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Appointments

Michael Coppedge, associate professor of government and international studies, was appointed Director of Graduate Studies in the Department of Government and International Studies beginning August 1998.

Oliver F. Williams, C.S.C., associate professor of management, and Bonnie F. Fremgen, associate professional specialist in management, have been appointed academic and program directors, respectively, of the Center for Ethics and Religious Values in Business.

Honors

Matthew F. Benedict, assistant professional specialist in English, had his short story "Signs" named runner up in the Prose Division, in an award series jointly sponsored by Outrider Press and the Feminist Writers Guild/Chicago.

Pamela A. Krauser, associate professional specialist in the graduate school, was awarded the Society of Research Administrators 1998 Hartford-Nicholsen Award on October 19.

Thomas Kselman, professor of history, has been elected to serve a three year term on the board of editors of French Historical Studies, the official publication of the Society for French Historical Studies.

James S. O'Rourke IV, director of the Fanning Center for Business Communication, has been inducted into the Arthur W. Page Society. The Page Society is comprised of some 300 members who represent Fortune 200 firms, the nation's leading public relations firms, and a select group of academics. The society was founded and operates on the principles rooted in the social responsibilities of business. It is committed through its mission to "providing a continuous learning forum and emphasizing the highest professional standards."

Morris Pollard, Coleman director of the Lobund Laboratory and professor emeritus of biological science, has been appointed to the International Advisory Board for the Bengt Gustafsson Symposium by the Karolinska Institutet to be held in Stockholm, Sweden, June 19-24, 1999.

Kathleen Pyne, associate professor of art history, has been awarded a Short-Term Visitor's Grant at the Smithsonian Institution for research on her project, "Modernism and the Feminine Voice: Alfred Stieglitz's Search for Woman in Art," for May 1999.

Esther-Mirjam Sent, assistant professor of economics, was appointed Research Coordinator for Institutional History of Economics by the European Associate for Evolutionary Political Economy Council.

Activities

Eleanor Bernstein, C.S.J., Director of the Center for Pastoral Liturgy, and Rev. Timothy Fitzgerald, associate director and associate professional specialist in the Center for Pastoral Liturgy, presented workshops in Sydney, Melbourne, and Wollongong, Australia and visited worship offices in New Zealand in July and August.

Michael Coppedge, associate professor of government and international studies, was an expert participant in the Surge Training Exercise on a Humanitarian Crisis in Venezuela at the U.S. Army War College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, June 23-25. He presented the paper "Métodos para Evaluar la Calidad de la Democracia" commissioned by the Estado de la Nación project, sponsored by the UNDP and the European Union in San José, Costa Rica, August 13. He served as organizer and discussant for the panel on "Theoretical and Comparative Perspectives on Stalemate and Cooperation in Presidential Democracies" at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association in Boston, Massachusetts, September 2-5. He was a discussant for the panel

**Norman Crowe**, professor of architecture, delivered the paper "The Death and Resurrection of Embodied Memory" at the West Central Regional Conference of the Association of Collegiate Schools in Architecture at Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri, October 5.

**Roberto DaMatta**, Joyce professor of anthropology, gave the lecture "Some Reflections on Football as National Drama" at the University of Sports in Oslo, Norway, November 3. He gave the seminar "Popular Gambling and Totemism in Modern Brazil" and presented the paper "Notes on Personalism and Bureaucracy in Brazil" at the International Seminar on Bureaucracy, Politics, and Ritual Practice at the Department of Anthropology at the University of Oslo in Oslo, Norway, November 4–6.

**JoAnn DellaNeva**, associate professor of Romance languages and literatures, presented the paper "Re-writing Ariosto: The Case of Ronsard and Du Bellay" at the Sixteenth Century Studies Conference in Toronto, Canada, October 22–25.

**Gregory Dowd**, associate professor of history, served as a commentator on "Native American Strategy and Tactics" at the Sixty Years' War Conference in Bowling Green, Ohio, September 18. He presented "Pre-Dependent Indian Nations: The Colonial Background of an American Oxymoron" at Davidson College, October 26.

**Michael S. Driscoll**, assistant professor of theology, **Maxwell E. Johnson**, associate professor of theology, **Lizette Larson-Miller**, assistant professor of theology, **John Allyn Mellor**, S.M., director of John S. Marten Program in Homiletics and Liturgics, made presentations as the annual pastoral liturgy conference "Church and Eucharist: The Many Presences of Christ," sponsored by the Notre Dame Center for Pastoral Liturgy at the University of Notre Dame, June 15–18.

**Georges Enderie, O'Neil** professor of international business ethics, gave a keynote address on "Approaches to Business Ethics in Different Parts of the World" at the first international conference on Ethics, Business and Economics in Latin America in Sao Paulo, Brazil, July 27–30. He presented the paper "What NGOs Expect from Global Companies: A Worldwide Survey" at the annual meeting of the Society for Business Ethics in San Diego, California, August 6–9. He organized, in cooperation with Richard De George, a four-hour session of the International Society of Business, Economics, and Ethics on "Ethics, Human Rights, and International Business" and gave a paper on "Ethical Assessment of Transnational Corporations" at the 20th World Congress of Philosophy in Boston, Massachusetts, August 10–16.

**Leonid Faybusovich**, associate professor of mathematics, was a keynote visitor in the program "Foundations of Computational Mathematics" at the Mathematical Science research institute in Berkeley, California, October. He gave the invited talk "Towards Dimension-Independent Complexity Estimates for Interior-Point Algorithms" in Brocketfest, at Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts, October 23–24.

**Timothy Fitzgerald**, associate director and associate professional specialist in the Center for Pastoral Liturgy, presented the workshop "Echoing God's Word" in Wichita, Kansas, October 2–3.


**Philip Gleason**, professor emeritus of history, gave the lecture "Catholic Higher Education in Reflection" at the conference Baptist and Catholic Higher Education: Promise of the Past, Challenge of the Future, sponsored by the Erasmus Institute, at the University of Notre Dame, October 30.

