculty to forum/town hall meeting and gain insight of what different faculty members think, but at same time don't think you have to choose one faculty position or another. He emphasized that one should arrive at own decision, saying never mind what the faculty think, what is more important is what do you think. Don't choose sides, it is more important to decide what you think and find various ways to bring that up. Maris responded that should pass all comments through to him personally and from the dorm discussions.

#### IV) **Committee Reports**

- a. Committee on Academic Affairs
  - i. Carol announced that Majors Night is tomorrow from 6-8 pm. Recognition to Ryan and Brian Jackson who have been working hard on it for the past month. Also, look for the clocks in classroom resolution next week. She has a meeting with OIT about the print quota online issue. Kelly asked what purpose is if it lets you go negative. Carol said she will bring up more next week. Also, committee is doing an evaluation of study spaces around the dorm and will be putting comment boxes in dorm study spaces to see improvements, trying to get recommendations of what people want.
- b. Committee on Community Relations
  - i. Colin said Taste of South Bend solicitation letters went to over 60 restaurants this week. Met with CSC about more publicity about Community Based Learning programs to increase participation through website and/or freshmen bulletin.
- c. Committee on Social Concerns
  - i. Karen said as an extension of locally grown food issue, they are talking to contemporary topics program directors about altering some of the course with topics incorporating locally grown food when discussing nutrition. Working on adding it in the textbook and to one of the class days. Other than that, they are in the planning stages for a bunch of other stuff that will hear about in future.
- d. Committee on Gender Issues

- i. Brenna thanked everyone for feedback about gender relations commissioners. Sheena put an awesome webpage together for the Health and Body Issues conference. Brenna is posting a sign-up sheet for some senators who are taking any classes applicable to health and wellness if you and professor would like to attend dinner to involve both students and faculty on evening of Ann Simonton's presentation. Robin asked if other students are allowed to do this or just senators. Brenna said dinner is limited to senators, but everyone is encouraged to go to the workshop and presentation. The committee will be doing lots of advertising soon.
  - e. Committee on Residence Life
    - i. Mariana had a meeting with Jenny Phillips from RecSports and working on a magnet stating when is best times to work out. Gus is working on an outline of what the matching program would look like through ResLife/RecSports. A resolution will be coming soon. They have finished the planning for Safe Spring Break week and next week will be looking for helpers. There is the iTunesU resolution tonight and a resolution going tonight to rectors to apply for matching funds. Tara is working on wireless internet survey that should be going out soon.
  - f. Committee on University Affairs
    - i. Callie said they have been continuing work on the Feb. 26<sup>th</sup> debate about healthcare. They are trying to narrow down the issue so let her know of any questions you want brought up. Working on having an environmental debate, hopefully in the middle of March. Please keep helping with Recyclemania.
  - g. Committee on Oversight
    - i. Ian said that the Constitution as Senate mended it last week should be up on website soon.
  - h. Committee on Multicultural Affairs
    - i. Ninny said Artist for Africa is going on tomorrow at Legends for ND 8. They have raised \$27,000 so far, but need \$35,000. Peru days started tonight. Winding down survey including Native American studies minor. Right now the university has 5 classes that would go toward this minor. They are working on how to present to senate. Look for a resolution in next couple of weeks.

V) **OLD BUSINESS**

- a. Student Senate Resolution SS0708-21 "On the Table"

VI) **NEW BUSINESS**

- a. Student Senate Resolution SS0708-27
  - i. Mariana said that the resolution is pretty self explanatory. In order for the administration to address this, they need student support. This resolution presents all the research and what they have been working on. Maris entertained any questions about grammar or content. Maris opened floor for debate. Robin asked if these other universities mentioned in resolution saw a drop in attendance. Mariana said that

University of Illinois in Springfield didn't see a drop, with most professors uploading usually before test and not after each class. Teachers can decide when he/she wants to upload lectures. They discussed that Notre Dame is not concerned with attendance, but more concerned about the issues with intellectual property. Peer universities are using it as recruitment tool. Ryan asked about students who don't have computers on campus. Mariana responded that they would probably have to put iTunes on cluster computers, but there will be lots of security features which is what OIT is trying to work on getting more information about right now. Maris moved into voting. Resolution SS0708-27 passed at 7:23 p.m. with vote of 21-0-0.

b. Student Senate Resolution SS0708-28

- i. Carol gave background that in beginning of year mentioned any new opportunities/changing for advising system. During majors night talks they were asked and they wanted some recommendations. Most of the focus is on the fact that in the transition from freshmen to sophomore year it is hard to tell who advisor is. They sent the resolution/ideas to First Year of Studies to see some of these ideas were feasible. Carol noticed an extra comma in third resolved, asked if that could be amended. She said that the rest was pretty self-explanatory. Maris opened floor to content and grammar. Gus presented friendly correction of comma. Carol accepted. Maris opened the floor up to general debate. Tara asked if there was a particular reason why Mendoza was singled out. Carol responded that lots of business majors on committee, but there were many recommendations in general not just on FYS transition. Mendoza has a problem different from other departments, since the entire college has only 4 advisors for sophomores. As for the status of undergraduate advisors in other colleges, it is broken down differently. Jim asked if this is going to cause a problem with faculty/advisors to meet with these people, doubling base of who is advising. Carol responded that it is not necessarily for freshmen to meet with these advisors now, but just to know who he/she should contact when leaving First Year of Studies. Maris moved into voting. Resolution SS0708-28 passed at 7:28 p.m. with vote of 21-0-0.

c. Continued Discussion on Catholic Faculty Recruitment and Tenure

- i. Carol wanted to acknowledge the sheets with presentation guide and directions for running dorm sessions. She noted it was especially important to contact rector/hall president first. Holding these sessions between Feb. 6<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> is best. She gave some recommendations for the best ways to have these dorm sessions. The sheets are fairly self explanatory. Also, bring up an outline of some things of what we have been discussing with possible discussion questions. Also add the questions that Prof. Brown stated in talk today. Carol asked that after the session, please come up with a summary of dorm, with the top 3 priorities of what to do with these issues. She also asked that those



who have the meeting before the next senate meeting to start sharing some of these ideas next week. Then Carol can start to summarize what the students tend to think.

**VII) ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- a. Maris said that every year in the last two months of administration that these Senate meetings can be lengthy, so please be present for entire meeting, stay focused until the end, and it is very important to stay focused until April 1<sup>st</sup>. She emphasized importance of quorum.
- b. Carol announced there is a talk about Super Tuesday in CoMo lounge tonight.

**VIII) ADJOURNMENT**

- a. Maris entertained a motion to adjourn. Tara motioned. Ryan seconded. *The February 6, 2008 Senate meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.*

Respectfully Submitted,

Caitlin Flynn  
Student Body Secretary

