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Honors

Asma Afsaruddin, assistant professor of Arabic and fellow in the Kroc Institute, was invited to join the editorial board of *Medieval Islamic Civilization: An Encyclopedia*, part of the *Encyclopedias of the Middle Ages* series, to be published by Routledge Press in 2006.

David Aune, professor of theology, was elected a member of the editorial board of the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* for 2003-2006.

Charles Barber, associate professor of art, art history, and design, was appointed to serve on the governing board of the Byzantine Studies Conference for the next four years.

Mary R. D’Angelo, assistant professor of theology, was elected to the editorial board of the *Catholic Biblical Association*.

Rev. Virgilio P. Elizondo, visiting professor of theology and associate director of Latino theology and pastoral concerns, Institute of Latino Studies, received a 2002 Hispanic Heritage award, Sept. 20, Washington, D.C.


Ralph McInerny, professor of philosophy, received the *Crisis* Magazine 20th Anniversary Award, Washington, D.C., Sept. 20.

Peter R. Moody Jr., professor of political science, has been invited to participate in a Roundtable on China and U.S.-China Relations, sponsored by the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, with meetings to be held at various times from the fall of 2002 into early summer 2003.

Eric L. Morgan, librarian and head of Digital Access and Information Architecture, was awarded the 2002 Bowker/Ulrich’s Serials Librarianship Award by the American Library Association, June 17, and was named one of the 2002 Movers and Shakers: The People Who Are Shaping the Future of Libraries, by the *Library Journal*, Mar. 15.

Guillermo O’Donnell, Kellogg Professor of Government and International Studies, has been appointed a member of the advisory board of the *International Political Science Review*.

Michael Wiescher, Freimann Professor of Physics, was appointed a member of the National Steering Committee for the Radioactive Ion Accelerator RIA.

Activities

Asma Afsaruddin, assistant professor of Arabic and fellow in the Kroc peace institute, gave an opening address and presented "Qur’anic Ethics in Transnational Discourse" at the conference on Islamic Ethics and Globalization, organized by the Istanbul Foundation for Science and Culture in Istanbul, Turkey, Sept. 22-24; and presented the invited paper "Pluralism and Tolerance in Islamic Thought" at the symposium "The Role of Religion in Promoting World Peace," Dallas, Sept. 28.

J. Douglas Archer, librarian, presented and participated as a panelist in a "Historic Peace Churches, Just War Theory, the Events of 9/11 and the War in Afghanistan" discussion at the Indiana Partners for Christian Unity and Mission (IPCUM) Servant Board meeting, Greenwood, Ind., on Aug. 27; participated as a panelist in the "USA Patriot Act" program at the Indiana Library Federation District One Fall Conference at the McKenna Center, Oct. 2; and presented "Genealogical Research in the University Libraries of Notre Dame" at a meeting of the South Bend Area Genealogical Society, South Bend, Sept. 23.


Margaret Barry, director of communications for the Mendoza College of Business, presented "Notre Dame Business: A Case Study in Collaborating on Award-Winning Publications" at the University and College Designers Association annual conference in Chicago, September.

Joseph P. Bauer, professor of law, made a presentation at the annual
meeting of the advisory board of the American Institute in Washington, D.C., Sept. 28.

Gary H. Bernstein, professor of electrical engineering, presented "Nano-computing by Field-Coupled Nanomagnets" with G. Csaba, A. Imre, Wolfgang Porod, Freimann Professor of Electrical Engineering and the director of the Center for Nano Science and Technology, and V. Metlushko, at the Silicon Nanoelectronics Workshop, Honolulu, in June.

Rev. Thomas E. Blantz, C.S.C., professor of history, served as chair and commentator of a session entitled "Immersion, Image making: Positive and Negative Impacts of Western and Native American Interactions" at a conference on "Christianity and Native Cultures" at Saint Mary's College, Notre Dame, Sept. 21.


Maureen B.M. Boulton, professor of Romance languages and literatures and fellow of the Medieval Institute, presented "Nobleswomen's Spirituality: Social Obligation versus Meditative Solitude" at the 37th International Congress on Medieval Studies, Western Michigan Univ., Kalamazoo, May 2-5; "Fleurs, Arbres, et Vergier: Le Symbolisme Végétale d'Eustache Deschamps" at the 11th Colloque International de Moyen Français, McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Oct. 7-9; and an invited lecture "Devotion at Court: Nobleswomen and their Prayerbooks" at the Institute for Medieval and Byzantine Studies, Catholic Univ. of America, Washington, D.C., Oct. 23.


William Carbonaro, assistant professor of sociology and fellow in the Institute for Educational Initiatives, presented "Allocating Rewards in the New Economy: The Importance of Skill Demands and Employment Mismatches for Earnings and Returns to Skill" at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, Chicago, in August.

Mary R. D'Angelo, assistant professor of theology, presented "Eusebeia: Roman Imperial Family Values and the Sexual Politics of 4 Maccabees and the Pastoral" at the Catholic Biblical Association annual meeting, Cleveland, Aug. 4; and presented "I have seen the Lord": Mary Magdalene as Visionary, Early Christian Prophecy and the Context of John 20:14-18" at Mary Magdalen, Prophet and Apostle in the Marianic Tradition Center for Religious Inquiry, New York, June 8.

Rev. Brian Daley, S.J., Huisking Professor of Theology, was a member of the external review team for the Theology Dept. at Boston College, Oct. 21-22; and was a member of an ecumenical study group meeting over the last three years and one of the drafters of the final form of "The Princeton Proposal," sponsored by the Center for Catholic and Evangelical Theology, Princeton.

Fred R. Dallmayr, Dee Professor of Political Theory, presented "Global Ethics: Beyond Universalism and Particularism" at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, New Orleans, Mar. 23-26; "Confucianism and the Public Sphere" at a conference on Confucianism and Affective Networks, City Univ., Hong Kong, Apr. 1-4; "Lessons of September 11" at a meeting of the Center for the Study of Islam and Democracy, Washington, D.C., Apr. 6-7; "Globalization and Inequality" and "Dialogue Among Civilizations" at the Univ. of Maine, Apr. 22-23; "Global Ethics: Beyond Universalism and Particularism" at a conference on "Moral Philosophy in a Pluralistic Cultural Context" organized by the Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences and the Centre for Oriental Studies, Moscow, June 4-8; and "Nectar of Wisdom: Jnaneshwar's Amritanubhava" and "Spirituality and Global Philosophy: A Tribute to Eliot Deutsch" at the 13th Vedanta Congress, Miami Univ., Oxford, Ohio, Sept. 12-24. He also presented "Civilizational Dialogue" at the Centre for Dialogue Among Civilizations; participated in a symposium of his book Beyond Orientalism and in another colloquium on "Political Theory and Dialogue"; and presented "The Enigma of Health: In Memory of Hans-Georg Gadamer" at the Univ. of Tehran, May 1-6. He served as chair and discussant on a panel on "Gandhi Today" and presented "What is Comparative Political Theory?" on a panel with that same theme at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, Aug. 29 through Sept. 1.

Roberto DaMatta, Joyce Professor of Anthropology, presented "Some Difficulties in Defining Ethics Behavior in Brazil" at the international seminar on "Ethics as Public Service Instrument" in Brasilia, Sept. 11-12.

Michael Detlefsen, professor of philosophy, gave a series of three lectures at the Univ. of Helsinki, Finland, May 15-24; and presented the inaugural lecture ("Creation and Completeness") of the newly instituted Graduate Students' Association lecture series at the Univ. of California-Irvine, June 7.


William G. Dwyer, Hank Professor of Mathematics, gave two invited talks in a workshop on Axiomatic and Enriched Homotopy Theory, Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Univ. of Cambridge, U.K., titled "Localizations" and "Homotopy Theory of Diagrams," Sept. 9-10; was an invited speaker in the Univ. of Bristol Mathematics Dept., Oct. 8, presenting "Multiplications on the Three-sphere"; and gave an invited talk "The Homotopy Theory of Topological Group" at the Univ. of Southampton (U.K.), Oct. 11.

Georges Enderle, O’Neil Professor of International Business Ethics, conducted a workshop on "Economics, Ethics, and Religion" at Mofid Univ., Qom, Iran, September; presented "The Role of Women in Sustainable Development" on Sept. 16 to the Governmental Commission for Women and Youth in Qom; presented "Economics and Religious Ethics" on Sept. 23 at the Economic Research Institute of Tarbiat Modarres University in Tehran; and presented "The Ethics of Financial Reporting, the Global Reporting Initiative, and the Balanced Concept of the Firm" on Sept. 28, at the Transatlantic Business Ethics Conference on "Corporate Integrity and Accountability: A Global Challenge," Georgetown Univ.

Paquita Friday, assistant professor of accountancy, presented "The Effect of Economic Environment, Corporate Governance, and Accounting Standards on the Market Valuation of Firms from Indonesia, Korea, Malaysia, and Thailand," coauthored with L.L. Eng and Chao-Shin Liu, associate professor of accountancy, at the American Accounting Association annual meeting, San Antonio, Aug. 16; and presented "Is Accounting Choice Associated with the Level of Voluntary Disclosure?" coauthored with M.B. Clement, at Indiana Univ., Sept. 20, Bloomington.

Umesh Garg, professor of physics, presented "The Low-energy L=1 Strength: Toroidal, Squeezing or Vortex?" at the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia, Aug. 14.

Rev. Daniel C. Groody, C.S.C., assistant professor of theology and director, LEPC, Institute for Latino Studies, presented the opening invocation at the Hispanic Heritage Awards, Washington, D.C., Sept. 20; presented "Border of Death, Valley of Life: An Immigrant Journey of Heart and Spirit" at the Mexican American Cultural Center, San Antonio, July 30; presented at mass on WNDU Television, Sept. 15; and presented "Juan Diego and the Undocumented Immigrant" on Catholic Television of San Antonio, Aug. 1.


Gregory T. Gundlach, Berry Sr. Professor of Business and professor of marketing and Kevin Bradford, assistant professor of marketing, presented "Distribution Safeguards Against the Sale of Firearms That are Ultimately Used in Crime," presented, with Debra M. Desrochers, assistant professor of marketing, and William Wilkie, Nathe Professor of Marketing, "Slotting Allowances and Fees: Past, Present, and Future," presented, with Joan M. Phillips, assistant professor of marketing, "Towards Integrating a Marketing Perspective in U.S. Antitrust Policy," each at the Marketing and Public Policy Conference, May, in Atlanta; and was invited to present, with William Wilkie, Kevin Bradford, Debra M. Desrochers, Elizabeth S. Moore, assistant professor of marketing, and Joan M. Phillips, a special session on the college's strategy on marketing and society research at the Midwest Marketing Camp, Univ. of Illinois, in June.

Glenn Hendler, associate professor of English, presented "Race, Riots, and Public Sentiments" as the inaugural lecture of the American Cultures Colloquium, Northwestern Univ., May 30.


Richard A. Jensen, professor and chair of economics, concurrent professor of finance and business economics, and Kellogg Institute fellow, presented "Basic Research and Education in the U.S." at the European Association for Research in Industrial Economics meetings, Univ. Carlos III de Madrid, in September; and "Economic Policy for Invasive Species" at the Second World Congress of Environmental and Resource Economists, Monterey, in June.


Christopher Kolda, assistant professor of physics, presented the invited talk "The Cosmological Triplet Coincidence Problem" at the APS Division of Particle and Fields 2002 Conference, Williamsburg, Va., May 27; the invited talk "Rare B° Decays at the Tevatron" at the 10th International Conference on Supersymmetry and Unification of Fundamental Interactions, Hamburg, Germany, June 22; and the invited talk "Flavor Changing at Large Tanβ" at the 2002 Argonne Theory Institute Workshop, Illinois, Sept. 9.


Xiaobo Liu, associate professor of mathematics, presented an invited address titled "Solving Universal Equations in Gromov-Witten Invariants" at the meeting of the American Mathematical Society, Northeastern Univ., Boston, Oct. 5.

Richard P. McBrian, Crowley-O'Brien Professor of Theology, appeared on "The Tim Russert Show," May 4; and presented "The Papacy and Church Reform" as part of The American Catholic Lecture Series, Farmington Community and Senior Center, May 4.

Ralph McInerny, professor of philosophy, presented "Literature and the Catholic Mystery Novel" at the Catholic Writers Festival, Franciscan Univ., Sept. 14; was on the EWTN Taping of "A Catholic View of the Arts" by Fr. M. Scanlan, also at Franciscan Univ., Sept. 13; presented "Relevance of Thomas Aquinas's Summa Theologicae Today" at Siena Heights College, Adrian, Mich., Oct. 3; "What Happened to Vatican II?" at the Call to Holiness Conference, Sterling Heights, Mich., Oct. 4; and "From Images and Shadows to Truth" at the Culture of Life Conference, Notre Dame, Sept. 26.


Anthony N. Michel, Freimann Professor of Engineering, cochaired and organized with Pangiotis J. Antsaklis, Brosey Professor of Electrical Engineering and director, Center for Applied Mathematics, the technical session "Hybrid Control System Analysis, Synthesis and Diagnosis" at the 15th International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems, Notre Dame, Aug. 12-16; presented (with Y. Sun) "Partial Stability of Dynamical Systems" at the same conference; and presented "Partial Stability of Systems With Applications to Discrete Event Systems" at the 15th Triennial World Congress of the International Federation of Automatic Control, Barcelona, July 21-26; and chaired the technical session "Hybrid, Switching and Discrete Systems" at the same conference.

Peter R. Moody Jr., professor of political science, presented "Recovering the Mainland: The New Direction of the KMT since 2000" and chaired a panel on China's Political Culture and Nationalism at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, Aug. 30.


Rev. Ronald Nuzzi, director of Leadership Programs in the Alliance for Catholic Education, presented "The Spirituality of 'Teaching' at a professional development day for Catholic school faculty and staff, Diocese of Corpus Christi, Tex., Aug. 2; "The Spiritual Dimensions of Leadership" at the Principals Leadership Conference, New England Division of CACE (Chief Administrators of Catholic Education), Holyoke, Mass., Aug. 4-7; "Multiple Intelligence Theory in Catholic Education" at a teacher inservice day, Archdiocese of Detroit, Aug. 16; and "You Are Salt; You Are Light: The Professionalization of Catholic Education" at faith development days, Catholic School Board of Medicine Hat, Alberta, Canada, Aug. 28-29.

Emily Lynn Osborn, assistant professor of history, was the commentator for the panel "Making Christianity Local in Africa" at the "Christianity and Native Cultures" conference, Saint Mary's College, Sept. 20.


Catherine Perry, associate professor, French and Francophone Studies, presented "A la recherche du Soleil de Satan: Résistance et consentement à l'eros chez Proust et Bernanos" at the Rocky Mountain MLA (RMMLA), Scottsdale, Oct. 10-12.

Joan M. Phillips, assistant professor of marketing, and Patrick Murphy, professor of marketing, presented "The Role of Third-Party Privacy Seals in Protecting On-Line Privacy" at the Marketing and Public Policy Conference, May, Atlanta.


Wolfgang Porod, Freimann Professor of Electrical Engineering and the director of the Center for Nano Science and Technology, served on the Program Committee of the Silicon Nanoelectronics Workshop, Honolulu, in June.


Terrence W. Rettig, professor of physics and associate director of the Center for Astrophysics, presented "CO and H3+ in Disks Around Young Stars—Evidence for Planet Formation" at the Gillett Symposium: Debris Disks and
the Formation of Plants Around Young Stars, Tucson, Apr. 11-13.

Joachim Rosenthal, professor of mathematics and concurrent professor of electrical engineering, presented the colloquium talk "Algebraische Elemente kryptographischer Protokolle" at the Univ. of Zurich, June 25; presented the seminar talk "Diffie Hellman and ElGamal Protocols From Semi-group Actions" in the Dept. of Computer Science at ETH in Zurich, June 28; presented the colloquium talk "Algebraische Elemente kryptographischer Protokolle" in the Dept. of Computer Science at the Univ. of Frankfurt, Germany, July 8; and presented four one-hour talks at the conference "Symbolic Computational Algebra 2002," which was part of the Fields Institute special meeting on Symbolic and Numeric Computation in Geometry, Algebra and Analysis, Univ. of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, July 15-19.

Mark R. Schurr, associate professor of anthropology, and coauthor T.J. Martin presented "How the Pokagon Band Avoided Removal: Archaeological Evidence from the Pokagon Village Site (20 Be 13)" at the Midwest Archaeological Conference 48th annual meeting, Columbus, Ohio, Oct. 4.

Rabbi Michael Signer, Abrams Professor of Jewish Thought and Culture, Dept. of Theology, and fellow in the Nanovic Institute, presented "The Image of Humanity After Auschwitz: Imago Dei?" at a seminar titled "Theology on the Edge of Auschwitz" at the Center for Dialogue and Prayer, Auschwitz, Poland, Oct. 4; presented "The Imperative of Interreligious Dialogue in the Age of Terrorism" at the Jay Phillips Center for Jewish Christian Relations, Univ. of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn., Oct. 7; presented "Dabru Emet: Sic et Non," a response to Prof. D. Berger, at the Association of Centers for Jewish-Christian Relations, St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Oct. 28.

Thomas Gordon Smith, professor of architecture, presented "Vitruvius on Architecture," an exhibition, at the South Bend Regional Museum of Art, Aug. 10 through Sept. 22; presented Rebuilding the Lanier Carriage House: Archaeology and Interpretation" at the conference titled "Recent Archaeology at the Lanier State Historic Site," Madison, Ind., Sept. 14; and presented an invited paper titled "The Sacred as Reflected in Life-Giving Architecture" for the Notre Dame Center for Ethics and Culture conference, "From Death to Life: Agendas for Reform," Sept. 27.