**Denis Goulet**, O'Neill professor in education for justice in the Department of Economics, presented the paper "Culture, Religion, and Development" at the Karl Polanyi Institute at Concordia University in Montreal, Canada, October 17.

**Jimmy Gurule**, associate dean of the Law School and professor of law, delivered the invited lecture "The 1998 U.N. Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances — A Ten Year Perspective: Is International Cooperation Merely Illusory?" to the faculty of the University of Kentucky Law School in Lexington, Kentucky, October 22.

**Jinesh C. Jain**, assistant professional specialist in civil engineering and geological sciences, presented "Effect of Instrumental Sensitivity on Accuracy of Low Level Rare Earth Elements in Geological Samples Determined by InductivelyCoupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry (ICP-MS)" at the Geological Society of America Symposium in Toronto, Canada, October 26–29.
Mark P. Jones, visiting fellow in the Kellogg Institute for International Studies, gave the seminar “Electoral Laws and Candidate Competition in Presidential Elections” at the University of Notre Dame, November 10.

David J. Kirkner, associate professor and acting chairperson of civil engineering and geological sciences, gave the invited seminar “A Multi-Scale Model for Thermal Cracking in Asphalt Pavements” at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio, October 30.

Gyula Klima, associate professor of philosophy, gave the invited talk “Aquinas on One and Many” at the Midday Medieval Seminar series at Boston College in Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts, November 2. He spoke on “Ontological Hierarchy in Plato’s Republic” at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst, Massachusetts, November 2.

Julia F. Knight, professor of mathematics, gave the talk “Complexity and arithmetic” at a meeting of the Indiana Section of Mathematical Association of America at Saint Mary’s College in Notre Dame, Indiana, November 7; and to the Notre Dame Math Club at the University of Notre Dame, November 9.

Pamela A. Krauser, associate professional specialist in the graduate school, presented the paper “Centers of Information: Research Resource Libraries in the Electronic Age,” co-authored with Ellen D. Rogers, associate director and associate professional specialist in the Graduate School, at the Society of Research Administrators annual meeting in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, October 20.

Thomas Kselman, professor of history, delivered the paper “Catholic Proselytism and Jewish Converts in Nineteenth-century France: The Case of Alphonse Ratisbonne” as part of a panel on religious minorities in modern France at the annual meeting of the Western Society for French History in Boston, Massachusetts, November 5–8.

Louise Litzinger, assistant dean and associate professional specialist in the First Year of Studies, made the presentation “The First Year: Quality Academic Advising and Critical Academic Support” at the National Conference on Academic Advising (NACADA) in San Diego, California, October 4–7. She presented “Peer Advising: Service to First-Year Students and Course Credit for Seniors” at the Ohio College Personnel Association Conference in Columbus, Ohio, October 18–20.

John M. LoSecco, professor of physics, gave the invited talk “Problems with Atmospheric Neutrino Oscillations” at the Institute for Theoretical Physics Seminar at the State University of New York in Stony Brook, New York, October 19; and at the Wednesday Theory Seminar at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center at Stanford University in Stanford, California, October 28.

Mary Ann Mahony, assistant professor of history, presented, “Shaping and Reshaping the Past: Collective Memory, Historical Representation, and Rule in Northeastern Brazil” at a seminar sponsored by the Latin American Studies Center, the Department of History and FOCAL-West of the University of Calgary in Calgary, Alberta, Canada, November 2.

Edward Manier, professor of philosophy, gave the invited address “Trauma, Molecular Psychiatry, and Religious Belief” at the conference Science in Theistic Contexts at Redeemer College in Ancaster, Ontario, Canada, July 21–25. He organized and chaired a scientific session on “Coevolution of Language and Brain” at the joint meetings of the Philosophy of Science Association and the History of Science Society in Kansas City, Missouri, October 22–25. He presented the papers “Why Playwright Brian Friel is a Better Medical Anthropologist than Oliver Sacks” and “Fear and Wisdom: Evolutionary, Cultural and Religious Perspectives on Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder” and organized and chaired a session on biological and discursive perspectives on post-traumatic stress disorder at the meeting Thinking the Brain, and Beyond of the Society for Literature and Science at the University of Florida in Gainesville, Florida, November 5–8.

A. James McAdams, professor and chairperson of government and international studies, presented the paper “German Public Officials as Historians” and chaired the panel “Democratization in the New German States” at the annual meeting of the German Studies Association in Salt Lake City, Utah, October 8–11.

Garth McIntjes, associate director of the Center for Civil and Human Rights in the Notre Dame Law School, was a consultant to the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. in Chicago, Illinois, September 11–13. He was a panelist on the topic of Control Unit Prisons at the Amnesty International conference “Focusing On Our Corner of The World” at the Urban Morgan Institute for Human Rights at the University of Cincinnati College of Law in Cincinnati, Ohio, October 31. He presented the keynote address "Renewing Our Promise: The Universal Declaration of Human Rights" at the 50th anniversary celebration of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights titled “All Human Rights for All, 1948-1998” was held at St. Mary’s College in Notre Dame, Indiana, November 1.

Nathan Mitchell, associate director of the Center for Pastoral Liturgy, presented the keynote address at the annual meeting of the Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commission in Memphis, Tennessee, September 27–29. He and Timothy Fitzgerald, associate director and associate professional specialist in the Center for Pastoral Liturgy, John Allyn Melloh, S.M., director of John S. Marten Program in Homiletics and Liturgics, and Eleanor Bernstein, C.S.J., director of the Center for Pastoral Liturgy, made presentations at the special workshop for priests on the ministry of presiding "Presiding at the Community's Prayer," sponsored by the Notre Dame Center for Pastoral Liturgy at the University of Notre Dame.
Morris Pollard, Coleman director of the Lobund Laboratory and professor emeritus of biological science, was the keynote speaker on progress in cancer research at the annual meeting of the Great Lakes Consortium of the American Cancer Society at the U.S. Golf Academy Center in Plymouth, Indiana, November 3.


Peter Schiffer, assistant professor of physics, gave the physics colloquium "Beach Physics: Studies of Wetting and Drag Forces in Granular Media" and gave the condensed matter seminar "Geometrical Frustration in Magnets: Common Behavior and Unique Ground States" at the University of Toronto in Ontario, Canada, October 22–23.


Steven R. Schmid, assistant professor of aerospace and mechanical engineering, presented the paper "Single Asperity Flowing with Applications" at the Conference on Integration of Material and Process Design in Seven Springs, Pennsylvania, October 19–20. He served as Chair of the Organizing Committee and served as moderator of a number of sessions at the Workshop on Integration of Research and Engineering Education, funded by the National Science Foundation, in Arlington, Virginia, November 8–10.

Mark R. Schurr, assistant professor of anthropology, presented the invited lecture "Categorizing Types in Archaeology" for the lecture series that accompanied the exhibit titled "What's the Point?" at the Northern Indiana Center for History in South Bend, Indiana, September 17. He presented the papers "Goodall Mound 16" and "The Late Prehistory of Northwestern Indiana: New Perspectives on an Old Model" and participated in the workshop "Midwest Protohistoric Ceramics" where he provided examples of prehistoric ceramics from northwestern Indiana for display at the Midwest Archaeological Conference in Muncie, Indiana, October 21–23. He presented the invited lecture "Archaeology at the Bennac Village: Searching for Evidence of Life at the End of the Fur Trade" as part of "Fur Trade on Southern Lake Michigan: 1634–1834" at the eighth annual Woodland National Conference on Great Lakes Native American Culture in Porter, Indiana, November 6.

Esther-Mirjam Sent, assistant professor of economics, presented "Bounded Rationality on the Rebound" at the 1998 World Congress of Philosophy in Boston, Massachusetts, August 13. She gave the talk "Models of Herbert Simon" at the 1998 University of Amsterdam Research Day in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, September 25. She presented "Playing Games with Bounded Rationality" at the 1998 European Association for Evolutionary Political Economy conference in Lisbon, Portugal, November 6.

Anthony M. Trozzolo, Huisking professor emeritus of chemistry and biochemistry, presented the invited lecture "Photochromism — Molecules that Curl Up and Dye" before the Department of Chemistry at Valparaiso University in Valparaiso, Indiana, October 30.

Sandra Vitzthum, assistant professor of architecture, recently completed a restoration of a church sanctuary in Vermont. The project used grants from the Windham Foundation, the State of Vermont Division for Historic Preservation, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation/Cynthia Woods Mitchell Fund for Historic Interiors.

Dean W. Zimmerman, associate professor of philosophy, presented the paper "Epiphenomenalism and the Given" in the departmental colloquia at Northern Illinois University in De Kalb, Illinois, April 10; and at Dartmouth College in Hanover, New Hampshire, May 27. He presented the paper "Shoemaker's Theory of Properties" at and invited session of the World Congress of Philosophy in Boston, Massachusetts, August 14. He presented the paper "Physical Necessity as Metaphysical Necessity in the departmental colloquia at Yale University in New Haven, Connecticut, October 29; and at Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island, October 30.

Publications


Esther-Mirjam Sent, assistant professor of economics, wrote *The Evolving Rationality Expectations: An Assessment...*


Activities

Jeffrey R. Shoup, director of residence life, presented "Integrating Community Service Opportunities with Professional Development" at the annual Great Lakes Association of College and University Housing Officers (GLACUHO) conference in Chicago, Illinois, November 8–10.

Publications

Graduate Council
Minutes
September 23, 1998


Members absent and excused: Edward J. Conlon, Anthony K. Hyder, Donald P. Kommers

Observer: Diane R. Wilson

Guests: Panos J. Antsaklis (for Gerald J. Iafrate), Steven A. Buechler (for Francis J. Castellino), Randall C. Zachman

Prof. Merz, vice president for graduate studies and research, called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. and began with a prayer.

I. Minutes of the 271st Graduate Council Meeting
The minutes of the 271st Graduate Council meeting were approved as submitted.

II. Proposal for Master of Theological Studies Degree
Prof. Merz turned over the floor to council guest Randall Zachman, associate professor of theology and director of the M.A. program, who presented highlights from the theology department's formal proposal to offer a new degree, the Master of Theological Studies (M.T.S.). He noted that the need for a two-year master's program has been long recognized both internally (since at least 1985) and externally. He said that none of our peer institutions has less than a two-year Ph.D. preparatory program, that our own doctoral students have two to three years of theology before coming here, and that some have even more.

The proposal pursues breadth, depth, and flexibility: as a theology—not an area—degree, it covers the five doctoral areas; it includes two or more areas of concentration; and it does not mandate specific courses but instead requires every student to take at least one course from each of the five areas. Prof. Zachman emphasized that no new courses and no new faculty will be needed to run the program; it will take nothing away from the undergraduate program. Regarding funding, the department hopes to increase the number of tuition scholarships "down the line" but will run the program now with no new funds. He anticipates that the number of students in the program will increase slowly.

Following these brief remarks, he responded to questions from council members. The M.T.S. program will not include the summer session, as the one-year M.A. program does, he said, but the department will encourage students to use the summer, especially the first summer, to work on language requirements and other courses not offered in the academic year. He anticipates that most M.T.S. students will do so.

Asked how the department will balance the funding needs of applicants for the pastoral training of the one-year M.A. program against the need to fund students in the two-year M.T.S. program, Prof. Zachman replied that the trend of the last several years indicates that most applicants to the one-year program are predoctoral intents; last year, 45 of 52 M.A. applicants were Ph.D. intents. We have lost our top picks because we have no two-year program, he said, and these are students who really wanted to come here. The intention is to direct two-thirds of the funding to M.T.S. and one-third to M.A. students, a ratio that seems to reflect applicant interest. The ratios are not meant to be ironclad; there will be some flexibility, depending on the applicant pool. Sometimes, it is possible to funnel funds from Ph.D. to M.T.S./M.A. students. Also, some people receive diocesan funding for the one-year program. The department does not want to give the impression that the only valid program is the two-
year program. Council member Greg Sterling, who is director of graduate studies for the Ph.D. program in theology, added that the one-year program is in no danger because the parallel theology summer program is vibrant. As director of graduate studies, he finds it difficult to respond to people who want to go on to the Ph.D. at Notre Dame after completing the one-year program here. They would be at a competitive disadvantage, he said, in a pool that last year had 125 applicants for 12 places since most of those applicants had a minimum of two years of graduate school experience.