Michael M. Stanisic, associate professor of aerospace and mechanical engineering, organized the Robot Mechanics Symposium of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers 27th Biennial Mechanisms Conference; and served as a member of the ASME Mechanisms Committee and as chairman of two paper sessions titled "Control/Calibration of Manipulators" and "Robotic Locomotion" in Montreal, Sept. 29 through Oct. 2; and served as faculty advisor to Eric Schearer, BSME '02, who was awarded the first prize in the ASME National Student Mechanism Design Competition at the meeting for his entry titled "A Passive Humanoid Shoulder Mechanism."

James X. Sullivan, assistant professor of economics, presented "Measuring the Well-Being of the Poor Using Income and Consumption" at the National Bureau of Economic Research Summer Institute, in July.

J. Kerry Thomas, Nieuwland Professor Emeritus of Chemistry and Biochemistry, presented an invited talk "Radiolysis of a Copolymer of Polyethylene and Polyvinyl Alcohol" at the Third International Congress of Radiation and Polymers, Montreal, Sept. 24.

Julia Adeney Thomas, associate professor of history, was the guest lecturer at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago, presenting "Between Sex and History: Photography and Cultural Policy in Occupied Japan," Sept. 27.


Robert P. Vecchio, Schurz Professor of Management, was an invited speaker at a symposium titled "Organizational Behavior and New Venture Creation: Synergies Between OB and Entrepreneurship" at the national meeting of the Academy of Management, Denver, Aug. 6.

Michael Wiescher, Freimann Professor of Physics, served as convener of the working group on solar neutrinos and stellar nuclear reactions at the International Workshop on Neutrinos and Subterranean Science 2002 in Washington, D.C., Sept. 19-21; presented a colloquium on "The Fate of Matter on Accreting Neutron Stars" at the Institute of Nuclear Research of the Hungarian Academy of Science, Debrecen, Sept. 10.

William Wilkie, Nathe Professor of Marketing, presented "Career Planning for Research on Marketing and Society" at the Marketing and Public Policy Conference, May, in Atlanta; and presented, with Elizabeth S. Moore, assistant professor of marketing, "Changing Views of Marketing and Society Over the Four Eras of Marketing Thought" at the same conference.

Publications

Charles Barber, associate professor of art, art history, and design, has published *Figure and Likeness: On the Limits of Representation in Byzantine Iconoclasm* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 2002).


James M. Bishop, research professor emeritus of physics, coauthored "A Study of the Reaction \( \pi \rightarrow \omega \rightarrow \omega \) at 18 GeV/c: The D and S Decay Amplitudes for \( h_2(1235) \rightarrow \omega \)" with T. Adams; Neal M. Cason, professor of physics; E.L. Ivanov, research associate; John M. LoSecco, professor of physics; J.J. Manak; William D. Shephard, professor of physics; D.L. Stienike; and S.A. Taeger, in *Physics Letters B* 541 (2002): 35-44.


Susan Blum, associate professor of anthropology, coedited *China Off Center: Mapping of the Margins of the Middle Kingdom with Lionel M. Jensen*, chair of East Asian Languages and Literatures, concurrent associate professor of history, and Kellogg Institute fellow (Univ. of Hawaii Press, 2002): 400 pp.


Paul M. Cobb, assistant professor of history and fellow of the Medieval Institute, recently published *Hūd* and *Iram* in the *Encyclopaedia of the Qur’an*, J. Dammerten Maclaliffe, ed. (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2001-).


David Cortright, visiting fellow, Kroc Institute, and George A. Lopez, senior fellow and director of policy studies, Kroc Institute, published *Disarming Iraq: Nonmilitary Strategies and Options,* *Arms Control Today* 32, No. 7 (Sept.): 3-7.

Thomas Cosimano, professor of finance, was guest editor of *Measuring and Managing Ethical Risk: How Investing in Ethics Adds Value*, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, with R. Chami, and C. Fullenkamp, Vol. 26, No. 9 (Sept.)


Rev. Brian Daley, S.J., Huisking Professor of theology, had his article "Divine Transcendence and Human Transformation: Gregory of Nyssa’s Anti-Apollinarian Christology" reprinted in *Modern Theology*.


Yahya C. Kurama, assistant professor of computer engineering and geologic sciences, coauthored with Q. Shen "Non-linear Behavior of Posttensioned Hybrid Coupled Wall Subassemblages," Journal of Structural Engineering, American Society of Civil Engineers 128, No. 10 (Oct.):
1290-1300; and published "Hybrid Post-Tensioned Precast Concrete Walls for Use in Seismic Regions," PCI Journal, Precast/Prestressed Concrete Institute 47, No. 5 (Sept.-Oct.): 37-59.

George A. Lopez, senior fellow and director of policy studies, Kroc Institute, published "Iraq and Just-War Thinking," Commonweal (Sept. 27): 14-15.


Timothy Matovina, associate professor of theology and director of the Cushwa Center, co-edited Horizons of the Sacred: Mexican Traditions in U.S. Catholicism (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell Univ. Press, 2002).


Nathan Mitchell, professional specialist and associate director in the Center for Pastoral Liturgy and concurrent professional specialist in theology, published "This Saving Cup" in Emmanuel 108, No. 5 (June): 276-282; "Forty Years Since the Second Vatican Council" in Continuing the Journey, B. Huebsch, ed. (Allen, Tex.: Thomas More); "Bread Remembers" in Eucharistic Minister, No. 217 (April): 1-2; and "Tell It Slant: Gestures and Symbols in the Liturgy" in Liturgical Ministry 11 (Spring): 89-94.


Honors

Kerry Temple, editor of Notre Dame Magazine, had his article "The Cairn Builder" selected as one of the outstanding essays of the year in The Best American Essays (Houghton Mifflin, 2002).

Don Miller, executive chef of the Morris Inn, has been certified a culinary judge.

Activities

Don Miller, executive chef of the Morris Inn, recently judged competitions for the Minnesota and Wisconsin state restaurant associations and the National Association of College and University Food Services (NACUFS) competition at Notre Dame.

Publications

Alan Bigger, director of Building Services, coauthored "Up, Up and Away ... How to Keep Your Cleaning Operations From Drifting" with L.B. Bigger, Executive Housekeeping Today 23, No. 9 (Sept.): 6-8+; "The Secret to a Long, Full Life" with L.B. Bigger, Sanitary Maintenance 60, No. 9 (Sept.): 60+; and "From Book to Bottle or Bottle to Book" with L.B. Bigger, Executive Housekeeping Today 23, No. 10 (Oct.): 6-8+.

Rev. Edward A. Malloy, C.S.C.
Address to the Faculty

October 1, 2002

Provost Nathan Hatch: Welcome to this annual address to the faculty by the President of the University. Let me open this assembly with the prayer of Francis of Assisi.

Lord, make me an instrument of your peace. Where there is hatred, let me sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; where there is sadness, joy.

0, Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console; to be understood as to understand; to be loved as to love. For it is in giving that we receive; it is in pardoning that we are pardoned; and it is in dying that we are born to eternal life. Amen.

Ladies and gentlemen of the faculty, let me present to you the President of the University, Father Edward A. Malloy, C.S.C.

Rev. Edward A. Malloy, C.S.C.: Most of you know that I do not like to talk with a text or notes, but I have a few detailed things to bring up today, so I want to make sure I don't give any statistical information that is wrong.

To establish the dignity of this occasion, I would like to tell a story that some of you have heard before. We have a facility across St. Joseph Lake called Holy Cross House. It is our retirement and health facility for the Congregation of Holy Cross. It was renovated a number of years ago and they put in a television system so that you can celebrate Mass for those who are healthy and those who are confined to their rooms still be able to participate. I like to celebrate Mass there on occasion, as a number of us priests from the campus do, in solidarity with our colleagues and friends from the past who are now in retirement. Some of them have served at Notre Dame and others have not. Some are occasionally from other provinces of the Congregation.

Anyway, about a year ago I went over there for Mass one day and Father Andre Léveillé, who is the superior there, led me out and we began Mass. He had said something very briefly welcoming me to the Holy Cross House community, and I was just starting my prayer when I heard one person in a wheelchair in the back say to another, "Who is that?" Somebody else in a very loud voice, "It's Malloy." "Who's Malloy?" "He's the President of Notre Dame." Then, with some vehemence, the original interlocutor asked, "Whatever happened to Hesburgh?" Thus it is with fame and reputation in a diverse religious community.

I want to take full credit for the wonderful September weather we have had. This is about the nicest September I can ever remember, and it really did facilitate a wonderful introduction to Notre Dame. For those of you who were able to participate, and I hope some of you did with your families, the opening Mass of the school year, which was on the first day of classes and was followed by a picnic and fireworks display, set us off to a great start. If you are a new undergraduate student at Notre Dame and this is your introduction, it makes life look pretty easy here. But the nice thing was to see all the families that were there; in a sense, it was a cross-section of Notre Dame, from the very newest members, being held in the arms of their parents, to some of our retired people. It has now evolved into a wonderful tradition, and if any of you have not had a chance to participate as of yet, I surely encourage you to do so in the future.

In addition to that, I had a chance myself, briefly, to be at the new-faculty retreat that is held at Lake Michigan. It provides a chance for new faculty and their spouses to come to know other new faculty members. In a sense, it's a kind of cohort identity. There is an opportunity for the newcomers to hear from various people at the University, including those who represent student life, and for us to try to provide them with the very best introduction to Notre Dame. This is an institution with a great and glorious history and a lot of established traditions. It is helpful to be able to communicate at least some of that as quickly as possible.

There was also a retreat for academic administrators in Chicago, which has
become another nice tradition at the beginning of the year. It gives Nathan and his colleagues a chance to talk about the big picture and have a lot of interactive sessions to try to get the new year off to an excellent start.

And then, unfortunately, but I think in a very representative Notre Dame fashion, we had the Memorial Mass recalling the events of September 11. We moved the venue deliberately to the reflecting pool in front of the Hesburgh Library. I thought it was a beautiful liturgical ceremony and I was really pleased with the large number who attended and the spirit that prevailed there. Of course, as I suggested toward the end of the Mass, with the beautiful image of Christ the Teacher in mosaic on the side of the library, what a fitting way to think about the great scholars of the past as well as our own roots.

On October 10, we will have the second annual Blue Mass, which was designed in the wake of September 11 last year to welcome police, fire, and emergency crews from around our area. It became known on the Internet, and we had a lot of visitors from New York and other places. We already know that we are going to have quite a few coming from other parts of the country this year. I hope this really does become a fitting way for us to say thanks to those who protect us, and whose devotion and sense of duty often is not noticed.

There are a lot of people who are new to our community, but I'd like to highlight three today. I would like to welcome Joe Marino, the new dean of science. He comes to us from outside, but I know already he is geared up and he is deeply involved in the planning process for the College of Science. Michael Lykoudis, the new chair of the School of Architecture, has been a member of the faculty and assumes that important responsibility of leadership at the school. I would like also to make mention of John Haynes, who is the director of the new performing arts center and who joins us ahead of the completion of the project so that he can help gear up for the programming that will make it such a wonderful and exciting venue for all of us here at Notre Dame. So we welcome these three new leaders as well as many others.

A brief thought about the U.S. News and World Report rankings. While it is not the most definitive study, they do it and we might as well do well in it. We are pleased that in the overall rating in our category we are in the tie for 18, versus 19 a year ago. We have been consistently in the top 20, and I do think, if you look at the various criteria that are used, it does suggest to us the general things we do well and the relative regard with which we are held by our peers. In addition to the 18th ranking, we have high marks in some things like graduation rates and progress to the sophomore year, and alumni satisfaction, all of those things we do extremely well.

But one of the new categories they established several years ago is something like "best buys." Best buys mean affordability connected to quality. They take the rankings of our category, national research universities, and then factor in not just the sticker price but also the tuition financial aid subsidization. We are ranked 14th in the country in that accounting, which is a wonderful sign of the progress we have made in financial aid. We see that same thing reflected in the yield rate for incoming classes. These rankings, of course, are an attempt to evaluate the quality of our undergraduate programs, but they clearly reflect, particularly, academic reputation and academic budget per student.

There is a new category dealing with service learning—something that I have been involved in for a long time in Campus Compact and a number of other groups. We are ranked seventh there, and seventh also in the quality of our students' first-year experience. We are ranked 22nd among American undergraduate business programs and 37th in engineering. So there is a lot of good news. We can always debate whether we should be higher or lower, but if you look at who is behind us in the rankings—Cal-Berkeley, Michigan, Virginia, Georgetown, Boston College, Vanderbilt, and many other fine institutions—some of the best universities in the world—we can be pleased that in this fallible and limited system of analysis, we continue to do well.

One of the things that we had a long discussion about at our annual officers' meeting at Land O'Lakes, Wisconsin, was a report from a committee on diversity at Notre Dame that Carol Ann Mooney from the Provost's Office chaired. This is a very complex topic that I have addressed before, but I simply want to report that, on the basis of our sustained conversations, the officers of the University have moved forward, even before this aspect of the strategic planning process is concluded, to recommit ourselves and to strategize how to be more effective in the recruitment of African-American students and faculty. We simply have to do a better job. We can be happy about the progress we have made in terms of diversity in general, and we want to continue to pay attention to the recruitment of women faculty and women administrators and so on. But if you look at the area where we need the best wisdom and distribution of sustained resources, it is in this area. So, I simply want to tell you that we are trying to reinvigorate this effort. I am confident that we will see signs of progress soon.

We have our 10-year accreditation visit from the North Central Association which will take place next year. We have begun the process of preparation for that. Father John Jenkins and Barbara Walvoord are helping to prepare for that visit. We have had a meeting with the woman who will prepare the accreditation team to visit us. She met with the coordinating committee of the strategic planning process, and we had a very helpful and cordial session. So I am confident that we will be well prepared for that visit.

Also next year we will be visited by the NCAA, which now accredits all member institutions on a regular cycle. Carol Kaesebier, our vice president and general counsel, will oversee the committee preparing for that visit.

These important events notwithstanding, the most important thing taking place this year is the follow-through on the strategic planning process. I would like first of all to say something about the process itself, and then say something about our initial impressions from the reports that we have received. The coordinating committee, composed of major administrators and faculty, includes me, Nathan Hatch, Father Mark Poorman, John Affleck-Graves, Scott
build on what already has been accomplished with a document, I presume that just about all of you have had a chance to participate—whether in an academic department or larger unit, or as part of one of the support structures of the University. Everyone should have a chance, within her or his bailiwick, to speak and be part of the process of reflection. This is intended to be farsighted and inspiring. It is intended to help us think how we can continue to build on what already has been accomplished here at Notre Dame.

When this local planning process has been completed with a document, it is passed on to the next level of administration. And so, for example, the plans from the departments are passed on to the colleges and vetted there. All of the academic plans, eventually, will go to the provost and those who advise him who will try, on the basis of all the accumulated information, to come up with some prioritization of goals.

I think all of us know that a process like this is intended to produce visions that are ambitious, inspirational, and that stretch the limits of what we think our capacity is. On the basis of that—the good ideas, the farsighted reaching for the best we are capable of—then, in a thoughtful and realistic way, we organize all those possibilities according to some scheme of things. And so, when it comes to the academic planning process, the committee and I will look forward to the role that Nathan Hatch has been able to do over roughly the last 10 years. These statistics are as of 2001. From 1991 to 2001, we added 138 faculty positions, 441 executive administrative and professional positions, 148 clerical and secretarial positions, 34 technical and paraprofessional positions, and 213 service and maintenance positions. In 10 years we went from a total work force of about 3,000 to one of 4,000. This is huge growth, and one can always be suspicious of growth in someone else's area. But let's assume the good will of everyone who was part of this evolution and acknowledge that there were good reasons for this growth. We had the resources to undertake it. It has allowed us to be expansive in our academic aspirations and to serve our student body and others more effectively. It has allowed us to be good stewards of our resource base, finances, physical plant, and so on. That's the first reality.

Generally, it's a good thing that we have been able to take on these additional challenges. At the same time, we have added a number of significant academic units—centers and institutes such as Nanovic, European Studies; Keough, Irish Studies; Kaneh, teaching; Walther, cancer research; the Institute for Entrepreneurial Initiatives, which is connected to the Alliance for Catholic Education and other education-related projects; Gigot, entrepreneurial studies; the Structural Earthquake Lab; Latino Studies; and Nano Sciences and Technology. I am sure I forgot one or two. But it is a representative indication of how expansive we have been able to be in responding to initiatives, new faculty, and funding for various institutes and centers.

In addition, and also because of our growth in personnel and activity, we have seen substantial expansion and renovation of our facilities on campus—Coleman-Morse Center, housing, First Year of Studies, Academic Services for Student-Athletes, and Campus Ministry; the Fisher Faculty Housing addition; additions, particularly for aquatic biology, to Galvin Life Sciences Center; the Mendoza College of Business building; Malloy Hall, which houses philosophy and theology; new facilities in London and Dublin; the expansion and restoration of Bond Hall for architecture; the remodeling of Hayes-Healy-Hurley, which now houses the Math Department and International Studies; the restoration of the Main Building, the treasured symbol of our collective identity. We have built four new dorms, all, coincidentally, with Irish names: Welsh, Keough, O’Neill, and McGlinn. We converted Grace and Flanner Halls into faculty and administrative offices, expanded Notre Dame Stadium, built the Rolf Recreational Sports Center, renovated and expanded our facilities at Land O'Lakes, Wisconsin; and built the addition to the Hesburgh Center, which houses Kroc and Kellogg. Under way now on the campus are the addition to Stepan Chemistry, the remodeling of the Hesburgh Library, and the construction of the Center for the Performing Arts. I have said to people, I feel caution about adding new buildings, just as advisory council members do. It would have been easier to have been President when we didn't have any new space needs. But it has been satisfying to be...
able to respond to people's dreams and visions and expansive ideas and to add new personnel. It has made us a better University, and we should be thankful to those who have been generous enough to make it all possible.