Some questions concerned the separate structure of the M.A. and Ph.D. programs in theology and the seemingly excessive ground covered and time-to-degree compared to other disciplines. Prof. Zachman explained that until fairly recently theology was a clerical enterprise and the three-year preparatory program for the Ph.D. program derives from the three-year Master of Divinity degree program for clergy—the Ph.D. preparatory program was an M.Div. streamlined for people not going into the priesthood. Prof. Sterling agreed that theology's academic structure is anomalous, but that we have to compete with reality; it's what our peers require. In addition to the discipline's historical development, he said, the language requirement in some areas can include three or four ancient and a couple of modern languages.

Asked why admission requirements are more flexible for M.T.S. than M.A. applicants, Prof. Zachman explained that the Association of Theological Schools mandates 18 hours of theology prerequisites for the M.A. because it is such a short program but not for the longer M.T.S. program. Because M.T.S. applicants need fewer theology credits coming in, there is wider scope for students with majors other than theology and more potential for cross-fertilization. By its nature, theology is more interdisciplinary than other fields, he said.

Why bother with the M.A. program? And is M.T.S. the appropriate designation for the two-year degree? Will it be recognized? The longest debate on the department committee was whether to revamp the whole M.A. program to a two-year program. The idea was rejected 4-to-1, and the entire department concurred. The need continues for the one-year program and, with about 150 students per summer, the summer program is strong. The name of the degree is not a problem, he said, because there is no uniformity; some two-year programs are M.T.S. and some, M.A. To switch names, however, would confuse current constituents of the one-year program.

Prof. Merz asked Prof. Sterling to talk about the department's efforts to decrease time to degree in the theology Ph.D. program, which averages seven years here after three to four years in prior predoctoral work. He replied that last year the department initiated five-year funding, giving all doctoral students a dissertation fellowship in the fourth year and requiring them to teach two courses in the fifth. This structure provides more continuity from course work through the dissertation proposal and research stage, without the disruption of teaching for a year in between. This year, the department is looking at ways to make the programs more efficient without diminishing quality by considering modifications to the requirements for the Ph.D. degree.

Asked to predict future funding needs, Prof. Zachman stated that the goal is to work toward 30 scholarships (twice the current number) for both programs to be able to flourish; the timetable depends on the possibility of getting resources. That would be 10 M.A. and 20 M.T.S. students each year. Still, no more faculty should be needed because, even though required courses are very full, electives currently are sparsely attended. That's one reason for not mandating required courses for the M.T.S. If students choose their own courses, the numbers may even out. Administrative needs will not increase, either; the current M.A. director will oversee both master's programs.

When asked about sources of funding, Prof. Zachman said that one student a year might receive external funding in the master's program. Prof. Sterling said the University funds most Ph.D. students until they begin the dissertation, when more external funding is available.

One member commented that offering 34 courses for 17 students seems odd. Why so many for so few? Also, how many Ph.D.s does the department accept from its own master's program? M.A.s, M.Div.s, and some Ph.D.s, as well as some students from other departments, all take these courses. Prof. Sterling said that about one in ten of the Ph.D.s come from the Notre Dame master's program and that those who do have two years of master's work or an M.A., come from another institution.

Will the number of Notre Dame master's students who are accepted into the Ph.D. program here increase? Prof. Sterling said that it would probably increase because we will have had a much longer time to assess them—one and a half years before they apply to the Ph.D. program. Another benefit is that those who choose to go elsewhere will represent Notre Dame better than they do now. De jure, a master's degree is not required for a Ph.D. program; de facto, it is. A few students have come directly from undergraduate programs, most with Pew Scholarships; they were required to do three instead of two years of course work. Our experience is that they have not done well in the program with other students who are older and have much more theological background.

As student numbers shift from the one-year to the two-year program, will it be possible to decrease some yearly class offerings to every two years? M.Div. requirements, which are very structured, and M.A. requirements will still drive a lot of those courses, Prof. Zachman replied. However, some courses do cycle even now and, theoretically, the new program should add more flexibility.
Prof. Merz asked Dean Roche for his reflections as dean of the College of Arts and Letters. Dean Roche said that he supports it and the arguments are very strong. He also suggested that there is an economy to the project—it needs no new faculty and will help to rotate courses. Dean Roche likes the scholarly integrity of the program and supports it very strongly.

Prof. Merz called for a vote by ballot, explaining that, if approved, the proposal would go next to the executive committee of the Academic Council and from there to the full council. If approved by the Academic Council, the program will begin in the fall 1999 semester. The Graduate Council voted, with 25 yes votes and 1 abstention, to recommend the theology department's M.T.S. proposal to the Academic Council.

III. Other business
Prof. Merz offered his reflections on opportunities this year for the Graduate Council, which he sees as a collegial, advisory body that gives him an opportunity to reflect with the University's academic leaders. He noted that the January meeting would be the annual joint meeting with the University Committee on Research and Sponsored Programs, which advises the Office of Research.

He is attempting to build support among the officers for the concept of modest growth for the Graduate School. "Small but superb" has been a good motto for many years of its development," he said; "we will never equal very large programs in size, but we want to equal them in quality. Perhaps now it's time to say, 'Small, superb, and growing to meet our challenges.'"

As called for in the Colloquy report, Notre Dame is adding new faculty, and they will need first-rate graduate students. Some departments currently are "understaffed" with graduate students. Modest growth is needed to provide a critical mass of graduate students for faculty to produce work, he said, and he needs support, aid, and enthusiastic assistance from the Graduate Council in this effort.

He outlined two areas of council engagement during this year. First, he plans to share with council members the results of the current round of external departmental reviews that began about a year and a half ago. He also will invite each department chair to a council meeting to engage in a collegial discussion of the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the department and its plans to improve. As the council responsible for graduate studies here, the Graduate Council ought to know the results and participate in the discussion. Two reviews will be discussed at each Graduate Council meeting throughout the review process.

Second, he will adopt the Academic Council tactic of forming subcommittees with strong chairs and four to five members working with an associate dean of the Graduate School who will serve not as leader but as a facilitator. He distributed an outline for three proposed subcommittees—on interdisciplinary studies, mentoring, and postdocs and visiting scholars—with brainstorming ideas under each topic area. The aim is to increase the vitality of intellectual life on this campus.

What are the needs? What are the institutional barriers? In developing proposals, he said, we want to work with the departments.

He adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.
University Committee on Women Faculty and Students

September 11, 1998

Members Present: Elizabeth Eldon, Barbara Fick, Philip Johnson, Carol Mooney, Michael Morris, Margaret Porter, Julie Potter, Ava Preacher, Gretchen Reydams-Schils, Susan Roberts, Jennifer Rotondo, Andrea Selak.

Members Excused: Melanie DeFord, Barbara Green, Kathleen Biddick.

The meeting was called to order by Barbara Fick at 8:00 a.m. Michael Morris volunteered to take minutes for the meeting. Barbara Fick asked each committee member to introduce himself/herself and welcomed new members to the committee. The minutes of the April 15, 1998 meeting were approved after minor editorial changes.

Chairperson Election. Barbara Green, an Associate Professor in the English Department, was elected chairperson of the committee for the 1998-1999 academic year.

Sexual Harassment. Barbara Fick reported on the status of the proposal for handling/reporting cases involving sexual harassment. She indicated that the proposal has been forwarded to General Counsel, Human Resources, Student Affairs, and the Provost’s Office and that the committee is waiting for feedback from each group.

Women’s Resource Center. Andrea Selak reported that the center has been granted space on the third floor of LaFortune along with the Campus Alliance for Rape Elimination.

Junior Faculty Mentoring. The committee examined the report which was generated as a result of the mentoring survey distributed to assistant professors in October 1997. The investigation was initiated from expressed concern over the extent and adequacy of a professional support system for encouraging the development of the academic careers of faculty. The response rate for the survey of 51% was found to be quite satisfactory, and the sample size of 91 allowed for cross-sectional statistical investigation at the university level but not the college or departmental level. The results suggest a need for improvement of the current mentoring system at the University of Notre Dame. In addition, statistically significant (at the .1 level) results were found between responses of male and female assistant professors in questions dealing with senior colleagues providing unsolicited assistance to junior faculty. Senior colleagues were found to recommend male faculty significantly more often for participation in conferences sponsored by others and for collaboration on projects with others. Senior colleagues were also found to ask male faculty to collaborate with them on their own work significantly more often than they ask female faculty.

The report concludes by urging discussions at the departmental level among faculty and junior faculty, within the Provost’s Advisory Council, and the sharing of information across colleges and departments regarding current experiences with formal and informal mentoring programs. The primary intent of encouraging discussions and the information sharing is to ensure the fullest development of the scholarly potential of all faculty.

The issue of bench marking against other universities was discussed. Margaret Porter volunteered to conduct a search for articles or reports related to mentoring efforts at other institutions. The Faculty Mentoring Report, with minor changes, was approved unanimously by the members present. The final report (attached) will be sent to the University Affirmative Action Committee and the Provost’s Advisory Council for their consideration.

Women’s Leadership. Michael Morris presented data which the subcommittee had collected from institutional research regarding the percentage of women faculty among associate professor, full professor, and tenured faculty groups by college at the University of Notre Dame. The results indicate that the percentage of women faculty in those groups in the colleges of science, business, architecture and engineering are below the university average, with no women associate professors in architecture and no full professors in business, engineering, and architecture as of the end of the 1997-98 academic year. The need for bench marking for this issue was also discussed, with several members noting the difficulty of obtaining data from private institutions. Elizabeth Eldon recommended using averages published in The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac. The committee also agreed to have the Law Research Librarian conduct a search for information from AAUP publications, and the following universities: Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Virginia, and California at Berkeley.

Discussion then turned to leadership by women at the undergraduate level. Concern was expressed that the university has never had a female student body president and that females do not aggressively pursue the top positions of many organizations on campus. Andrea Selak agreed to draft a letter to be sent to female undergraduate student leaders with the purpose of inviting them to the October meeting of this committee to discuss impediments and methods which could encourage females to take a stronger role in leadership positions at the undergraduate level.

Other Business. Barbara Fick asked each member to consider other issues which should be examined by the committee this year. She added coresidentiality to the list of topics discussed at this meeting, but asked for assistance in identifying other issues important to women faculty and students.

Each committee member submitted a form indicating the times throughout the week when he/she would not be available, so that an agreeable time could be found for future meetings. The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael H. Morris
Mentoring Survey

Report of the University Committee on Women Faculty and Students

Introduction

The University Committee on Women Faculty and Students was established in the Fall of 1996 to consider policies, practices and the general environment at the University as they relate to women faculty and students. During its first year, some women faculty asked that the committee consider the extent and adequacy of any professional support system for encouraging the development of the academic careers of faculty. Concern was expressed not only about the availability of such a system, but also whether women faculty were disproportionately excluded from the benefits of any mentoring system which did exist. (See Minutes of the November 8, 1996 meeting reported in Notre Dame Report, volume 26, p. 374 (1997)).

The ability of a faculty member to demonstrate excellence in scholarship and teaching are primary factors influencing retention and promotion decisions. Strong support within a faculty member's department for developing academic potential can be key to successfully demonstrating such excellence. Thus the lack of a mentoring system, or the exclusion of female faculty from its benefits, can negatively impact the retention and promotion of women.

The Committee decided that an examination of current mentoring practices at the University was appropriate for determining whether the concerns expressed were valid, and if so, for suggesting possible mechanisms for improvements. With the assistance of the Lab for Social Research, the Committee created a survey instrument aimed at assessing current mentoring practices. (See Minutes of the September 11, 1997 meeting reported in Notre Dame Report, volume 27, p. 202 (1997)).