Over the past 10 years, we have added $12 million to the budget. When it comes to the supplements to the operating budget, we have added about $68 million, which has allowed us to do many of these things within the budget. And when it comes to the increase in financial aid resources, over those 10 years we have added about $34 million to make ourselves more affordable, not simply at the undergraduate level, but with our professional and graduate students as well. I think that makes us more competitive for the best students and it surely qualifies us in that category I mentioned in the University, and we should be thankful

Where did we get the money? Over that 10 years you know we completed a fundraising campaign, raising about $1.1 billion, the largest sum ever in the history of Catholic higher education or in any kind of Catholic activity, and one of the highest in higher education anywhere. Of that, about $156 million was unrestricted and the rest of it was restricted. Over the 10 years, we also had a very significant level of return on our endowment—14 percent annualized over 10 years. Scott Malpass and his colleagues deserve a lot of credit for building that base, which has allowed us to do so many wonderful things. We have also been able to increase our debt in a deliberate way, which is a choice that every institution makes about how to cover costs for unfunded projects. We increased the debt by about $200 million while remaining one of the very few American universities with a triple-A credit rating. That's the good news.

Now, a bit of difficult news. We have a weak economy. We have declining financial markets. And we have a lot of geopolitical uncertainty. Many of you in your own professional areas of expertise could get up here and give a long talk about each of these issues and what the causes are and what you think the solutions might look like. I am not going to pretend to be able to give you that. Any of us who follow the news know that these realities are accurate.

Nobody's pulling the wool over our eyes. We simply have to pay attention to the reality at this particular moment of the financial circumstances we face in this country and the world, and particularly in higher education.

College endowments in general have declined the last two years. If you read The Chronicle for Higher Education, you've seen some evidence of this already, and you'll see it even more dramatically when next year's reports come out. Several schools have dipped significantly into their endowments because they continue to own medical school hospitals. That was a particular cause of serious decline with institutions, including Georgetown. Generally, they now have sold their hospitals and the most difficult period has passed.

When our endowment peaked it was at $3.1 billion. In the last two years, we have lost almost 17 percent of that value, or $500 million. This is not unlike what has happened to every other endowment; our relative position in endowment among institutions has stayed the same. But this is a big hit because we use the earnings from our endowment to supplement very significant parts of our operating budget.

The last difficult bit of news to absorb is that giving to higher education declined last year for the first time since 1975, ending an unprecedented streak generally, and certainly at Notre Dame. How has higher education reacted to these new realities? In the public sphere, at least 42 states have deficit budgets; as a result, there have been significant cutbacks in state funding to higher education, as well as to other important services. As those of you know who have roots in major flagship state universities, cutbacks in state funding, especially to research university flagship campuses, have been dramatic; the percentage of the budget that comes from state funding has dropped below 10 percent in some instances. This has led to increased tuition, hiring freezes, deferred maintenance, and unfunded capital projects. One hears benchmarking reports about state universities that had dreamed they were going to do XYZ. The plan still is on the books, but they don't have the money to do it, so it is on hold.

Public universities always are subject to fiscal fluctuations of state budgets, so they tend to reflect economic conditions more immediately than private institutions. Nonetheless, already there are indicators from relatively important private institutions: Cornell has instituted a hiring freeze on all non-student, non-faculty positions; the Kennedy School at Harvard cut 30 percent of its adjunct faculty, 11 percent of its administrative staff, and closed an office in Washington, D.C.; Stanford cut its budget 5 percent this year and is proposing a 3 percent cut for next year. It has also reduced its capital spending by $500 million. You think of Harvard and Stanford as preeminent in institutional wealth. When they make these moves, we have to recognize that no one is immune. Boston University, maybe not as strong as the others I mentioned, is cutting 450 positions, including faculty, over coming years, and paying no merit increases. Dartmouth cut its budget for this year by 2.1 percent and will cut it 2.6 percent next year. They are reviewing all non-faculty positions and have placed a hold on all construction that is not already under way or contractually committed.

So what about us? Where do we stand in the midst of this seemingly troubled picture? We had a balanced budget last year with fairly significant reserves. We expect to have a balanced budget this year, and I am confident that all the budget administrators in here will live by the commitments they have made. Preparing the 2003-2004 budget will be challenging—not impossible, but challenging. Why? I have already indicated some of the reasons for that. The market value of our endowment declined by $500 million and, therefore, the earnings from it are seriously affected. The trustees of the University have mandated to the officers that we restrain tuition increases. We cannot raise the tuition without their approval or propose a budget with a tuition increase more than 5 percent. Tuition increases, of course, are one of the ways a private university can bring in new resources.

Only about 7 percent of our budget comes from research dollars from federal grants and other sources. If you look at the budgets of most long-established research universities, that figure
is far, far higher. We are working hard. We have made progress. But you can't look at research dollars as a source for overcoming budget shortfalls.

Donors are more reluctant to make large commitments. You can understand why. Sometimes they want a longer period of time in which to pay off the commitments they have already made. So, we have to factor that into our planning. That money is not here yet, and if we don't have sufficient resources to cover it in the interval, then that too affects our capacity to get things done.

The last thing to mention is that more parents of our students are requiring more in financial assistance. Our early indicators are that the students who said they were coming, did, in fact, come. And the students’ families paid their tuition bills. But I do know, maybe not as heavy numbers as we might initially have expected, that there are cases where people who were fairly well-to-do have been laid off or suffered significant financial setbacks. That certainly, in the short term and the long term, will affect their capacity to pay for and their attitude concerning private higher education.

So, here are my conclusions. We are financially sound. The long-established tradition of balanced budgets will continue. The officers of the University and the trustees and all of us who are involved in any kind of oversight function with the budget need to keep it within the parameters that have been established. We are not in a sense of crisis. Indebtedness from our recent past is not driving this. We are financially sound. However, we are not immune from the financial pressures that the rest of higher education faces. I think all of us can look the facts in the face. This particular year, as we try to build a budget for next year, provides an opportunity to focus, to prioritize, and to reap the benefits of this surge of resources that we saw over a 10-year span of time. It doesn't mean we must stop dreaming or advocating or picturing the possibilities in the short- or long-term. Truly, nothing that I say now implies that I would like to squelch the enthusiasm for the process of planning for 10 years out. Insofar as there are economic cycles, insofar as we can have some sense of what will happen from year to year, we can look forward to better times, to more resilient resources than we enjoy in this particular year.

We are more dependent, however, when it comes to finding funds for capital projects—building and restoration—because many of these projects are mega-projects. So, here is what we have decided to do. All capital spending projects will be reprioritized so that academic and student life needs come first. Of all the things that we can imagine, all the good things we could do, academic and student life really have the highest priority when it comes to facilities and other capital projects. One sign of this is that we have put on hold further construction of the Security/Post Office building on the old Stepan Center courts. We have never done this in my time as President, put something on hold. It is simply a symbol for me of making sure we have our priorities straight.

Meanwhile, our fundraising efforts under Lou Nanni and his team will be focused on the unfunded portions of the academic and student life facilities that are our priorities. We already have begun that. We are out on the hustings, trying to go against the tide to assure that we have the dollars for these very worthwhile, high-priority projects.

We will only move forward on capital projects that are on our priority list when funding—that is, gifts and pledges—has been assured. We do not have the capacity today to move forward and cover large portions of unfunded capital costs. I am confident that, with this renewed effort coming between the end of our last campaign and the beginning of the next one, we will get the job done. We will do it as quickly as we can, and we will do it according to the set of priorities we have established.

So, what is the challenge of my concluding remarks today? Sustain the momentum. We have made huge progress by any gauge, and I see no reason why we can't sustain that progress as we move into the future. We do have strength, not only in our financial base, but in the deep loyalty to the institution that so many of our graduates, friends and benefactors have. This is a special place, and I am confident the good ideas we have will always see the light of day as they are prioritized and we find the right fits between potential benefactors and priority goals.

The second challenge is to soberly build a budget for 2003-2004. “Soberly” means different things to different people. We recognize that the conversation has to be sustained and that hard decisions sometimes will have to be made in the short-term.

Lastly, let me ask you to continue to participate with confidence and hopefulness, as I do, in our strategic planning process. In contrast to many of our peers, we have opportunities now to attract faculty from places that are not doing as well, to think about how we can do some things more efficiently here, to take a deep breath and focus and prioritize and give ourselves an opportunity to catch up with all of the things that have been happening. God willing, this will be a short time of more intense financial pressures. But with the quality of people we have here, with the excellent financial stewardship that Tim Scully and Scott Malpass and their colleagues have provided in the University's recent past, I'm confident we can get the job done. Let's be as courageous in facing challenging news as we have been enthusiastic in celebrating the good times. This, one hopes, will be a short span and then we can get back to big dreams again. I wanted to be as honest and straightforward with you as I could. Let's work hard. Let's get the job done.

Thank you very much.
DeBoer, Ava Preacher, Sonja Mapes, Stephanie Arnett

Members Excused: Rev. Timothy Scully, C.S.C., Maura Ryan, Francis Castellino, Patricia O'Hara, Patricia Blanchette, Teresa Ghilarducci, Cornelius Delaney, Mitchell Wayne, Panos Antsaklis, Robert Bretz, Dino Marcantonio, Samantha Schmid

Observers Present: Mary Hendriksen, Col. Mark Gehri, Harold Pace, Tom Laughner, Julia Dayton

Observers Excused: Dennis K. Moore, Dan Saracino

Guest: Prof. Harvey Bender, chair, University Committee on Libraries

Fr. Malloy called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. Fr. Jenkins offered a prayer.

1. Minutes of the meeting of January 17, 2002. The minutes of the meeting of January 17, 2002, were approved after Prof. Garg offered a minor amendment to the wording of his statement concerning the attendance requirements of high-level University courses in which seniors are often enrolled.

2. Smoking policy in faculty offices (information item). Prof. Hatch explained that in 1992 Notre Dame adopted a policy on smoking in University buildings and offices. While the policy states that the University is generally a smoke-free environment, it allows smoking in private offices not open to the public except by invitation. The guidelines also state that the rights of nonsmokers to a smoke-free environment always take precedence over the desire of smokers to smoke.

Prof. Hatch said that the administration has received increasing numbers of complaints about secondhand smoke, which has infiltrated offices and other work spaces because of ventilation systems that are incapable of removing smoke entirely from private offices. He has discussed the issue with the deans, who agreed unanimously that smoking should be banned in all faculty offices. Prof. Hatch said he realizes the proposed ban will inconvenience some, but he is convinced that imposing it is the proper course of action. He brings the issue today to the Academic Council for members' comments.

Prof. Brogan spoke in favor of the proposed ban. She said that as one who honors the rights of nonsmokers, she cannot imagine that there might be much objection to it.

Prof. Bigi asked if the proposed ban would extend to visitors. He is particularly concerned about the University's treatment of visitors from abroad, who may be accustomed to smoking in seminar rooms.

Prof. Hatch replied that neither the current no-smoking policy nor amendments to it can dictate the handling of an individual case—whether it is a visitor or a Notre Dame faculty member who chooses to smoke. The issue is one of general University policy.

Fr. Malloy agreed. Even with the new rule it will continue to be true that judgments must be made in individual cases. The decision on extending the University's no-smoking policy to faculty offices has to do primarily with the regular routines of life on campus. Treatment of those with different cultural expectations and occasional infractions of the proposed rule are different matters.

Prof. Wegs commented that visitors to the Nanovic Institute in Planner Hall readily accept the University's ban on smoking.

Prof. Tidmarsh said he surveyed the Law School faculty on the issue but received only four responses, with one favoring the change and three against it. The three responses against the change stated that there were no complaints in the Law School under the present policy.

Prof. Incropera supported the proposed ban, saying that the current policy sets up a dual standard. Clerical and technical staff must go outside to smoke, but the very few faculty members in Engineering who continue to smoke are able to do so in their offices. He would prefer a uniform policy that requires faculty members to treat their habit in the same way the University requires of its staff.

Prof. Roche also spoke in favor of the proposed ban. He said that while it will certainly inconvenience some faculty members in Arts and Letters, the Dean's Office regularly receives complaints about secondhand smoke, particularly in Decio, one of the largest office spaces on campus.

Col. Gehri said he comes from an institution that enacted a ban on smoking about 10 years ago. After the initial brief discussion, there has been hardly a ripple. People adjust to the new rule.

Prof. Hatch thanked members for their comments.

3. Faculty Senate Resolution of May 2, 2001, to dissolve the Senate. Prof. Hatch explained that for purposes of clarification, the Executive Committee decided to ask for a vote on the Faculty Senate's resolution of May 2, 2001, to dissolve the senate by deleting Article 4, Section 3(b) from the Academic Articles (Attachment A). The Faculty Senate passed the resolution at its final meeting of the 2000-2001 academic year. At the beginning of this academic year, the Executive Committee remanded the resolution to the Faculty Affairs Committee. A subsequent motion from the new senate proposed a reorganization of that body. That, too, was sent to the Faculty Affairs Committee, which then wrestled with the whole issue of dissolving or reorganizing the senate. Additionally, in the fall, the Executive Committee of the new senate proposed that the Executive Committee of the Academic Council join with it in forming a nine-member committee to examine the possible restructuring of the Faculty Senate. The Academic Council Executive Committee agreed, and the joint committee produced a proposal to restructure both the Faculty Senate and the Academic Council, which was approved by the Academic Council at its meeting of February 27, 2002.

Prof. Hatch said that the issue remains of the Academic Council's formal response to the senate's May 2 motion to amend the Academic Articles by dissolving the senate. For purposes of clarification, he would like members to vote today on that resolution. Given the Academic Council's vote on February 27, he thinks the response of the council to the resolution is clear; nevertheless, a motion is on the floor to which he is now asking members to respond.
Fr. Malloy said that the logic of the council's actions at the last meeting would dictate a "no" vote on the motion. He also informed members that through its Executive Committee, the Board of Trustees approved the restructuring plan Academic Council members approved at the February 27 meeting.

Prof. Hatch said that the council's actions at the February meeting constituted an implicit "no" vote on the resolution, but because the senate has the right of agenda to the Academic Council, he thinks it wise for members to vote explicitly on the motion to dissolve the senate.

Prof. Brogan said the vote at the February 27 meeting was explicit. Members specifically said that the restructuring proposal was to be substituted for the senate's proposal to dissolve. The reason the vote is being taken on this date is that some who were members of the senate when it passed the resolution to dissolve feel that the resolution has never come before the Academic Council. She then asked Prof. Hatch if she should make a motion.

Prof. Hatch said that the resolution already comes to the council as a motion.

Prof. Preacher said it seems odd to vote on the motion to dissolve after the motion to restructure has been approved.

Prof. Hatch responded that the vote today is for purposes of clarification. He has been asked whether the Academic Council specifically voted the motion up or down.

Prof. Preacher said she is not sure that the motion to dissolve the senate was implicitly rejected. The motion to dissolve should have been introduced at the February meeting before the motion to restructure the senate and the Academic Council. Discussion has been cut off that might have taken place if the council had taken up the motions in the appropriate order.

Prof. Hatch responded that there was never an intent to cut off discussion. The joint committee of the Academic Council and the Faculty Senate wrestled seriously with the proposal to do away with the senate. In fact, the administration was open to a complete reconfiguration of faculty governance, but it was the senate that said it believed the faculty needs a separate governing body. Thus, because there was a thorough discussion of whether the senate should be dissolved or reorganized, in substance, the Academic Council did take up the motions in the correct order.

Prof. Garg said that as a matter of parliamentary procedure, the motion to dissolve probably should have been presented at the last meeting.

Mr. Krieger said that the forum in which the issue of dissolving the senate was "wrestled with" was the Faculty Affairs Committee. In supporting the work of the joint committee, he believes that the council did, in effect, decide to reject the Faculty Senate's motion. He is not sure if there is a need to bring the resolution to the full council.

Prof. Brogan agreed that, technically, the motion to dissolve the Faculty Senate went through the Faculty Affairs Committee, where the proposal to reorganize the senate and the Academic Council was substituted for it. The resolution did not need to come to the floor of the council; however, some who were part of the senate that voted to dissolve the body want a vote by the full council specifically on the motion to dissolve.

Prof. Garg responded that the senate has the right of agenda. Its resolutions need not proceed through the Academic Council's committee structure. If the senate says a resolution goes on the Academic Council's agenda, it goes.

Prof. Brogan said that not every resolution of the senate makes it to the floor of the council. She knows of certain propositions from the senate that were stopped in various subcommittees.

Prof. Gernes asked if no one seconds the motion to dissolve the senate, does it just die? She said that failure to second the motion may be a way of not putting people in the position of voting but fulfilling the obligation to bring the motion to the floor.

Prof. Garg replied that a motion from the Executive Committee does not require a second.

Prof. Affleck-Graves said that when the Faculty Senate directs a resolution to the Academic Council, it has been dealt with in one of three ways. Almost always, the resolution comes to the Executive Committee first because it draws up the agenda for council meetings. One of the options at that point is for the Executive Committee to ask that the motion go back to the Faculty Senate for further clarification or further work. That has happened on some occasions. The more usual course is that the Executive Committee directs the motion to one of the committees of Academic Council, whose members then work through the issue—and this, perhaps, is the point at which some feel that motions from the senate have died and never made it to the floor of the council. The third option for the Executive Committee when presented with a resolution of the senate is to bring the motion directly to the full Academic Council.