Mentoring Survey

Surveys were mailed out in October, 1997, to all faculty holding the rank of assistant professor. Faculty were encouraged to complete the survey and were promised confidentiality. In the beginning of November, Committee members individually contacted each survey recipient by telephone and again encouraged completion of the survey. By the end of the semester, 91 surveys had been returned to the Lab for Social Research — a response rate of 51%. The Lab analyzed the data collected and presented the results to the Committee at the end of the spring semester, 1998. A copy of the survey instrument with the responses is appended hereto, as well as a technical appendix prepared by the Lab for Social Research.

Analysis of Survey Responses

Of those responding 59.3% were male and 37.6% were female (Q1). The break-down by race/ethnicity is shown in Question 2. The Lab performed a non-response analysis based on race/ethnicity, gender and college, which suggested that as to these three variables the survey respondents are not significantly different from the non-responders (See Technical Appendix).

The results of the survey were cross tabulated to assess differences in responses by gender. Due to the assurance of confidentiality given to respondents and the limited numbers of respondents of particular race/ethnicity or in particular departments, cross tabulation to assess differences based on these factors was not performed (See Technical Appendix).

Chi-square tests were used to assess differences in responses by gender, with statistical significance based on a p value of < .1 (See Technical Appendix).

The survey questions fall broadly into four categories: 1) questions concerning junior faculty soliciting help from senior colleagues (Qs 5, 8 and 15); 2) questions concerning senior colleagues offering unsolicited assistance to junior faculty (Qs 6, 9, 10-14 and 16); 3) questions concerning departmental practices relating to evaluation, renewal and tenure (Q18-20); and 4) questions directly addressing mentoring programs (Q21-24).

The answers to questions in the first category revealed no statistically significant difference in the rate at which male and female faculty solicit help from colleagues. More than half of the junior faculty either frequently or occasionally ask their colleagues to review their work (Q5(a)) and senior colleagues generally comply with the request (Q5(b)). Almost half the junior faculty either frequently or occasionally ask about opportunities to pursue their work (Q8(a)) and again colleagues generally assist them (Q8(b)). Junior faculty are much less likely to solicit help with their teaching (Q15(a)), but when they do senior faculty are extremely responsive (Q15(b)). Overall, male faculty are somewhat more likely to solicit help on research-related aspects of their work (Qs 5 and 8), whereas female faculty are somewhat more likely to ask about teaching (Q15). These differences are not, however, statistically significant.

Statistically significant differences in responses occurred in the second category dealing with senior colleagues providing unsolicited assistance. Senior colleagues recommend male faculty significantly more often for participation in conferences sponsored by others or for collaboration on projects with others (Q10(a)). Senior colleagues ask male faculty to collaborate with them on their own work significantly more often than they ask female faculty (Q12(a)). Moreover, when female faculty are asked to collaborate, it tends to be only one senior colleague who asks whereas a larger number of colleagues will ask male faculty to collaborate (Q12(b)).

Senior colleagues provide both process advice (Q13(a)) and administrative help (Q14(a)) significantly more often to male faculty than female faculty. Again, in both instances a larger number of colleagues are likely to assist male faculty in these areas than female faculty (Qs 13(b) and 14(b)).
No statistically significant difference was found, however, in the rate at which senior colleagues provide unsolicited assistance in reviewing work (Q 6(a)), inviting junior faculty to participate in conferences which they sponsor (Q 11), or in providing teaching help (Q 16).

In the third and fourth set of questions, there were no statistically significant differences in the responses of male and female faculty. It should be noted that of the 87.6% of respondents who have been through the renewal process, only 60.2% received any information about putting together the renewal packet (Q 18(a)). For those that did receive information, over half found it only moderately useful and almost half described the information received as minimal (Q 18(b) and (c)). The results concerning information about the tenure packet were even less encouraging — of the 40% of respondents to whom this question applied, only half were given any information about the tenure packet (Q 19(a)). Again, for the majority of respondents the information they did get was only moderately useful (Q 19(b)). The majority, however, did describe the extent of information received as moderately extensive (Q 19(c)).

Specifically with regard to mentoring, it is interesting to note that while 71.1% of the junior faculty did not hold any faculty position before coming to Notre Dame (Q 4(a)), 48.2% receive mentoring by individuals at universities other than Notre Dame (Q 24), whereas only 36.1% receive structured mentoring by someone at Notre Dame (Q 21). 75% of all respondents favored establishing a structured mentoring program (Q 22). Accurate information about the process of publication, obtaining grants, and scheduling conferences was viewed as an important component of a mentoring program (Q 23).

Twenty-nine respondents wrote additional comments on the survey form. The most common remarks dealt with reviews, the tenure process and mentoring. Six respondents suggested that meaningful annual reviews, along with clear information about expectations for tenure, are important factors for career development. Seven individuals specifically suggested creating a mentoring system, either formal or informal. Some respondents indicated that what is needed at Notre Dame is a culture that encourages mentoring and a supportive spirit.

Conclusion

The survey indicates that female faculty are disproportionately excluded from at least some types of mentor support. Moreover, in the general area of unsolicited support, less than half the junior faculty receive assistance in reviewing their work (Q 6(a)), in being informed about work opportunities (Q 9(a)), or in receiving either administrative help (Q 14(a)) or teaching help (Q 16(a)).

The Committee suggests the following might be useful first steps for ensuring that all faculty, male as well as female, receive the support necessary to ensure the fullest development of their scholarly potential:

1. Discussions with the Provost's Advisory Council on how the University as a whole can promote a culture which supports junior faculty in their work, including such topics as annual review process, methods for ensuring any mentoring system used by the departments is uniformly available to all faculty, and clarification and distribution of university guidelines regarding renewal and tenure packets.