Prof. Affleck-Graves continued that in almost every instance in which the Faculty Senate has emphasized the need to put a resolution on the agenda, it does eventually happen. In this particular case, he thinks the reason it is important that the motion to dissolve the senate come before the Academic Council is that, as pointed out in Prof. Porter's letter (Attachment A), upon being seated, the 2001-2002 senate chose not to rescind the resolution to dissolve. If the Faculty Senate had rescinded the motion, then it would not be the council's issue. The fact is, though, that a duly constituted Faculty Senate passed a motion, and there is a right for that motion to come before the council.

Prof. Affleck-Graves said that the order in which the motions should come before the council is difficult. The case can be made that if the motion to dissolve had come to the floor first, members would be unsure of their vote because they would not know the outcome of the restructuring proposal. Thus, arguments can be made on both sides of the question of the logical order of voting on the motions. Nevertheless, the council should take a formal vote on the senate's resolution of May 2, and either approve or disapprove it. A motion was made and seconded to call the question.

The vote was unanimous in favor of calling the question.
Fr. Malloy then called for a vote on the resolution to dissolve the Faculty Senate. It was rejected by a unanimous vote.

4. Approval of procedures to elect undergraduate student representatives to the Academic Council. Prof. Affleck-Graves explained that the Academic Articles do not outline the way in which the undergraduate student representatives to the Academic Council will be elected; rather, the students are to devise the plan and the council has the authority to approve or disapprove it—Article IV, Sec. 3(a). After the Academic Council increased the number of undergraduate student representatives from three to four at the meeting of February 27, 2002, Student Government proposed a plan for their selection calling for: (1) an open application process, followed by (2) the nomination of one delegate and three representatives by the incoming student body president, and then (3) approval of the nominations by the Student Senate. The proposal granted the student body president nonvoting observer status at full council meetings.

Prof. Affleck-Graves said that the proposal was discussed at the Executive Committee meeting where several members expressed concern about the process of selection. Thus, members asked Ms. Rauch, academic commissioner, Student Government, to return to student government and rework the proposal. The second proposal (Attachment B) is now before members for discussion and a vote.

Ms. Rauch explained the new proposal. She said it attempts to address the concerns expressed at the Executive Committee meeting about giving too much influence in the selection process to the student body president. Rather than nomination by the student body president, the new proposal continues the current practice of nomination by the colleges. The colleges' nominees are then approved by the Student Senate. The proposal's drafters envisioned that the Student Senate would be provided with information on the nominees' backgrounds and given the opportunity at a meeting to ask questions and to make sure that the candidates are aware of the responsibilities the job of student representative entails.

Ms. Rauch said that the section of the proposal granting the student body president nonvoting observer status arose from a Student Senate resolution. It was the senators' belief that both the Academic Council and student government would benefit from having the student body president present at Academic Council meetings. The student body president is able to offer a unique perspective on students and their concerns to Academic Council members and would, as well, benefit from being fully aware of matters discussed at Academic Council meetings. As is true with the proposal passed at the last meeting to reorganize the Faculty Senate and Academic Council, the intent of the proposal is to streamline the flow of information and decision-making and to eliminate the duplication of effort that occurs when separate groups work on identical projects.

Ms. Rauch acknowledged that some concerns were raised at the Executive Committee meeting about giving the president observer status on the Academic Council. They were related both to the growing size of the Academic Council and the fact that not every matter raised at Academic Council meetings is pertinent to students. Ms. Rauch said her answer to the first concern is that the students believe the benefits of a slightly larger council outweigh the costs. As to the second concern, it is true of all observers that not every matter discussed at council meetings is pertinent to their office or area of responsibility. Ms. Rauch added that she believes the Executive Committee implicitly endorsed the section of the proposal granting the student body president observer status because the sentence is taken directly from the proposal that was approved at the Executive Committee meeting.

Fr. Malloy said that while he has no objection to granting observer status to the student body president, he is not sure that it is an effective use of his or her time. The role that the president would play may not be sufficient for the time and energy involved. Perhaps the student body president should serve as the actual delegate.

Ms. Rauch responded that the suggestion was made at the Executive Committee meeting that the president serve as the delegate; however, the time a student must devote to that position would be too much of a burden on the student body president. The delegate must attend Executive Committee meetings, serve on the Undergraduate Studies Committee, and attend full Academic Council meetings. Serving as an observer would not require nearly as much time, although it would give the president the same kind of informed knowledge of University matters and decisions as other observers—for example, the registrar or director of admissions—gain from their positions on the council.

Mr. Krieger pointed out a typographical error in a sentence of the proposal. It should read: "Upon their endorsement, the President-elect will contact the three colleges not represented by the Academic Delegate to nominate their own student representatives."

Fr. Jenkins offered a friendly amendment. As written, the proposal states that the Student Senate must approve the method by which each college nominates its student representative as well as formally approving the three nominees. Through its power of approving the nominees, however, the senate has the power to disapprove the method by which the nominees were selected. Thus, he would suggest deleting the sentence about approving the method of selection and replacing it with: "The Student Senate must formally approve the nominated student representatives."

It would have the same effect of giving the senate appropriate control over the colleges.

Ms. Rauch explained that the reasoning behind the language is that the different colleges have different election procedures. Nevertheless, she is willing to accept the amendment.

Prof. Roche spoke in favor of the original language. He said that it clarifies for the colleges that they must develop a method of selection that will be discussed and approved in the senate. Thus, the sentence requiring approval of the method of election recognizes the possibility that each college will formulate its own election procedures. In the College of Arts and Letters, for example, the Student Advisory Council may be responsible for the selection.
process. Other colleges, however, have different kinds of student bodies and they may develop their own strategies. The argument for retaining the second sentence—"Additionally, the Student Senate must formally approve the three nominated student representatives"—is that it creates a link between the representative and the senate—actually, they would formally bond with the senate. They become a cohort of sorts who are approved. He was persuaded of this at the Executive Committee meeting.

Fr. Jenkins withdrew his amendment.

Prof. Powers asked whether the head of the Graduate Student Union should be granted observer status as well as the student body president. While he, too, has concerns about over-commitment on the part of the student body president, if undergraduates are to be represented by their president, so should the graduate students. Perhaps law and M.B.A. students should have representation as well. By giving the student body president observer status, it would set a precedent. He would not want to accept the undergraduates' proposal without others.

Prof. Garg said he believes it very appropriate for the graduate students to have representation on the council.

Prof. Kantor and Prof. Hatch discussed whether the Executive Committee had, in fact, endorsed giving observer status to the student body president.

Prof. Affleck-Graves said that he understands the concerns about extending observer status to representatives of graduate, law, and M.B.A. students but believes they present a slightly different case than undergraduates. The graduate student representatives would have a direct reporting relationship back to their student bodies, while under the undergraduates' system of colleges nominating student representatives, the student representatives are not linked to the Student Senate. They are linked to the colleges.

Prof. Powers said that nuance might be lost upon the graduate students.

Prof. Garg said that the approval by the senate of each college's representative creates a linkage between them and the senate.

Returning to the issue of whether giving the student body president observer status would increase the size of the Academic Council too much, Prof. Brogan said she has never seen the meeting room so full that it could not hold one more body. Also, granting observer status to the student body president does not require his or her attendance at every meeting; there will be many times when there will be nothing on the agenda that demands the president's attendance. When there is, however, the president will not need to hear the discussion third-hand. Even though he/she would not be a voting member, the president will at least have been present at the meeting and able to participate in the discussion. Prof. Brogan endorsed the proposal.

Prof. Hösele asked why undergraduates of the School of Architecture are not represented on the council.

Prof. Affleck-Graves answered that the current rules provide that architecture students vote with the students of the College of Arts and Letters.

Prof. Bigi said he senses that a feeling exists among some graduate, law, and M.B.A. students that they are not fully a part of the University. Giving them observer status would strengthen their ties to the academic community. Furthermore, there are several issues brought before the Academic Council of great interest to them. Of particular note is the discussion held at the meeting of January 17, 2002, regarding health insurance benefits for graduate students. Adding three more representatives to the council would demonstrate a welcoming attitude to the University's graduate, M.B.A., and law students.

Prof. DeBoer said that it is not appropriate to bring up observer status for representatives of the graduate, law, and M.B.A. students when the students themselves have never expressed that wish to the council. Only the undergraduate students have asked for observer status.

Prof. Garg indicated that the proposal is not from the Student Senate; it is from the Executive Committee as accepted by the student body. The Student Senate does not have the right of agenda with the Academic Council.

Prof. Roche offered several comments. First, he disagreed with Prof. Affleck-Graves on the lack of a connection between the undergraduate representatives and the senate. Even if the undergraduates are thought to have more of a link with the colleges than with the senate, the academic delegate definitely has a strong link to the senate. Second, in voting for Academic Council members, the Architecture faculty is grouped with faculty in Arts and Letters, but he does not believe that there is any such grouping for architecture students under the current system. As to adding graduate student observers to the council, Prof. Roche said he favored Prof. Powers' view—that if the council adds undergraduate student observers it should add observers for graduate students as well. He recommends, however, that the council bracket out the last sentence of the Student Government proposal and vote only on the first paragraph, which appears to have the support of most Academic Council members. The Executive Committee can then work with the chair of the Graduate Studies Committee to see if they can devise a more comprehensive proposal integrating representation for all student constituencies rather than considering proposals piecemeal.

In response to a question from Prof. DeBoer, Ms. Rauch clarified that under the proposal one of the four student representatives will continue to assume the role of Student Government academic delegate (aka commissioner), an ex-officio member of the Executive Committee. This position is not affected by the new election procedures.

Prof. Kolman offered some thoughts on the nature of observers. While one could say that there would be no harm in having even hundreds of observers on the council, the defining characteristic of observers is that they have a vested interest in the deliberations of the body but no representation. It is for this reason that such offices as the Registrar's Office have been provided with observer status. Students, both undergraduate and graduate, already have representatives of their own choosing. Starting to add observers may prove to be an endless process.
Prof. Roche moved that the council vote only on the middle paragraph of the proposal regarding undergraduate student representatives. Prof. Powers seconded the motion.

Prof. Tidmarsh asked the meaning of the word "formally" in the sentence: "Additionally, the Student Senate must formally approve the three nominated student representatives."

Ms. Rauch answered that there must be a vote of approval by two-thirds of the senate's members.

Members voted unanimously to vote only on the proposal's middle paragraph, which, in a separate vote, was approved unanimously.

Fr. Malloy concluded the discussion by saying that the Executive Committee will have a conversation on the need of granting observer status to various student constituencies.

5. Report of Jennifer Younger, Director, University Libraries. After the Academic Council's meeting of January 17, 2002, at which questions concerning Notre Dame's library expenditures were raised, Prof. Hatch asked Jennifer Younger, Edward H. Arnold Director of University Libraries, to report to members on library funding. Dr. Younger explained that her report will present information on recent University investments in its libraries, comparisons with other research libraries, and the funding trajectory for Notre Dame's libraries. She will also include information on the serious challenges of maintaining purchasing power for books and journals, as these are issues integral to understanding the impact of the funding trajectory for library resources. Before beginning her presentation, Dr. Younger introduced Prof. Harvey Bender, chair of the University Committee on Libraries, who was invited to the meeting as a guest.

(a) University investment since 1994. Dr. Younger began by explaining that the Report of the Ad hoc Committee on University Libraries (May 1994) recommended significant improvements in funding for the University Libraries and the Kresge Law Library. Following the Report, the library budget increased by 83 percent over a six-year period (fiscal years 1995-96 to 2000-01), with the increase coming both from annual budget increases from the University ($3,450,000) and funds received during the successful Generations Campaign. By category, individual funding increases over this six-year period were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Wages</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitions</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>346.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>142.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Younger explained that the Report also identified six areas for onetime expenditures: (1) retrospective purchases, $12,500,000; (2) processing retrospective purchases, $5,000,000; (3) new equipment, $300,000; (4) replacement of the NOTIS system, $1,000,000; (5) Hesburgh Library renovation, $10,000,000; and (6) a book security system, $400,000. The University funded all but the onetime retrospective purchases and their processing.

(b) Comparison with peer research libraries. Dr. Younger then compared Notre Dame's total library expenditures to those of the other 112 research libraries in the country. In the 1991-92 fiscal year, Notre Dame's position in the Association of Research Libraries' (ARL) ranking of total library expenditures was 35th. By the 1999-2000 fiscal year, it had risen to 20th place. Dr. Younger emphasized that the ARL ranking is not a measure of the quality of an institution's library. It simply measures, among the 112 research libraries in the country, each institution's position with regard to resources and investment.

As compared to the 12 libraries identified in the 1994 report as Notre Dame's peers, Dr. Younger said that Notre Dame is seventh in terms of total expenditures, when excluding medical library expenditures, with a total of $17,225,138. Princeton, at $29,434,902, is ranked first. Duke, Emory, Johns Hopkins, Northwestern, and Rice cluster above Notre Dame in the rankings with expenditures from $20,628,492 to $18,207,455. Georgetown, Washington University at St. Louis, Vanderbilt, Dartmouth, Syracuse, and Tulane follow Notre Dame with expenditures ranging from $17,022,829 to $9,665,029. Dr. Younger noted that four of the universities named as peers in the report—Princeton, Johns Hopkins, Rice, and Dartmouth—have no law school.

(c) Funding trajectory for library collections. Dr. Younger continued with a discussion of the funding trajectory for the library collections. As is true of most University entities, she said, funding for library collections comes from unrestricted and restricted (endowment) sources. In FY 2000-01, 61 percent of the University Libraries' collections budget came from unrestricted funds and 39 percent from restricted income. With the completion in that fiscal year of the annual increases in response to the 1994 Report, there were no increases in the libraries' non-salary budgets.

Dr. Younger said that despite the zero increase, there has been good growth in the collections budget as a result of income from new endowments and increased payouts from existing endowments. Although the Generations Campaign has ended, Notre Dame's libraries continue to receive new endowments, including endowments directed toward collections in Shakespeare, architecture, Medieval studies, Portuguese studies, globalization, and critical technologies in engineering. In fiscal year 2001-02 the payout rate from endowments increased 20 percent, of which half has been reserved in the collections budget to cover inflation—now at six to 10 percent annually—of the costs of books and serial subscriptions.

Dr. Younger said that among the libraries' five major funding priorities, three are for collections. They are in the areas of: (1) critical technologies for the 21st century, especially in engineering and the biological sciences; (2) globalization and issues associated with the development of a worldwide capitalist market economy; and (3) Early Christian, Byzantine, and Medieval collections. In addition, the libraries have defined other giving opportunities in a wide range of subjects. Librarians work with Notre Dame's Development Office so that whatever the interest of a potential benefactor, they can define almost immediately a match in a collections area. It is through such donor matches that collections have been enhanced in Russian history, Caribbean studies, and Latino studies.

Dr. Younger said that Notre Dame's library collections are also funded from gifts and grants. Major support from the
National Endowment for the Humanities has allowed for acquisition of Medieval vernacular materials as well as the preservation of significant portions of the collections of the Medieval Institute Library. Multiple expendable matching funds obtained as a result of the NEH initiatives directed by Prof. Chris Fox have greatly supported Irish Studies.

Dr. Younger said that to build on the remarkable success of the University in generating external funding, the libraries' collections need an ongoing place in the priorities of Notre Dame's colleges, centers, institutes, and schools. The goal is to work with the various University units to define needs and then incorporate those needs into priorities. The libraries can partner with colleges, centers, institutes, and schools in fund-raising initiatives. An example of successful partnering occurred recently with the College of Arts and Letters when the Hesburgh Library acquired 16th- and 17th-century Chinese manuscripts written by Jesuit scholars.

Dr. Younger said that the libraries also seek funding opportunities on campus. They have received additional funds from the Provost's Office and the Graduate School for major purchases.

(d) Maintaining purchasing power for books and journals. Dr. Younger then discussed the issue of how the University libraries strive to maintain purchasing power in the face of rising inflation of books and periodicals. She said that superinflation is more serious than merely high prices. The cost of books and journals has increased by 226 percent, while the unit cost of books has increased by 66 percent. As a result, college and university research libraries across the nation, expenditures rose steadily, but the number of journals purchased during between 1986 and 2000 declined from an average of 16,312 to 15,223.

During the same period the number of books purchased dropped from 32,679 to 27,059. Dr. Younger said that at Notre Dame the annual inflation figures for the collections budget ranges from 6 to 10 percent—and those are conservative figures—with most of the increase occurring in scientific and technical journals. Over the last several years the libraries have been able to absorb the inflationary increases because of an increase of 77 percent—both from additional University funding and new endowment income—to the collections budget. While she expects the inflation rate to continue, Dr. Younger said, she does not expect collection budget increases in the 77 percent range. Although some additional income from new endowments, gifts, and campus funding opportunities will appear in the collections budget next year, at this time, she is projecting an overall increase in the collections budget of approximately 2 percent.

(e) Strategies for maintaining purchasing power. Dr. Younger said that Notre Dame's libraries have put into place multiple strategies to maintain and increase purchasing power. Foremost among them is "smart shopping," with other strategies revolving around collaboration and finding new sources of funding. Dr. Younger said that smart shopping begins with consortial licensing. Notre Dame has joined the Northeast Research Libraries Association (NERL), through which it licenses electronic resources, for a total savings at a minimum of $20,000 a year. This spring, the libraries are reducing the number of journals they acquire in both paper and electronic formats by working with academic departments to, where feasible, drop the paper copies and maintain the electronic version. She also intends to establish a regular review of journal subscriptions to ensure that Notre Dame is actually purchasing the most important titles for its users. Where cost effective on the basis of use, the Libraries will order individual articles for faculty and students as needed rather than placing journal subscriptions. Dr. Younger said that the libraries depend on and welcome faculty support in the cancellation of expensive, low-use titles, although she noted that defining what constitutes "low-use" requires some work. If the break-even point is defined incorrectly, the University may spend more on purchasing articles individually than it would in simply having a subscription.