2. Request the Deans of each College, and the Director of the Library, to solicit from each department whether a mentoring system exists, if so, the details of how the system works, and any comments regarding the efficaciousness of the system. Such information could then be provided to all the departments to generate ideas for establishing or improving a mentoring system.

3. Departmental discussion aimed at clarifying retention and promotion standards and establishing a framework for support and mentoring of junior faculty.

4. Creation of departmental committees composed of junior faculty for the purpose of proposing mentoring methods which take into account the particular circumstances within each department.

Technical Appendix—Junior Faculty Mentoring Survey

The Junior Faculty Mentoring Survey was mailed to all junior faculty who held the rank of assistant professor during the Academic year 1997/1998. Of the 178 surveys mailed out in early Fall, 91 were returned to the Laboratory for Social Research data entry by the end of the fall semester. This represents a response rate of 51%. The data were analyzed using the SPSS statistical software system. Limited sample size prevented the use of extensive crosstabulation, especially by race and ethnicity, as well as by department. Respondents were assured the confidentiality of their answers. Crosstabulation for small populations could potentially reveal the respondents' identity because of the limited number of cases per cell. Chi-square tests were used to assess differences by gender. Hypothesis testing was conducted using a p value of .01. This value was chosen because of the small sample sizes. Differences between the categories for single questions should be treated with caution as these differences are as likely due to chance as to real differences between the answer categories.

Although the response rate for this survey is well within the limits of surveys of this type, because of the sensitive nature of the questionnaire, the staff of the Lab for Social Research conducted a non-response analysis. Questionnaires of a sensitive nature tend to engender responses selectively from those individuals who are particularly concerned with the subject matter. Inference to the general population then is problematic. This non-response analysis was conducted to assess whether respondents differed systematically from the population of junior faculty at large, who both responded and did not respond to the survey instrument. Three variables were available from the Office of Institu-
tional Research which could be used to characterize the junior faculty. These items were also available on the Mentoring Survey. The three items include race and ethnicity, gender, and College in which the faculty member was employed. We compared the distribution of respondents on these 3 variables to those for the junior faculty at large using Chi-Squared tests. There were no significant differences on any of the items. While this is not definitive evidence that those who responded to the survey were qualitatively similar to those who did not respond, it does suggest that at least across several important demographic and employment domains, the respondents are not significantly different from the non-responders.

Mentoring Survey

I. General Information

1. Gender
   (1) 59.3% Male
   (2) 37.6% Female

2. Race and/or Ethnicity
   (1) 4.4% African American/Black
   (2) 8.9% Asian American/Oriental
   (3) 6.7% Latin American/Hispanic
   (4) 77.8% Caucasian/White
   (5) 2.2% Other

3. Department (if not affiliated with a department, please list the center, institute, or other organizational unit) with which you are affiliated.

4. (a) Did you hold any faculty positions before coming to Notre Dame?
   (1) Yes: 22.2% Male; 38.8% Female; 28.8% Total
   (2) No: 77.8% Male; 61.1% Female; 71.1% Total

   (b) If yes, how many years did you hold a faculty position before coming to Notre Dame?
   3 yrs. or less: 50.0% Male; 71.4% Female; 63% Total
   4-7 years: 41.6% Male; 28.5% Female; 33.3% Total

The following questions are concerned with the assistance your senior colleagues here at Notre Dame have provided for you which support your advancement in your professional field. Success in your field may be based on publishing books, papers or articles, writing successful grant proposals, presentations at professional conferences, or performances, concerts or exhibitions. The survey is referring to all of this as "your work."

II. The first group of questions deals with improving your work in progress

5. (a) Do you ever ask your senior colleagues to review, evaluate, or comment on your work?
   (1) Frequently: 19.6% Male; 13.8% Female; 17.2% Total
   (2) Occasionally: 47.1% Male; 44.4% Female; 46.0% Total
   (3) Rarely: 21.6% Male; 33.3% Female; 26.4% Total
   (4) Never: 11.8% Male; 8.3% Female; 10.3% Total

   (b) If you have asked your senior colleagues for comments, do they provide them?
   (1) Always: 60.0% Male; 62.5% Female; 61.0% Total
   (2) Occasionally: 24.4% Male; 21.8% Female; 23.3% Total
   (3) Rarely: 15.5% Male; 12.5% Female; 14.2% Total
   (4) Never: 0.0% Male; 3.1% Female; 1.2% Total

6. (a) Do your senior colleagues ever offer to review, evaluate, or comment on your work, without your request for such assistance?
   (1) I have a standing offer from one or more colleagues: 9.8% Male; 16.7% Female; 12.6% Total
   (2) Occasionally: 15.7% Male; 11.1% Female; 13.8% Total
   (3) Rarely: 37.3% Male; 36.1% Female; 36.8% Total
   (4) Never: 37.3% Male; 36.1% Female; 36.8% Total

   (b) If any senior colleague has offered to comment, how many different colleagues have made such an offer?
   (1) One: 51.6% Male; 50.0% Female; 50.9% Total
   (2) Two: 25.8% Male; 45.4% Female; 33.9% Total
   (3) Three or more: 22.5% Male; 4.5% Female; 15.0% Total

7. If senior colleagues have reviewed, evaluated, or commented on your work, how helpful were their comments overall?
   (1) Very helpful: 40.0% Male; 52.1% Female; 44.1% Total
   (2) Moderately helpful: 40.0% Male; 30.4% Female; 37.3% Total
   (3) Slightly helpful: 20.0% Male; 13.0% Female; 16.9% Total
   (4) Not helpful: 0.0% Male; 4.3% Female; 1.7% Total

III. The next set of questions deals with opportunities for you to pursue your work

8. (a) Do you ever ask your senior colleagues about grant opportunities, conferences, or other opportunities to publish, perform or present your work?
   (1) Frequently: 6.0% Male; 2.8% Female; 4.7% Total
   (2) Occasionally: 48.0% Male; 34.3% Female; 42.4% Total
   (3) Rarely: 28.0% Male; 40.0% Female; 32.8% Total
   (4) Never: 18.0% Male; 22.8% Female; 20.0% Total