Dr. Younger continued that the libraries are strengthening existing collaborative relationships, particularly with the Laboratory for Social Research, to reduce duplicate purchases in data resources. A similar arrangement in regard to data resources has been forged with the Mendoza College of Business. The libraries will pursue new relationships beyond the campus to develop collections cooperatively. Relationships developed over the years with Saint Mary's College, Indiana University, and Purdue University are most important in this area. Finally, Notre Dame's libraries are seeking new funding sources through endowments and campus opportunities. Without these sources, it is not possible to meet the information needs of the campus.

(f) Faculty help in controlling superinflation. Dr. Younger emphasized that superinflation of books and periodicals cannot be described as just "a library problem." It is unfair as well, she said, to shift the responsibility for funds keeping pace with increases in volume demand and price to university provosts' offices. The problem of superinflation must be addressed by all involved in the system of scholarly communication and publication, including faculty and publishers. As she has explained, libraries across the nation have reduced acquisitions, leveraged buying power through consortial purchasing of electronic resources, and extended cooperative agreements with other libraries; yet, collectively, there has been a steady decline in the number of books and serials purchased. It is only recently, with the strength of faculty editorial boards, that there has been any change in the larger pattern of significant cost escalation. As an example, in 2001, the American Association of Physical Anthropologists became concerned about the drop in library subscriptions to its professional journal. The board negotiated a new agreement with the publisher to reduce library subscription rates by 40 percent. This demonstrates, Dr. Younger said, how the involvement of faculty members is critical in controlling the effects of
Dr. Younger concluded her remarks by stating that to inform faculty of the ways they can help make changes to the system of scholarly publishing, her staff has put together a list: http://www.createchange.org/change.html. Of course, no institution can tackle this problem independently. Thus, many of the strategies ask faculty to work through their national or international professional associations. The common focus of the suggestions is for faculty to take an interest in the business aspects of the publishing programs of their professional societies. That entails encouraging professional societies to maintain reasonable prices, to define and explain these goals to commercial publishers as important for the broad and affordable dissemination of research and, if warranted, to encourage societies to explore alternatives to contracting or selling publications to a commercial publisher.

She said that other strategies faculty members can use are to submit papers to journals supported by the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) or to serve on their editorial boards. Faculty members can also examine the pricing, copyright, and licensing agreements of any commercially published journal they contribute to as an author, reviewer, or editor and discuss with libraries or departments how those agreements help or hinder affordable dissemination of research—for example, in a faculty member's ability to post papers on a public archive.

Dr. Younger emphasized that the libraries' faculty and staff are most willing to participate in faculty departmental meetings and graduate seminars to discuss scholarly communication issues or to provide journal cost-per-use studies. They have provided information to the editorial boards of various journals on strategies for containing publishing costs.

In response to a question by Prof. Roche concerning Notre Dame's membership in the Center for Research Library Collections, Dr. Younger explained that the center began in 1949 as a cooperative deposit library of 13 university libraries, all but two of which were members of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC). The goal was to find a way to make cost-effective use of library collections. In an age of physical books and delivery, each of the CIC libraries began the initiative by donating its own low-use collections to the center. Over time, that has evolved into a program for cooperative acquisitions. Materials held by fewer than five libraries in the country qualify for cooperative acquisition. Thus, materials in the center's collection are relatively scarce in North American library collections.

Dr. Younger said that together with the Kresge Law Library, the assessment for membership in the Center for Research Library Collections for the University Libraries is approximately $35,000/year. For that, Notre Dame is given a voice in the materials purchased. Membership also demonstrates Notre Dame's commitment to national acquisitions and the preservation of low-use or hard-to-acquire materials in various areas. One of these areas is foreign dissertations. With a collection of about 800,000 volumes, the center has the most extensive collection in the world of foreign dissertations. Thus, Notre Dame fulfills all requests for them from the center; it does not purchase them independently. The center also has very strong holdings in area studies—for example, Asian studies, Latin American studies, and African studies.

Dr. Younger continued that one of the problems with the center's collections is that they are not fully catalogued. Librarians know that every foreign dissertation is available, but they cannot provide potential users with a list or access to a catalogue. The board of the center met recently and learned of a funding request to the Mellon Foundation for cataloging the collection—an endeavor that will greatly enhance its accessibility to the average user. The request is in process and is likely to be granted.

Prof. Roche asked if the collections that are catalogued at the center appear in the University's collections database.

Dr. Younger said that they appear in a separate catalogue, which is accessible from Notre Dame's catalogue under the heading "other catalogues." While some libraries have chosen to actually enter the center's collections in their catalogues, Notre Dame will take a slightly different approach: simultaneous broadcast searching. Thus, when users search the Notre Dame catalogue, they also search those of the center, the Law Library, and some other catalogues of their own choosing. Dr. Younger said she hopes to implement broadcast searching in a year.

Dr. Younger then asked Prof. Bender, chair of the University Committee on Libraries, to provide his comments on library funding issues. Prof. Bender said that while necessary, a report of expenditures and rankings is unable to convey how exciting the development of librarians and staff has been throughout the recent period of growth. Also, when looking at facts and figures, it is easy to lose sight of the centrality of the libraries to the entire university enterprise. The exciting part of libraries—the very critical kind of dynamic that goes on involving the nature of learning and interaction and reading—is difficult to assess. It is important that students throughout the University find their libraries to be an environment conducive to learning. Whatever Notre Dame's rankings in the size of collections or expenditures on them, he suspects that rankings would be very high in the factors that truly make a difference in terms of student life and graduate support.

Prof. Aldous asked about the 81 percent increase, from $3,906,936 in FY 1994-95 to $7,093,642 in FY 2000-01, in library salaries. Has there been an increase in the number of librarians and staff?

Dr. Younger answered that the 81 percent increase in salaries represents both increases in the number of librarians and staff and increases in salaries. She would estimate the number of new librarian and staff positions in that five-year time as 25 or 27.

Prof. Aldous said she has been told that librarians who have been employed at Notre Dame for 10 to 15 years have not received sufficient increases in salary to keep pace with their newly hired counterparts.

Dr. Younger replied that salary compression affects all longtime faculty and staff, not just those in Notre Dame's libraries. The libraries have addressed the issue and made some progress, although she can make no claims to having fully resolved all problems.
Prof. Aldous then asked whether the increase in students at Notre Dame has affected the number of librarian and staff positions.

Dr. Younger answered that she has added a faculty position and a staff position in the area of user instruction. Library faculty and staff have also been added in public service areas that interact directly with users.

Prof. Hösle remarked that he has observed very diverse levels of electronic literacy in his students. Those students with greater ability to access information have an obvious advantage at the University. He asked about integrating more training in electronic resources into the curriculum of first-year courses in order to give all students the same opportunity to engage in quality research.

Prof. Bender agreed that such a program is critical. As a clinical geneticist, he often sees patients attempting to explore the Web for information about a condition they believe affects them, but many are unable to differentiate between useful and irrelevant information. It is absolutely critical that students know how to sort through and identify information so that they can use new electronic resources effectively.

Dr. Younger said that the library has made some efforts to increase students’ electronic literacy. Last year, Hesburgh Library began a workshop for 25 students a session in which wireless computers were used for hands-on instruction on how to find and evaluate information resources. There are also some successful examples of instances in which faculty members and librarians have worked together to integrate teaching about electronic resources into the curriculum. She thinks an integrated program is much preferred.

While it is very difficult for students to learn library information outside of a course, they can benefit greatly when they have a reason to learn certain skills.

Prof. Kolman said that she and Dr. Younger have often discussed this issue and agree that to provide students with an education for the future, they must be educated to seek out the most up-to-date information in the most up-to-date ways and then trained in how to make judgments about the quality of that information. She, too, believes that students find it difficult to learn about library resources when their experiences are isolated from the classroom.

The question of whether all students are able to keep up with the vast amount of information available today is an area in which the libraries need to step up their efforts in terms of marketing and working with individual faculty.

Dr. Younger replied that the whole issue of faculty outreach is one of the major issues identified in the library’s self-study report. She thinks there is much work to be done in this area. Even on a budget, the resources available today are truly astounding. This is an area in which the libraries need to step up their efforts in terms of marketing and working with individual faculty.

Dr. Younger responded that discussion of ideal configurations of the library’s physical space occurred during the
many benefits to be derived from interaction between human beings. He encourages Dr. Younger to keep concerns about student interaction in the forefront of space discussions.

Prof. Hösele said that the Hesburgh Library frequently sells books for $1 in the lobby. Are these books that have been removed from the collection?

Dr. Younger said that most of the books for sale have never been in the collection but are part of gifts from various donors. The libraries will accept a gift only with an agreement that it can handle the entirety of the donation as necessary. After books in the gift are added to the libraries' collections, books that are not needed in the collections are sold as a service to patrons. The University libraries generally do not discard books because of low use or other reasons.

Mr. Kreiger said that occasionally, the number of copies of a title held by the libraries is reduced for reasons of space, but titles are not eliminated.

Ms. Rauch said she was pleased to hear about efforts to develop access to the library from study spaces on campus. Students often study in their rooms, dorm lounges, or the Coleman-Morse Center. Efforts to make libraries more accessible across campus are encouraging.

Fr. Malloy thanked Dr. Younger and Prof. Bender for their report and participation in today's meeting.

6. Committee Reports

(a) Faculty Affairs Committee. Prof. Incropera said he was encouraged by Prof. Bender's words about examining "space" in the libraries not only from a standpoint of the amount of space, but also how what space is available can be made more conducive to promoting interaction among students and between students and faculty. He is involved in similar issues in designing the space for the Learning Center in the College of Engineering. Despite our existence in the digital age, there are

(b) Graduate Studies Committee. Prof. Tidmarsh reported that he expects an item on the committee's agenda to be the issue that arose today of representation of graduate students on the Academic Council. Members will continue to work on library issues and have a meeting planned with the members of the Graduate Student Union.

(c) Undergraduate Studies Committee. Prof. Roche said the committee will bring to the council's next meeting a proposal on issues connected with classroom scheduling. It is a follow-up to the proposal discussed at last May's meeting. Because the question of whether there will be major changes to the curriculum has not yet been settled, the committee's proposal is more an adjustment than a wholesale reordering.

There being no further business, Fr. Malloy adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John Affleck-Graves
Secretary
May 8, 2001

Protest

Nathan Hatch
Office of the Provost
300 Main Building
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

Dear Nathan,

The enclosed resolution was passed by the 2000-2001 Faculty Senate during its last meeting of May 2, 2001. Upon being seated, the 2001-2002 Senate considered a motion to rescind this resolution, but that motion was defeated due to its failure to receive the two-thirds majority necessary for a motion to rescind a previous action. It is therefore my understanding that this resolution represents the judgement of the new, as well as the outgoing Senate, and I am accordingly sending it to you with the request that you forward it to the Academic Council for its consideration next fall.

I would also like to inform you that my successor as Chair of the Senate is Professor Jacqueline Brogan.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Meanwhile, best wishes for a good and productive summer.

Sincerely,

Jean Porter
Chair, Faculty Senate
2000-2001

cc: Professor Jacqueline Brogan

Faculty Senate Resolution

Be it resolved, that the Academic Articles shall be amended as follows:

Delete Article 4, Section 3, sub section b.

Passed
May 2, 2001
15-11
ATTACHMENT B

Proposal on the Election of Student Academic Council Representatives

As approved at the meeting of February 26, 2002, the total number of undergraduate student representatives on the Academic Council will increase from three to four. Each college will have one student representative. Also mentioned at the February meeting, the policy by which student representatives are selected requires revision. In an effort to enhance the effectiveness of these student representatives, and correct the current anomaly that the student body does not designate or approve its own representatives, the student government recommends the following proposal:

"In March, the Office of the Student Body President-elect will seek students for the position of Academic Delegate, an ex officio position on the Academic Council. Based on the applicants, the President-elect will nominate one student who must then be approved by the Student Senate. Upon their endorsement, the President-elect will contact the three colleges not represented by the Academic Delegate to nominate their own student representatives. The Student Senate must approve the method by which the college nominates this student. Additionally, the Student Senate must formally approve the three nominated student representatives. The selection and approval of these positions will be completed by April 30. The four student representatives would then serve on the Council for the following academic year.

In addition, the Student Body President would be granted non-voting observer status at full Council meetings."
Academic Council

April 30, 2002


Members Excused: Francis Castellino, Patricia O'Hara, Jennifer Younger, Ikaros Bigi, Joseph Powers, Edward Conlon, Dino Marcantonio, Sonja Mapes

Observers Present: Mary Hendriksen, Julie Flory (for Dennis K. Moore), Harold Pace, Tom Laughner, Julia Dayton

Observers Excused: Dennis K. Moore, Col. Mark Gehri, Dan Saracino

Prof. Bretz opened the meeting with a prayer.

1. Course Scheduling. Prof. Roche, chair of the Undergraduate Studies Committee, explained that the proposal on course scheduling presented to members today results from the discussion at the Academic Council meeting of April 23, 2001, concerning possible solutions to the high concentration of classes at the University in the midterm and midday hours relative to other segments of the day. The concentration is particularly high on Tuesday and Thursday. As discussed at that meeting and stated in the resolution presented to the council today by the committee, members believe that the current distribution of classes across the class day has an adverse effect on requirements for classroom space, course availability, and, consequently, tuition demands for students. (See Attachment A.) In addition, Fr. Malloy has cited the decline in Friday classes as a factor related to the high incidence of student drinking at Notre Dame. Prof. Roche said that the committee decided on a proposal that is relatively modest in scope—primarily because the Curriculum Committee, headed by Fr. John Jenkins, C.S.C., is now in the midst of its discussions. It would be foolish to formulate an elaborate restructuring of undergraduate course scheduling a year in advance of that report.

After noting that the title of the committee's proposal should be amended to read "Proposed Resolution to the Academic Council on Course Scheduling" and distributing copies of a proposed amendment to the committee's motion, prepared by Dr. Harold Pace, University registrar (See Attachment B), Prof. Roche explained that the proposal calls for the council to abolish the present Monday/Wednesday 75-minute time slot and replace it with an equivalent Wednesday/Friday 75-minute slot. The committee asks the Registrar to make the replacement in such a way that the number of Wednesday/Friday 75-minute classes is roughly equal to the present number of Monday/Wednesday 75-minute classes. The committee's proposal also calls for: (1) the formation of a standing committee that will review classroom scheduling issues, continue efforts to allocate classroom resources in an efficient and equitable manner, and resolve disputes that arise in classroom scheduling; and (2) the registrar to compile data each semester indicating how the University as a whole as well as each college and school has performed in allocating classroom resources. Dr. Pace said that the measures proposed will take effect in the spring 2003 semester.

Prof. Roche said that the impetus for the main change—exchanging Monday/Wednesday classes for Wednesday/Friday classes—is that the smallest number of University courses are held on Friday. Thus, in the fall 2000 semester the registrar's data showed the distribution of total classrooms in use on each day of the week as: Monday—698, Tuesday—736, Wednesday—644, Thursday—710, and Friday—644. (See footnote 1 of Attachment A) Shifting a segment of the University's current two-day-a-week classes to include Friday maximizes the University's use of classroom space as well as addressing the concern of many at the University that the lower number of classes on Friday contributes to the problem of students' alcohol abuse. While some have asked if the change would serve only to turn the "Friday problem" into a "Sunday problem," Prof. Roche said he does not think that will occur. The campus culture on Thursday night is quite different than that of Sunday night. On Sundays, there are dorm Masses and students tend to turn back to their books in anticipation of the week. Thus, committee members feel that in a modest way and as an initial step the proposal addresses some of the complexity involved in creating better course scheduling opportunities for students.

Prof. Brogan asked why the committee's proposal blocks out all classes from 9:15 a.m. to 11:45 a.m. in the Wednesday/Friday time slot.

Dr. Pace answered that there is a high concentration of Monday/Wednesday/Friday classes from 9:15 to 11:45. It would destroy the University's MWF schedule as a whole if either Monday/Wednesday or Wednesday/Friday classes were offered during that time period.

Prof. Incropera commented that the problem in addressing course scheduling issues is that any attempt must seek to maximize three objectives: (1) improving students' access to classes, (2) utilizing classroom space as effectively as possible, and (3) accommodating the faculty's interest in keeping open some large blocks of time. Prof. Incropera said that he knows of many engineering students who are shut out of classes they would like to take in philosophy or theology, for example, because of scheduling difficulties. He wonders if the issue of course scheduling could best be examined from a standpoint of seeking the most effective utilization of space.

Dr. Pace answered that while it is certainly possible to create a schedule that maximizes the use of classroom space, that objective has never been part of Notre Dame's culture. Some universities do use software that maximizes the use of classrooms to the highest level and creates the fewest potential conflicts in students' schedules. Building a schedule in this way, however, ignores...
the faculty's need to keep open some large blocks of time. Notre Dame builds its schedule differently. The problem the committee has faced is how it can spread out classes over the class day and make departments stick to that schedule.

Prof. Roche said that at the April 23, 2001, meeting Academic Council members specifically articulated the conflict between the scheduling difficulties students now face from the current distribution of classes—primarily due to the overuse of certain time slots—and faculty members' need for large blocks of time for concentrated work on their research, writing, and class preparation. Council members said then that even though faculty might be modestly inconvenienced by an adjustment to Notre Dame's schedule, the committee should continue to look at strategies to address maximizing classroom space and students' concern about difficulties in scheduling classes. He anticipates that when Fr. Jenkins' committee report is completed and the committee is supplied with the data the motion asks the registrar to provide each semester, it will advocate that the University move to a system that was discussed at length last year: setting a percentage of classes in "prime time" slots over which departments cannot offer courses. When this more final proposal is developed he expects that faculty members might be inconvenienced to some degree; however, the committee is not planning to propose a scheme that would completely take off the table the need for faculty members to have blocks of concentrated time.

Prof. Incropera asked Prof. Roche to explain the nature of the inconvenience certain course schedules present to faculty.

Prof. Roche replied that most faculty members would prefer not to teach four or five days a week so that they have more options for giving lectures elsewhere and for concentrated work on their own projects. Many faculty members find that teaching one class that meets Tuesday and Thursday mornings and another that meets Tuesday and Thursday afternoons provides them with the necessary large blocks of time. There are other benefits to two-day-a-week courses. Many business and humanities courses at the 200-level and above are two-day-a-week courses because longer time slots offer more time for discussion.

Prof. Hösele asked why Monday/Wednesday time slots must be replaced. Why not add Wednesday/Friday slots but keep the current Monday/Wednesday option?

Prof. Roche replied that the current proposal is not a wholesale revision of the University's schedule but an attempt to shift some of the current two-day-a-week courses from Monday/Wednesday to Wednesday/Friday. Many faculty members in the Colleges of Science and Engineering, as well as many who teach language classes in the College of Arts and Letters, often prefer Monday/Wednesday/Friday classes. Thus, the proposal attempts to cause the least amount of disruption to and conflicts with the existing schedule by merely replacing the Monday/Wednesday time slot with a Wednesday/Friday slot.

Dr. Pace added that a primary goal of the scheduling change is to provide students with as much choice in their classes as possible. Having a variety of different schedules with Wednesday classes—Monday/Wednesday, Wednesday/Friday, and Monday/Wednesday/Friday—causes too many conflicts for students.

Fr. Malloy asked if any student members of the council wished to comment on the proposal.

Ms. Rauch said that because the problem of a high concentration of classes on Tuesday and Thursday will be taken up at another time, it seems that the purpose of this proposal is solely to address the Thursday night partying problem. She doubts, however, that many students will choose to take a class that meets at 8 a.m. on Friday. The University would need to schedule very popular classes at 8 a.m. to persuade students to select that time slot. Even though the council may choose to shift Monday/Wednesday classes to Wednesday/Friday, she thinks that students who are inclined to go out on Thursday night will continue to do so.

Ms. Schmid said she sees one very clear advantage of shifting Monday/Wednesday courses to Wednesday/Friday. Presently, many students leave for the weekend on Thursday afternoon, which can affect the quality of discussions in classes that meet on Friday afternoon. If Friday afternoon classes are one of two classes a week rather than one of three classes, she thinks students would be less likely to miss them. Moreover, she does expect that the schedule change will help with the "Friday problem." Students who have presentations on Friday will not go out on Thursday night.

Prof. Bretz asked whether adopting the proposal precludes discussion of future, more radical changes to the University's schedule.

Prof. Roche reiterated that adoption will not preclude further discussion. Committee members felt that it was not appropriate at this time to come forward with a radical proposal. As Fr. Jenkins' committee finishes its work and the council tackles other proposals it has considered, he anticipates that the Undergraduate Studies Committee will come to the council with proposals that involve, at a minimum, setting a cap for the number of classes each department can offer in the "prime time" hours of the schedule. Such a proposal will address students' concerns about difficulties in putting together a schedule and issues of classroom allocation.

Prof. Bretz asked whether the options of Monday/Thursday or Tuesday/Friday were still on the table?

Dr. Pace said that they were.

Prof. Blum commented that the Anthropology Department has often used Friday afternoons for departmental meetings. This is a time when faculty members have fewer time constraints than other days and conversations can spill over the allotted time. Changing the University's schedule so that meetings must now be held on Mondays could very well change this dynamic.

Fr. Malloy pointed out that the Theology Department has long used a late Monday afternoon time for its departmental meetings. Most likely, departments across the University have become accustomed to holding their meetings on a variety of days.

Ms. Arnett asked if the statistics given on the distribution of classes across the class week include graduate and professional
classes. She also asked how the proposal will affect tutorials and graduate students with teaching responsibilities.

Dr. Pace answered that the Registrar’s Office gives more flexibility to graduate classes when putting together the University’s schedule—for instance, in the Tuesday/Thursday 8-9:15 a.m. time period. It also schedules graduate-level classes later in the day or in the evenings. There is more flexibility for graduate-level courses because they do not normally require large classrooms. As for the effect of the proposal on tutorials, it would require holding the tutorial on Monday and lectures on Wednesday and Friday. Also, classes that meet only on Friday would be shifted to Monday.

Fr. Malloy asked Dr. Pace to list his amendments to the Committee’s proposal.

Dr. Pace said they were: (1) In the first paragraph, adding that all classes now taught on Friday only, or as a Friday tutorial, be changed to Monday; (2) responsibilities of the standing committee proposed in the second paragraph also include setting classroom physical and technical configuration standards, considering requests to upgrade a classroom, taking a classroom out of service, or otherwise altering the current use of a classroom; (3) the data the Registrar’s Office compiles each semester indicating how the University as a whole as well as each college and school has performed in scheduling classes that result in the allocation of classroom resources will be reported as well to the chair of the Classroom Committee; and (4) the changes proposed will take effect “for” rather than “in” the spring 2003 semester so that the Registrar’s Office can consider them as it builds the spring 2003 schedule. (See Attachment B.)

Prof. Roche said that it would be useful to him if in addition to statistics on each college’s and school’s allocation of classes, he also had a breakdown by department of class allocation.

Fr. Malloy said that could be included as a friendly amendment.

In response to a question by Prof. Kolman, Dr. Pace reiterated that the proposal replaces all Monday/Wednesday lectures now having Friday tutorials with Wednesday/Friday lectures and Monday tutorials. He also said that the only exceptions are labs and physical education classes, which meet on a different schedule.

Fr. Malloy asked for a vote on the Undergraduate Studies Committee’s proposal, as amended by Dr. Pace, regarding classroom scheduling. With only one “nay” vote, it was approved by the Academic Council.

2. Observer Status for Student Presidents. Prof. Affleck-Graves said that the Executive Committee decided to recommend that the council not grant observer status to the Student Government president and the Graduate Student Union president. The membership of the council, already large, includes a number of observers. While some may believe that one or two more observers would seem to make little difference, the Executive Committee decided that including student presidents as observers could very well open the door to a proliferation of observers. Thus, it decided to abide by the principle that in cases when categories of people have elected representatives to the council—establishing a direct reporting line back to those constituents—there is not a need for observer status. Prof. Affleck-Graves noted that in the reorganization of the council and Faculty Senate undertaken this academic year, the council increased its student members to six, with two graduate students and four undergraduate students.

Ms. Rauch said that even though Student Government raised the issue of including the student presidents as observers, it will not oppose the Executive Committee’s recommendation. She explained that the rationale of the request was to bring the presidents’ expertise to council meetings.

Prof. Hatch said the point was raised at the Executive Committee meeting that the student presidents can always be invited to participate in a particular meeting when discussion of an agenda item would benefit from their presence.

Fr. Malloy called for a vote on the Executive Committee’s recommendation not to grant observer status on the Academic Council to the president of Student Government and the president of the Graduate Student Union. By a voice vote, a majority of members supported the Executive Committee’s recommendation.

3. Committee Reports

(a) Graduate Studies Committee. Prof. Garg said that the committee’s primary concentration this year has been quality-of-life issues for graduate students. He reported that several topics will be under consideration for further discussion in the fall of 2002, including tuition subsidies for spouses of married students, revisions of du Lac, opening hours of computer clusters during breaks, and discussion with Jennifer Younger on an e-dissertation project.

(b) Undergraduate Studies Committee. Prof. Roche said that during this academic year one subcommittee successfully completed work on revising the Honor Code and another developed the proposal voted on today regarding course scheduling. The latter will continue its work next year. A third subcommittee has been working on a number of issues: (1) Academic advising—while aspects of academic advising were addressed in the 1996-97 academic year, it has been suggested that the area needs to be revisited, with the purpose of highlighting a range of best practices; (2) Tutoring—tutoring is available in some colleges but not in others. While this may be due to the nature of the work in various departments, the subcommittee intends to look at the issue; (3) International study—the subcommittee has examined the impact of international study on the curriculum in some of the colleges and has maintained a file so that its work may be completed next year. Finally, committee members have been in touch with Fr. Jenkins’ Curriculum Committee, since that committee’s report will come to the Undergraduate Studies Committee before presentation to the full Academic Council. Committee members have also discussed University curricular issues that transcend colleges.

(c) Faculty Affairs Committee. Prof. Delaney said that the principal item on the agenda all year has been the reconstitution of the Faculty Senate and the integration of the Faculty Senate and the Academic Council. The joint committee was instrumental in the success of that endeavor. Another issue the
committee discussed was University policies related to retirement, including the issue of offices for retirees. Members learned that the issue of office space was unique to every college and that the colleges were aware of the problem and trying to deal with it. Also, as a result of the committee’s examination of the issue of participation of library faculty on various University committees, it has asked Prof. Affleck-Graves to take a serious look at the structure and composition of all committees at the University.

Prof. Delaney continued that next year the committee would like the council to hold a discussion of the University’s financial planning so that members could get a word in early in planning stages and make a case for the allotment of funds for certain purposes. Secondly, members would like to hear from Prof. Kantor, vice president for Graduate Studies and Research, so that they might provide input early enough in the strategic planning process to impact that process. Finally, under the general rubric of planning and restructuring, and following Prof. Affleck-Graves' completion of his study of various committee structures at the University and their function, it may be appropriate to have a general discussion at an Academic Council meeting of governance of the University.

Fr. Malloy thanked members for their participation in the Academic Council this year. He said that the restructuring of the council and the senate that occurred this year is intended to promote and facilitate a conversation that is healthy, oriented to the future, and directed to action. While committees must continue their conversations and work, this takes for granted that issues will percolate to the surface for action.

4. Minutes Approved. The minutes of the Academic Council meeting of February 26, 2002, were approved without amendment.

There being no further business, Fr. Malloy adjourned the meeting at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John Affleck-Graves
Secretary

ATTACHMENT A

Proposal Resolution to the Academic Council on Classroom Scheduling
March 15, 2002

Whereas there exists a high concentration of classes scheduled in the mid-morning and mid-day hours relative to other portions of the day,

whereas there exists a fewer number of classes scheduled on Fridays relative to the rest of the week,¹

whereas these factors have an adverse effect on the requirements for classroom space, course availability, and, consequently, tuition demands for students, and

whereas the decline in number of Friday classes has been publicly cited by the President of the university as an issue of concern,

be it resolved that

1. the present Monday/Wednesday 75 minute class schedule be abolished and replaced with an equivalent Wednesday/Friday 75 minute class schedule in such a fashion that the number of Wednesday/Friday 75 minute classes scheduled be less than or roughly equal to the present number of 75 minute classes taught on Monday/Wednesday,

2. a standing committee be formed, composed of a representative of the provost’s office, chosen by the provost, who shall serve as chair; the registrar, two representatives from the appropriate professional staff, selected by the registrar; and representatives from each college and school as selected by the dean or chair of each college and school, whose function shall be to review classroom scheduling issues, continue efforts to allocate classroom resources in an efficient and equitable manner, and resolve disputes which arise in classroom scheduling.

Be it further resolved that

3. the registrar shall compile data each semester which indicates how the university as a whole as well as each college and school has performed in allocating classroom resources and that this data will be reported to the president, provost, deans of the colleges, and chairs of the schools, and

4. these measures will take effect in the Spring 2003 semester.

¹In Fall 2000, registrar’s data showed the following distribution of total classrooms in use on each day of the week, Monday: 698, Tuesday: 736, Wednesday: 716, Thursday: 716, Friday: 644.
ATTACHMENT B

The Office of the Registrar recommends the following changes to the proposal:

Proposed Resolution to the Academic Council on Course Classroom Scheduling

1. The present Monday/Wednesday 75 minute class schedule be abolished and replaced with an equivalent Wednesday/Friday 75 minute class schedule in such a fashion that the number of Wednesday/Friday 75 minute classes scheduled be less than or roughly equal to the present number of 75 minute classes taught on Monday/Wednesday. That all classes now being taught on Friday only, or as a Friday tutorial, be changed to Monday.

2. a standing committee be formed, composed of a representative of the provost's office, chosen by the provost, who shall serve as chair; the registrar, two representatives from the appropriate professional staffs, selected by the registrar; and representatives from each college and school as selected by the dean or chair of each college and school, whose function shall be to review classroom scheduling issues, set classroom physical and technical configuration standards, consider requests to upgrade a classroom, take a classroom out of service, or otherwise alter the current use of a classroom, continue efforts to allocate classroom resources in an efficient and equitable manner, and resolve disputes which arise in classroom scheduling.

Be it further resolved that

3. The registrar shall compile data each semester which indicates how the university as a whole as well as each college and school has performed in scheduling classes which result in the allocation of classroom resources and that this data will be reported to the president, provost, deans of the colleges, and chairs of the schools, and to the chair of the Classroom Committee, and

4. these measures will take effect for in the Spring 2003 semester.

Minutes of the 289th Graduate Council Meeting

April 24, 2002

Present: Terrence Akai, Norman Crowe, Peter Diffley, Andrew Gould, Howard Hanson, Frank Incropera, Jeffrey Kantor, LeRoy Krajewski, Blake Leyerle, Mark McCready, Daniel Myers, Samuel Paolucci, Jan Poorman, James Powell, Kathy Psomiades, John Renaud, Mark Roche, David Smith, James Turner, Barbara Turpin, JoEllen Welsh, Diane Wilson, Carolyn Woo, Jennifer Younger

Absent: Ani Aprahamian, Gabriela Burgos-Solorzano, Peter Burns, Frank Castellino, Kishori Deshpande, Umesh Garg, Anthony Hyder, Paul Weithman

Guests: Joseph Marino

Prof. Jeffrey Kantor convened the meeting at 3:35 p.m. He introduced Prof. Joseph Marino, the new dean of the College of Science as of July 1, 2002.

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 288TH GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING

Prof. Kantor invited a motion to approve the minutes from the February 6, 2002 Graduate Council meeting. Dr. Jennifer Younger made the motion. They were approved unanimously.

II. MEASURING PROGRESS IN GRADUATE EDUCATION

Motivated in part by some comments from the last meeting of the Graduate Council, Prof. Kantor said that he sought the advice of the council on metrics that we might develop to measure graduate studies and the success of graduate programs at Notre Dame. These should be both objective and comparative. He then introduced Dr. Peter Diffley, associate dean of the Graduate School, to lead the discussion.

Dr. Diffley asked what data the council felt was important for the Graduate School to collect, and suggested that it think in terms of four major categories: (1) recruitment and admissions; (2) student progress; (3) placement; and (4) faculty profiles that interface with
graduate education and research. He said he would like to concentrate on one group at a time.

**Recruitment and Admissions**

Prof. Diffley asked the members to identify data points in this area that would be important for the Graduate School to collect.

The following suggestions were made:

- Institutions we tend to lose students to and those we tend to beat by department but by particular departments, over time
- Percentage of offers accepted, by school and by particular departments
- Number of applications received by the top programs at other institutions vs. the number of applications Notre Dame's programs attract
- How potential graduate students hear about us

Prof. Roche said that he would like to know what the GRE scores are of places like Princeton and some of our peer institutions. Dr. Diffley said that this information would be hard to come by on an annual basis without developing a consortium. Prof. Kantor added that we are working on developing a consortium to collect data for placement and Dr. Diffley said that we could possibly do this for a variety of data points.

Prof. Turner said that it would be helpful to have data broken down not only by department but by particular subfields within a department. Dr. Diffley said that it would be difficult to get that information right now, but Dr. Akai said that with the new IT system we would be able to capture it.

Prof. Turner stated that undergraduate admissions has a ranking system for high schools so that they can relate the high school GPA to the quality of the institution. It would be helpful if we could know the percentage of graduate applications that come from tier 1 institutions and how the students rank in their classes. Prof. Peter Diffley said that to rank according to institution might not be helpful in this case because a particular department at a peer institution might be weak.

However, this would be interesting to look at and determine if it is useful. He said that there does not seem to be any connection between attrition and a student's baccalaureate institution.

Prof. Gould suggested using the NRC or *U.S. News and World Report* rankings for undergraduate institutions to see if departments are attracting students from top schools. Dr. Akai stated that we must be careful about using this data and it is best to use it at the departmental level.

Prof. Paolucci said that his department (Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering) maintains a fair amount of data. It has found that the most important factor in determining a student's potential for success is the undergraduate institution. (For American students GREs and GPAs are also important, but they are less so for foreign students.)

Prof. Gould said that knowing whom we lose to and whom we beat is very important because it's a measure of a department's reputation. But he said it is often difficult to gather this data because we have to ask the students who have decided to go elsewhere. Dr. Akai stated that he did a study of this last year and found that the schools that we seem to lose to are largely East Coast schools, Wisconsin, and other Big Ten schools.

Prof. Roche stated that the issue is not only whether we are winning or losing to those departments but also whether our students are applying to the schools that we would see as our aspirational peers

**Student Progress**

Dr. Diffley asked the council to identify the important data points in this category. The following suggestions were made:

- Attrition (especially for minorities, and for women in science and engineering)
- Time to comprehensive exam and time to degree
- Academic year support from the University
- Academic year support from outside the University
- Summer support
- Amount of support
- Publications and presentations
- Time teaching, time researching
- TCE data on graduate students
- Number of Ph.D. and master's degrees awarded (by gender and ethnicity)
- A.B.D.s who have jobs
- Faculty member vs. TA TCE

Prof. Marino said that many of these items are important to the College of Science and they are important in recruitment too.