   (b) If you have asked your senior colleagues about such opportunities, do they provide you with useful information?
   (1) Always: 22.5% Male; 28.0% Female; 24.2% Total
   (2) Frequently: 45.0% Male; 36.0% Female; 42.4% Total
   (3) Rarely: 20.0% Male; 24.0% Female; 21.2% Total
   (4) Never: 12.5% Male; 12.0% Female; 12.1% Total

9. (a) Do your senior colleagues ever draw your attention to grant opportunities, conferences or other opportunities to publish, perform or present your work without you having to request such information?
   (1) Frequently: 6.0% Male; 5.7% Female; 5.8% Total
   (2) Occasionally: 42.0% Male; 31.4% Female; 37.6% Total
   (3) Rarely: 28.0% Male; 17.1% Female; 23.5% Total
   (4) Never: 24.0% Male; 45.7% Female; 32.8% Total
40.2% Total
(2) Two: 28.0% Male; 30.0% Female; 28.6% Total
(3) Three or more: 32.0% Male; 0.0% Female; 22.9% Total

13. (a) Have any senior colleagues given you helpful advice on the process of doing your work (e.g. the process of submitting grant proposals or papers, preparing for conferences, etc.)?
(1) Yes: 62.7% Male; 37.1% Female; 52.3% Total
(2) No

14. (a) Have any senior colleagues given you administrative help or advice in your work (e.g. managing a grant, organizing a conference, scheduling or publicizing a performance, etc.)?
(1) Yes: 37.3% male; 17.1% Female; 29.1% Total
(2) No

15. (a) Do you ever ask your senior colleagues for help on improving your teaching?
(1) Frequently: 15.4% Male; 22.2% Female; 18.2% Total
(2) Occasionally: 9.6% Male; 11.1% Female; 10.2% Total
(3) Rarely: 40.4% Male; 47.2% Female; 43.2% Total
(4) Never: 34.6% Male; 19.4% Female; 28.4% Total

16. (a) Do your senior colleagues ever help with your teaching without you having requested such help?
(1) I have a standing offer from one or more colleagues: 7.7% Male; 5.6% Female; 6.8% Total
(2) Occasionally: 11.5% Male; 5.6% Female; 9.1% Total
(3) Rarely: 15.4% Male; 16.7% Female; 15.8% Total
(4) No: 65.4% Male; 72.2% Female; 68.2% Total

(b) If any senior colleague has offered teaching help, how many different colleagues have made such an offer?
(1) One: 25.8% Male; 46.1% Female; 31.8% Total
(2) Two: 48.3% Male; 46.1% Female; 47.7% Total
(3) Three or more: 25.8% Male; 7.6% Female; 20.5% Total

17. If senior colleagues have provided teaching help, how helpful were their suggestions/comments overall?
(1) Very helpful: 14.7% Male; 34.7% Female; 22.8% Total
(2) Moderately helpful: 55.8% Male; 43.4% Female; 50.9% Total
(3) Slightly helpful: 17.6% Male; 13.0% Female; 15.8% Total
(4) Not helpful: 11.7% Male; 8.6% Female; 10.5% Total

V. This last set of questions deals with how your department formally assists your progress toward tenure

18. (a) Were you provided with any information about putting together your renewal packet?
(1) Yes: 53.1% Male; 70.6% Female; 60.2% Total
(2) No: 34.6% Male; 14.7% Female; 27.4% Total
(3) Not applicable: 12.2% Male; 14.7% Female; 13.1% Total
20. (a) Have you received annual reviews of your progress?
(1) Yes: 58.7% Male; 50.0% Female; 55.0% Total
(2) No: 41.3% Male; 50.0% Female; 45.0% Total
(b) If yes, how helpful have the reviews been?
(1) Very helpful: 18.5% Male; 25.0% Female; 20.9% Total
(2) Moderately helpful: 33.3% Male; 50.0% Female; 39.5% Total
(3) Slightly helpful: 33.3% Male; 18.7% Female; 27.9% Total
(4) Not helpful: 14.8% Male; 6.2% Female; 11.6% Total

21. Does your department or college currently provide you with structured mentoring:
   By the chair of your department?
   (1) Yes: 23.8% Male; 17.6% Female; 21.3% Total
   (2) No
      By other senior faculty inside the department?
      (1) Yes: 14.6% Male; 9.1% Female; 12.3% Total
      (2) No
         By senior faculty outside the department?
         (1) Yes: 2.1% Male; 3.0% Female; 2.5% Total
         (2) No

22. Would you be in favor of a structured mentoring program for junior faculty?
   (1) Yes: 72.3% Male; 78.8% Female; 75.0% Total
   (2) No

23. Which forms of structured mentoring do you think would be likely to be helpful to you?
   Regular conversations with an assigned senior person?
   (1) Likely to be quite helpful: 25.5% Male; 34.3% Female; 29.3% Total
   (2) Likely to be somewhat helpful: 55.3% Male; 57.1% Female; 56.1% Total
   (3) Unlikely to be of help: 19.1% Male; 8.6% Female; 14.6% Total
   Accurate information about the process of publishing books and articles, obtaining grants, organizing and scheduling conferences, performances and exhibits, etc.?
   (1) Likely to be quite helpful: 38.3% Male; 60.0% Female; 47.6% Total
   (2) Likely to be somewhat helpful: 44.7% Male; 25.7% Female; 36.6% Total
   (3) Unlikely to be of help: 17.0% Male; 14.3% Female; 15.8% Total
   Informal forums to present my work and get early feedback?
   (1) Likely to be quite helpful: 29.8% Male; 50.0% Female; 38.3% Total
   (2) Likely to be somewhat helpful: 44.7% Male; 35.3% Female; 40.7% Total
   (3) Unlikely to be of help: 25.5% Male; 14.7% Female; 21.0% Total

24. Do you have a mentor at some other university with whom you are still working closely?
   (1) Yes: 46.0% Male; 51.4% Female; 48.2% Total
   (2) No

25. Please write down any additional comments that you would like to make about mentoring, and the assistance and support that senior faculty do (or should) provide.