Prospective students will want to know how long it will take them to obtain their Ph.D. and how many years they will be required to TA.

Dr. Diffley said that he wants to look at publications and presentations, and time to degree, to see how each of these factors affects placement.

Prof. Roche said that there should be a comparison of the amount of time students spend teaching and the time they spend on their research. Dr. Diffley said that he would compare teaching load to publications and presentations.

Prof. Marino asked what the purpose would be of collecting TCE data. Dr. Poorman said it lets us know how much we are assisting students in their professional development.

Prof. Roche said that it might be good to track A.B.D.s who have jobs. Dr. Turpin said that occasionally the Grad School gets that information, but it is dependent on departments to provide it. She said she knew of only two departments in Arts and Letters that routinely place A.B.D.s.

**Placement**

Among the data points of interest to the council were the following:

- Length of time it takes a new Ph.D. to obtain the first tenure-track or research-related job
- Where students in M.A. programs go to earn Ph.D.s
- Number of job offers received by our Ph.D.s
- Qualities that distinguish students who get tenure-track appointments in top tier schools
• Prestigious nonacademic placements
• Institutions from which faculty come
• Institutions where Notre Dame grads go to grad school

Prof. Leyerle said that students in master's degree programs would be interested in knowing where previous M.A. recipients have gone to obtain their Ph.D.s. Dr. Turpin said that the Grad School has been tracking master's degree placement for only two years, and the data is fairly thin.

Prof. Gould said that the quality of placements is very important, and that Dr. Turpin's comparative placement report was very helpful. He suggested, however, that we shouldn't just lump schools into two categories; finer gradations are necessary.

Prof. Roche said that it would be good for graduate students to have a choice of jobs so that they wouldn't have to take the only job that is offered; perhaps the number of offers could be tracked as we moved up in the rankings. He noted that we have so few placements in the top tier that it would be interesting to try to determine what allowed these students to obtain these jobs. Is there some set of common characteristics among these people?

Prof. Roche also asked whether it would be possible to do a comparative study of research-related placements. Dr. Diffley said that this would be very hard to do as there is no objective ranking of employers in these cases. Dr. Akai added that it would be difficult, for example, to compare a staff psychologist at a small clinic with one at a university. Which is more 'prestigious'? Prof. Roche noted that some departments say that the reason students aren't getting tenure-track jobs is because they end up in research jobs. We must be able to look at that. Dr. Diffley said that it would be helpful if the council could assist in compiling a list of desirable nonacademic jobs.

Prof. Leyerle argued that we also need to keep in mind what kind of jobs the students actually want; it is also a measure of success if we are able to place them in an unranked institution if that is what they want. Dr. Diffley replied that it's possible to measure our level of success by comparing students' statements of intent on their applications with the jobs they eventually get.

Prof. Smith suggested investigating where hiring institutions are getting their Ph.D.s from. It might be helpful to look at programs, not necessarily in the top tier, that are producing and placing a lot of Ph.D.s and to figure out what they are doing to attract students.

Prof. Roche argued that long term tracking of our Ph.D.s is important; we need to find out, for example, if they eventually earn tenure. He also suggested tracking ND B.A.s who have gone on to top 50 graduate programs.

Prof. Crowe argued that it would be more valuable to know what people are doing three years out instead of upon graduation. Architecture students, for instance, may be in internships right after graduation; they would most likely have a more permanent placement after three years.

**Faculty Profiles**

Prof. Diffley asked what departmental statistics are important to maintain. The Council made the following suggestions:

- Number of full-time tenure-track faculty
- Number of faculty by rank
- Faculty origins (i.e., previous job, Ph.D.-granting institution)
- Number of faculty who have mentored Ph.D.s in the last five years
- Percentage of faculty who have outside support
- Number of faculty who have received research awards

Prof. Turner argued that we need better and more current information on reputation at the subdisciplinary level. He suggested that the Grad School and departments work together to distribute a list of faculty at all ranks in the subdisciplines to a select list of schools and ask them to rank our faculty. Dr. Diffley replied that it is important to have rankings at the subdisciplinary level and that U.S. News and World Report does provide them.

Prof. Kantor said that some disciplines use citations as a measure of scholarly impact and that this is something that we could contract to do. Prof. Turner said that this wouldn't work in history.

Prof. Roche said that we could invite a few other institutions to participate in the collection of this data. NRC is so slow and its methodology is not as reliable as that suggested by Prof. Turner.

Prof. Kantor stated that the Graduate School is committed to building a better set of metrics and to working with the departments to provide information that can be used for comparisons. He adjourned the meeting at 4:50 p.m.

A. Commitment to Diversity

The University of Notre Dame has a long-standing commitment to increasing the presence of minorities, women, Catholics, and members of the Congregation of Holy Cross on the teaching-and-research faculty. In 1970, then President Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh created the Affirmative Action Committee and directed its members to prepare the University's Affirmative Action Program. The affirmative action plan was completed five years later in 1975. In a letter addressed to the University officers, deans, department heads, and chairs, publishing the University's statement of affirmative action goals and objectives, Rev. Hesburgh articulated this commitment:

I have long since come to the conclusion that no amount of rhetoric can bring social change in a society, not even in such a committed society as the University of Notre Dame. We are committed to academic excellence, but, at the same time, we are committed to achieving this goal within the context of justice for all our minorities who in one way or another have never had an adequate share in the task here. I have no problem in visualizing this search for excellence with the constant concern for justice in the matter of hirings and promotions. It is not an easy task, but it will have to be accomplished at the departmental level because that is where the hirings mainly take place.

In his annual address to the faculty delivered on October 8, 1996, President Rev. Edward A. Malloy reaffirmed the University's commitment to affirmative action:

In a time in the history of American higher education when opposition to this policy of affirmative action has become commonplace and strident, I want to urge us to ratchet up our commitment. I am convinced that affirmative action is the best method available to make Notre Dame a more inclusive and representative institution.

Additionally, Provost Nathan O. Hatch, in an address to the faculty delivered on September 18, 1996, identified increasing the presence of women, racial minorities, and Catholic scholars as one of the provost's "Six Priorities for Academic Life" at Notre Dame. Noting that in the next decade the University planned to add as many as 150 new faculty, in addition to replacing faculty who choose to retire, he stressed that special attention should be given "to women, people of color, and persons who would enliven Notre Dame as a Catholic center of learning ... ."

Diversifying the Notre Dame faculty remains a high University priority. However, we are far from achieving the diversity necessary to realize our aspirations as a premier Catholic research and teaching institution. In 2002, the number of faculty and students from historically underrepresented groups remains well below the national averages for other institutions of high education and below that of our peer institutions. As Father Hesburgh stated, "no amount of rhetoric can bring social change." In other words, good intentions, and an adherence to a written policy of non-discrimination, will not, by itself, change the racial and gender composition of the teaching-and-research faculty. As we begin the process of developing and implementing a strategic plan for the next decade, special attention must be paid to translating the ideal of faculty diversity into a reality at Notre Dame. That our best efforts have been largely unsuccessful, especially with regard to increasing the numbers of African-American students and faculty, suggests the need to re-examine our efforts and strategies and to take bold steps in new directions. Specific strategic goals should include a commitment to double the numbers of African-American full-time teaching-and-research faculty by 2012, to strengthen and raise the visibility of African-American and multicultural studies at Notre Dame while continuing to support and strengthen Hispanic/Latino studies, and to expand and intensify efforts to recruit and retain faculty and students from historically underrepresented groups. At the same time, as Rev. Hesburgh correctly observed, if success is to be realized in this endeavor it must be accomplished at the departmental level where faculty recruitment and hiring takes place. Therefore, strategic planning must continue to emphasize accountability at the departmental level as well, and ensure that every reasonable effort is made to include highly qualified women and racial minorities in the faculty applicant pool.

B. Office of Institutional Equity

In the fall of 2001, the University of Notre Dame created a new Office of Institutional Equity and appointed Rhonda Brown as its first director. Before coming to Notre Dame, Rhonda served for eight years as affirmative action officer at the College of the Holy Cross in Worcester, Massachusetts, and, for her last six years, as assistant to the president. Brown will work directly with departments on faculty hiring as well as with the Academic Affirmative Action Committee on furthering diversity initiatives. In addition, the Office for Institutional Equity will handle discrimination and gender equity issues and house the University ombudpersons for sexual and discriminatory harassment.

C. Appointment of College Diversity Officers and Description of Their Duties

At the recommendation of the Academic Affirmative Action Committee (AAAC), the provost directed the deans of the Colleges of Arts and Letters, Science, Engineering, Business, and the Law School in Spring 1997 to appoint someone from their respective faculties who would have responsibility for developing and implementing a plan of action to increase faculty diversity in each college. It became readily apparent to the provost and the members of the AAAC that in the absence of such a plan, there is simply no way to effectively monitor and evaluate efforts to enhance diversity on the faculty. The persons appointed in each college have been referred to by the AAAC as the "College Diversity Officers."

The College Diversity Officer (CDO) has several responsibilities. First, at the beginning of the academic year, the
CDO is responsible for identifying the number of faculty vacancies to be filled within his/her college. Second, in coordination with the dean, Committees on Appointments and Promotions (CAP), and department chairs, the CDO is responsible for developing an "action plan" intended to increase the number of racial and ethnic minorities and women in the applicant pool for filling the faculty vacancies. To this end, the CDO works with departments to develop creative, innovative, and nontraditional methods to identify highly qualified ethnic minority and female faculty candidates. The plan, as envisioned, should detail active outreach efforts to be undertaken during the academic year to identify minority candidates. Such efforts might include, for example, active networking, where members of the CAP would contact colleagues at other peer institutions to identify prospective minority and women candidates; publishing vacancy notices in minority professional periodicals; using the Internet to identify so-called up and coming scholars whose academic interests and scholarship would make the person a good fit to fill a particular faculty vacancy; as well as attending minority professional conferences to identify prospective candidates.

The CDOs report directly both to the deans of their colleges and to the AAAC. Once the CDOs have completed their action plans, a meeting is scheduled to review the affirmative action plans with the AAAC. At this initial meeting, the CDOs discuss the number of faculty vacancies in their respective colleges, and efforts to be undertaken to ensure that women and ethnic minorities will be considered to fill those positions. After this initial meeting, the AAAC meets regularly with the CDOs to monitor implementation of the action plans. At follow-up meetings, the CDOs are asked to report on the number of on-campus interviews conducted and whether ethnic minorities and women have been invited to interview on campus. The reason for this inquiry is to determine if the action plan has been effective. If no minorities or women, or relatively few, had been invited for on-campus interviews, this would obviously bring into question the effectiveness of the action plan, and whether the plan should be amended. Data on the national availability of women and minorities in the relevant fields is compared to the department's performance with the expectation that the performance will at least meet the national availability figures.

The CDOs are further asked to report on the number of faculty offers extended, and whether any offers have been extended to women and minority candidates. This is one important way of evaluating whether the action plan has been successful in identifying women and minority candidates. If no offers have been extended to either women or minority applicants, this suggests that efforts should be intensified to identify more women and ethnic minorities. Furthermore, if an offer has been extended, but rejected, the AAAC should examine the reasons for the rejection, e.g., salary offer not competitive, lack of research support, or a spousal hiring problem. Additionally, in the case of a pending offer, if there is a spousal hiring issue that the AAAC becomes aware of, the AAAC typically asks the Administration to explore the possibility of finding the spouse a faculty position in another college or department or to assist in locating suitable employment in the surrounding communities. Early intervention by the administration often proves helpful in securing an acceptance of the offer.

At the end of the academic year the CDOs are required to submit a final report to the AAAC summarizing the hiring efforts for the year. The final report describes the efforts undertaken to fill the faculty vacancies with women and ethnic minorities. The report further details the total number of on-campus visits, as well as offers and acceptances by race and gender. The CDOs are also asked to evaluate whether their action plans were successful and, if not, why not.

Finally, the AAAC takes the final reports submitted by the CDOs and prepares a year-end report summarizing the progress made (or lack thereof) in increasing the ethnic and gender diversity of the faculty. The report is submitted to the Provost and published in the Notre Dame Report.

D. Evaluation of the College Diversity Officer Affirmative Action Plans

The College Diversity Officers were appointed for the first time in 1997 and asked to develop affirmative action plans for increasing faculty diversity. The results have been mixed. In 1996-1997, before the College Diversity Officers began their work, there were 120 women on the regular teaching-and-research faculty. In 1997-1998, that number increased from 120 to 127. In 1998-1999, the number of women on the regular teaching-and-research faculty increased to 131; it reached 141 in 1999-2000, 153 in 2000-2001, and 171 by the fall of 2001. Thus, since the appointment of the College Diversity Officers in 1996-1997, and implementation of the action plans, the number of women on the regular teaching-and-research faculty increased from 120 to 171, or by a total of 51 women. Although the total number of teaching-and-research faculty has also been growing during this same time period, the percentage of women on the teaching-and-research faculty has increased from 17.4 percent in 1996-1997 to 22 percent in 2001-2002. While the percentage of women has been steadily increasing, significant additional progress still needs to be made; indeed, the progress is not now as rapid as it was in the early 1990s.

The results have been even less impressive with respect to racial minorities. In 1996-1997, there were 11 African-Americans on the regular teaching-and-research faculty (1.6 percent). By the fall of 2000, the number had increased to 16 (2.2 percent). The number remained at 16 for 2001-2002.

The number of Hispanics has remained relatively static, with the number of regular teaching-and-research faculty only increasing slightly over the last few years. In 1996-1997, there were 25 Hispanics on the regular teaching-and-research faculty (3.6 percent). In 2001-2002, the number of Hispanics has increased by 6 to 31 (4.0 percent). In light of the minimal progress that has been realized in increasing the number of African-Americans and Hispanics on the Notre Dame faculty, recruitment efforts and strategies must be re-examined.

The numbers cited above show the net change on the faculty over the period of
time that the AAAC has established the practice of working with College Diversity Officers. The net change reflects not only new hires but also separations from the University. The hiring picture is a bit brighter.

The hiring patterns of the last six years reflect a growth in the total faculty as a consequence of new faculty lines being added as a part of the Colloquy plan, which calls for 150 new faculty slots over a 10-year period. In the past six years, more than 80 new faculty positions have been added to the teaching-and-research faculty. It is not possible to separate the persons who occupy those new positions from other newly hired faculty who replace a faculty member leaving the University. It has been our aim that the hiring patterns of departments at least reflect the national availability figures for the relevant disciplines. Over the past seven years, 321 new teaching-and-research faculty members were hired. Ninety-five of them (29.5 percent) were women and 52 (16 percent) were racial or ethnic minorities. The rate at which women have been hired has been relatively constant over that period of time: 2001-02—27.7 percent; 2000-01—30 percent; 1999-00—30 percent; 1998-99—30 percent; 1997-98—33 percent; 1996-97—34 percent; 1995-96—23 percent. The hiring of minorities varies more significantly: 2001-02—27.7 percent; 2000-01—16 percent; 1999-00—22 percent; 1998-99—13 percent; 1997-98—3 percent; 1996-97—24 percent; and 1995-96—9 percent).

While the current profiles of most departments do not match the current availability figures, the departments typically have been built over a period of 30 years and the availability figures have changed significantly during that time period. A better test is to compare our recent hiring patterns with national availability figures. Our hiring of women over the last six years has been at the rate of 30 percent, while the percentage of women receiving Ph.D.s in 2000 (the last year for which we have data) was 43 percent. That suggests that we are falling short of our goal. However, in the Notre Dame group most closely comparable to the newly minted Ph.D.s in 2000, assistant professors who were members of the teaching-and-research faculty in 2000-2001, the percentage of women was 40 percent. (At Notre Dame in 2001-2002, women constituted 41 percent of the teaching-and-research faculty at the rank of assistant.) It is even more accurate to compare recent hiring percentages to the availability percentages in each discipline. The availability percentages vary widely by discipline. The 43 percent national figure includes Ph.D.s in education, where women received 64.9 percent of the Ph.D.s in 2000 and Notre Dame has a small education program (associated with the ACE program) and consequently does not really hire in that field. The availability percentages also include Engineering. Only 15.7 percent of the engineering Ph.D.s at the University were awarded to women in 2000. While recruiting a diverse faculty (both gender and ethnic diversity) is an important goal of the University, it is equally important to strengthen the structures that would facilitate the promotion and retention of racial and ethnic minority and women members of the faculty. Furthermore, any progress made in recruiting a diverse faculty may be undermined if women and minority faculty, for whatever reason, leave the University. With this in mind, the Academic Affirmative Action Committee formed a Subcommittee on Promotion and Retention to study the issues that are of most importance with respect to retaining minorities and women.

In 1997-1998, the Subcommittee on Retention and Promotion of the AAAC conducted a series of focus group meetings with women and minority faculty to identify problems affecting promotion and retention and to suggest solutions. At these meetings, faculty expressed the need to have faculty mentors to assist incoming faculty in acclimating themselves to both the academic environment of the University, as well as the local community.

In 1998-1999, based upon what was learned during the focus group meetings, the subcommittee determined that two distinct kinds of mentoring should be addressed: academic mentoring (providing guidance on professional matters, including, for example, navigating the tenure process, scholarship, teaching, and joint research) and informal mentoring (providing guidance about social structures of the University and the South Bend community).

The subcommittee met jointly with subcommittee members of the University Committee on Women Faculty and Students and the University Committee on Cultural Diversity, both of which had conducted their own research and discussions on the critical need of mentoring. Based on the recommendations made by these subcommittees, the University has implemented the following:

1. Academic Mentoring Program

Provost Nathan Hatch has recommended that the deans of each of the colleges establish a faculty mentoring program. The main objective of the mentoring program is to ensure that all departments have a plan in place to accommodate the academic needs of incoming faculty. Furthermore, in order for the academic mentoring programs to succeed, the support of the deans is absolutely essential.

The University recognizes that a "one size fits all" mentoring program is not always desirable. Thus, department chairs should ask incoming faculty what particular type of mentoring they would find most helpful and whether they have a preference or suggestion for a mentor. Initially, the chairs should suggest one-year pairings that could be renewed if the mentoring proves beneficial. To encourage faculty participation in the mentoring program, mentoring should be counted as a service contribution.

Additionally, deans and chairs are strongly urged to excuse incoming faculty from committee service during the first year following a faculty appoint-
ment and to require limited service on committees before tenure. The University recognizes that committee work can consume valuable time more appropriately directed towards teaching, research, and scholarship. However, limited committee work is appropriate both to make new faculty members aware of the expectation of participation in the work needed to promote the common good of the department, college, and University, and to permit evaluation of a faculty member’s ability and willingness to so participate.

2. Social Mentoring Program

In 1999-2000, the Subcommittee on Promotion and Retention, together with the Committee on Cultural Diversity, organized a social mentoring program. Although motivated by the concerns raised by women and minority faculty members, the program is open to all faculty members. This service operates across all departments and colleges and is intended to complement existing sources of information about Notre Dame and the South Bend community. For example, the social mentoring program might be helpful in introducing incoming ethnic minorities to other ethnic members of the faculty, as well as to members of the local ethnic community. It offers the opportunity to discuss University-related matters with a person outside the new faculty member’s department and frees the discussion from the possibility that the mentor may one day sit in judgment on the new faculty member’s tenure or promotion case.

The mentoring program operates on an informal basis. The mentors and mentees may decide to meet monthly for lunch, or talk by phone when a question arises, or combine e-mail and personal meetings. This informal service will not replace the usual sources of information about promotion and tenure—indeed, the faculty mentors are urged to refer tenure-track faculty to their department chairs for information about their own departmental procedures.

To date, the program has been well received by the faculty. In the first year of offering this service (1999-2000), 23 requests were received from recently hired faculty seeking a mentor. These faculty were paired with senior faculty mentors. Requests for this year (2001-2002) and last year (2000-2001) have been stable at approximately 12. The higher number of requests in the first year may partially reflect the desire of several junior faculty with more than one year of service to participate in this initiative, not just the group hired in the most recent year.

In order to obtain some feedback on the effectiveness of the social mentoring initiative, an informal e-mail survey of the 1999-2000 participants was conducted. Of the 23 pairs (46 participants), 41 received the survey and 16 responded (7 mentees and 9 mentors). The most common benefit stated by both groups is meeting new junior/se­nior faculty outside of one’s department. The mentees responded almost equally to receiving benefits and not receiving benefits. Both mentors and mentees also made some suggestions for enhancing the effectiveness of the initiative.

Based on the information obtained from the survey and on committee discussions, the AAAC made plans to (i) better communicate the purposes for the initiative and provide better guidance for both the mentor and mentee; (ii) communicate somewhat more formally with participants, using typed letters in addition to e-mail messages; and (iii) hold an informal social event soon after the pairings to bring together all mentors, mentees, and AAAC members to discuss the expectations and guidelines, as well as to provide a social occasion that will initiate communication between the mentors and their mentees. For the 2000-2001 participants (12 pairs), a social event was held in September. In addition, the AAAC hosted an informal reception for participants and others interested in the program in the spring of 2002. A survey of participants is conducted regularly to gather feedback about the program.

Report of the Subcommittee on Recruitment for the Year 2001-2002

During the 2001-2002 academic year some progress was made to diversify the teaching-and-research faculty at the University of Notre Dame. Especially encouraging is the addition of three women to the faculty ranks of the College of Engineering. However, while the percentages of minorities hired increased over that of the preceding year (from 16 percent to 27.7 percent), the percentages of women hired slipped below that of the preceding year (from 30 percent to 27.7 percent). Thirty-six teaching-and-research faculty were hired for the 2001-2002 academic year. At the time this report was submitted, nine additional appointments were in the process of being finalized. Of the 36 faculty members hired, 10 are women (seven white and three minority) and 26 are men (seven white and two minority). In comparison, during 1999-2000, there were 60 hires—26 of them women (19 white and seven minority) and 34 men (13 of whom are racial or ethnic minorities [six men and seven women]). During 2000-2001, there were 62 hires—18 women (16 white and two minorities) and 44 men (nine of whom are racial or ethnic minority groups [seven men and two women]).

With respect to filling 23 teaching-and-research faculty positions in the College of Arts and Letters, six were filled by women, and seven were filled by members of a racial or ethnic minority group, including two Asian males, two African Americans, and three Hispanics (two men and one woman). The Mendoza College of Business made one new faculty hire, an Asian male. The College of Engineering hired six faculty members, including three women and two members of an ethnic minority group (one Asian male and one Asian female). Four offers to join the faculty of the College of Science were accepted. Although one woman initially accepted an offer, her acceptance was later withdrawn, and all those hired were men. There were no offers accepted from members of a racial or ethnic minority group. The Law School made two faculty hires, including one woman. An examination of these numbers reveals that of 36 faculty hires, only two are African American, and three are Hispanic or Latino. No African Americans or Hispanics were hired to join the teaching-and-research faculty ranks in the Colleges of Business, Science, Engineering or Law. Women were hired in all colleges except Science and Business.
College of Arts and Letters

Despite the progress that is being made, in 2001-2002 the overall picture of the college continued to be disappointing in light of the fact that the availability of women and minorities is relatively high in a large number of the disciplines represented in the college. There were 385 members of the regular teaching-and-research faculty of the College of Arts and Letters. Of this number, 30 percent were women (118 of 385) and 10 percent were ethnic minority (40 of 385).

There were 18 openings in the College of Arts of Letters for both tenure track and senior appointments. All departments advertised widely and used various electronic networks. A number of special initiatives in the college were employed to attract both women and racial minorities to Notre Dame. For example, the Institute for Scholarship in the Liberal Arts (ISLA) sponsors the Young Scholars Program, which helps departments identify and bring to campus pre-tenure minority and female scholars by inviting them to present a lecture at Notre Dame. Similarly, the African and African-American Studies Program brings to campus at least two Erskine Peters Fellows annually. However, because of the quality of the pool and the importance of the endeavor, the college and the University funded four Fellows in 2000-2001, five Fellows in 2001-2002, and will support six Fellows in 2002-03. Finally, each department's search committee has been encouraged to have an affirmative action designate.

In hiring 23 faculty members for the coming year, the College had hired a total of six women and seven members of ethnic minorities (five men and two women) at the time this report was written. In comparison, last year 30 hires were made—10 women and five members of ethnic minorities, and the previous year, 35 hires were made—15 of whom were women and 10 were minorities (six of them women). Most of the hires in 1999-2000 (in which 71 percent of the hires in the college were women or members of ethnic or racial minorities) were target-of-opportunity hires (TOP). Lower numbers for 2001-2002 (47 percent) and 2000-2001 (50 percent) may reflect, in part, reduced flexibility in TOP hiring.

There was a concerted effort to generate greater awareness of the importance of diversity in hiring throughout the College of Arts and Letters this year. Every department received information in the fall concerning the overall composition of the College's faculty by gender, race, and ethnicity. The CDO and the associate dean of the faculty met with groups of department chairs to discuss best practices for recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty. Rhonda Brown, Director of the Office of Institutional Equity, will continue to work closely with specific departments within the college during 2002-03.

Mendoza College of Business

In the fall of 2001, there were 98 members of the regular teaching-and-research faculty in the Mendoza College of Business—18 percent are women (18 of 98) and 22 percent are members of ethnic minorities (22 of 98).

The Mendoza College of Business recruited to fill seven open positions at the entry level for 2001-2002. Thirteen men and 12 women were invited to campus for interviews, including 13 members of ethnic or racial minorities. Seven offers were extended—three to men and four to women candidates. One Asian male accepted.

All the departments advertised widely, including Internet-based sites that are sponsored by key professional organizations. Contacts were also made with faculty and department chairs of target schools from which MCOB would like to hire Ph.D. candidates. While directories of women and minority Ph.D. candidates have been examined, they have not been very helpful since the listings are quite broad. All departments doing hiring had active search committees working diligently and aggressively to identify and pursue qualified minority and women candidates. This resulted in increasing the pool of qualified women and minority candidates invited for campus interviews.

College of Engineering

As of fall semester 2001, the College of Engineering had 93 teaching-and-research faculty members. Four were women (4.3 percent) and 13 were members of racial or ethnic minorities (13 percent). This year the College of Engineering made great strides in hiring women, increasing by 75 percent the number of women faculty. Six new faculty members were hired—one Asian female, two white females, one Asian male, and two white males.

The commitment to attracting qualified female candidates was evident through the hiring process. A search committee was formed to identify candidates for the Luce Assistant Professorship (an appointment which is reserved for a female faculty member and which has remained unfilled for the last two years). Fourteen out of 40 on-campus interviews were of female candidates. Six out of 11 initial offers were made to female candidates. These numbers are particularly impressive given the low availability of female engineering faculty candidates (in the 10-15 percent range by some estimates, and much lower in some disciplines).

The College was unsuccessful this year in hiring members of ethnic or racial groups historically underrepresented in engineering. However, the College was successful in hiring ethnic minority faculty in 2000-2001.

College of Science

There were 22 women among the 144 teaching and research faculty members in the College of Science in the fall of 2001 (14.5 percent) and 17 persons from historically under-represented minority groups (11.6 percent). It is noteworthy that the college has two departments (Mathematics and Physics) in which there are three women at the rank of full professor. In addition, over the last decade, the college has used junior, or term, chairs to hire seven women (two of whom were ethnic minorities) and one minority male. The college also makes special efforts in the area of spousal hiring. There are eight couples, both members of which are on the faculty of the college.

During the academic year 2001-2002, the College of Science recruited to fill 11 faculty positions. Of 50 on-campus interviews, seven were of female faculty candidates and 17 were of candidates from ethnic or racial minority groups. Four appointments were made to white males. (One offer, initially accepted by a female candidate, was later
Law School

As of the fall of 2001, the Law School had 32 teaching-and-research faculty members, consisting of seven women (21 percent) and three members of racial and ethnic minority groups (nine percent). The number of women on the law faculty does not compare favorably when measured against peer law schools, many of which average over 30 percent women on their faculties. In 2001-2002, the Law School recruited to fill four faculty vacancies. Ten prospective faculty members were invited for on-campus interviews including four female candidates and two African-American candidates. Two faculty hires were made, one man and one woman. No minority candidates were hired this year.

The Law School continues to explore strategies for attracting and retaining faculty from historically underrepresented ethnic or racial minority groups.

FACULTY STATISTICS

The following tables are similar to those published for the last several years. They describe the composition of the faculty during academic year 2001-2002 and do not reflect the hiring done for the next fall. The first three show the breakdown between men and women on the faculty and the last four provide information about the presence on the faculty of persons from minority groups.

There was a slight decrease in the overall percentage of women on the faculty (from 28.7 percent to 28.4 percent) and similar decrease in the overall percentage of minority faculty members (from 13.1 to 12.9 percent) from academic years 2000-2001 to 2001-2002. Within the ranks of the teaching-and-research faculty, the number of female full and assistant professors increased (from 29 to 34 and from 58 to 69 respectively), while the number of female associate professors remained the same (at 57). The total number of regular teaching-and-research minority faculty members increased from 93 to 98.

Tables 3 and 6 compare the actual presence on the Notre Dame faculty of women and minority faculty members with a national availability figure. Unfortunately, for the past several years it has been difficult to obtain cumulative numbers for use as the national availability percentage. Therefore, the availability percentage is computed using the number of Ph.D.s awarded to women or minorities in the various fields in 2000 (the most recent year for which there is such data). This information is obtained from the National Opinion Research Council at the University of Chicago, which surveys all U.S. doctoral granting institutions. Because the availability percentage is computed using the number of degrees awarded in a single year, the availability figure is subject to more change from one year to the next than it would be if it were computed using data from several years. This is especially true in fields in which very small numbers of Ph.D.s are awarded. In most disciplines the change from the availability percentage used in last year's report to the percentage used this year is not great, in a few disciplines the change is significant. The availability percentage in both Tables 3 and 6 are computed using only degrees awarded to U.S. citizens and permanent residents because, for reasons explained above, the departmental numbers and figures are based only upon those faculty members who are U.S. citizens and permanent residents.

1. The AAAC meets periodically to set policy guidelines and to review the work of the two subcommittees. The full committee is divided into two subcommittees: the Recruitment Subcomm
### TABLE 1

Total Male/Female Composition for 2001-02 by Faculty Categories, Number of Faculty, and Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Faculty</strong></td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>1134 (71.5%)</td>
<td>450 (28.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGULAR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Regular</strong></td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>831 (71.4%)</td>
<td>332 (28.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Research</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>600 (77.8%)</td>
<td>171 (22.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Professional</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>150 (56.6%)</td>
<td>115 (43.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21 (77.7%)</td>
<td>6 (22.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25 (45.4%)</td>
<td>30 (54.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35 (77.7%)</td>
<td>10 (22.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON-REGULAR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-Regular</strong></td>
<td>421</td>
<td>303 (71.9%)</td>
<td>118 (28.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Research</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>271 (73.8%)</td>
<td>96 (26.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Professional</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5 (45.4%)</td>
<td>6 (54.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7 (77.7%)</td>
<td>2 (22.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (66.6%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18 (58.0%)</td>
<td>13 (41.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Includes U.S. citizens, permanent residents, and non-resident aliens.
TABLE 2

Male/Female Composition for 2001-02 by Faculty Categories and Rank
U.S. Citizens and Permanent Residents Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REGULAR FACULTY</th>
<th>Non-Regular Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Men Women</td>
<td>Total Men Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1113 320</td>
<td>335 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>737 163</td>
<td>294 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>328 34</td>
<td>59 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>243 57</td>
<td>43 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>162 69</td>
<td>113 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>4 3</td>
<td>79 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>257 113</td>
<td>11 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>58 12</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>90 41</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>107 60</td>
<td>0 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>22 6</td>
<td>3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>5 1</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>8 2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>9 3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>53 28</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>18 10</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>21 11</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>13 6</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44 10</td>
<td>27 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Note: This differs from Table 1, which includes non-resident aliens.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Female Availability¹</th>
<th>Women Actual²</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts and Letters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Studies</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>1 (25.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>9 (56.2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art, Art History &amp; Design</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>5 (27.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>3 (27.2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian Lang.</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>1 (20.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>3 (13.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>16 (43.2%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film, Television &amp; Theatre</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>6 (66.6%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German &amp; Russian Lang.</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>3 (33.3%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>11 (30.5%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>9 (32.1%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>6 (46.1%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>5 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program of Liberal Studies</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 (21.4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>9 (34.6%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romance Lang.</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>11 (52.3%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>6 (28.5%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>8 (20.5%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountancy</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>5 (21.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>5 (19.2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>4 (13.8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>3 (23.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3 — continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Female Availability¹</th>
<th>Women Actual²</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace &amp; Mechanical</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil &amp; Geological</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>1 (5.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>8 (24.2%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry &amp; Biochemistry</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>3 (10.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>4 (-9.0%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>4 (10.5%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law School</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6 (20.0%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>23 (52.3%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law Library</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5 (55.6%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. U.S. citizens and permanent residents.
### TABLE 4

Minority Composition for 2001-02 Faculty Categories, Number of Faculty and Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Minority</th>
<th>African/ African Am.</th>
<th>Asian/ Pacific Is.</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Native Am.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FACULTY</strong></td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>205 (12.9%)</td>
<td>43 ( 2.7%)</td>
<td>83 ( 5.2%)</td>
<td>74 ( 4.6%)</td>
<td>5 (0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGULAR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Regular</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>147 (12.5%)</td>
<td>30 ( 2.5%)</td>
<td>68 ( 5.8%)</td>
<td>46 ( 3.9%)</td>
<td>3 (0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Research</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>98 (12.7%)</td>
<td>16 ( 2.0%)</td>
<td>49 ( 6.3%)</td>
<td>31 ( 4.0%)</td>
<td>2 (0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Professional</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>39 (14.7%)</td>
<td>12 ( 4.5%)</td>
<td>12 ( 4.5%)</td>
<td>14 ( 5.2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5 (18.5%)</td>
<td>0 ( 0%)</td>
<td>5 (18.5%)</td>
<td>0 ( 0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2 ( 3.6%)</td>
<td>1 ( 1.8%)</td>
<td>1 ( 1.8%)</td>
<td>0 ( 0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3 ( 6.6%)</td>
<td>1 ( 2.2%)</td>
<td>1 ( 2.2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON-REGULAR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Regular</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>58 (13.7%)</td>
<td>13 ( 3.0%)</td>
<td>15 ( 3.5%)</td>
<td>28 ( 6.6%)</td>
<td>2 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Research</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>38 (10.3%)</td>
<td>7 ( 1.9%)</td>
<td>14 ( 3.8%)</td>
<td>17 ( 4.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Professional</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4 (36.3%)</td>
<td>0 ( 0%)</td>
<td>0 ( 0%)</td>
<td>3 (27.2%)</td>
<td>1 (9.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4 (44.4%)</td>
<td>0 ( 0%)</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
<td>3 (33.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (66.6%)</td>
<td>0 ( 0%)</td>
<td>0 ( 0%)</td>
<td>2 (66.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10 (32.2%)</td>
<td>6 (19.3%)</td>
<td>0 ( 0%)</td>
<td>3 (9.6%)</td>
<td>1 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Includes U.S. citizens, permanent residents, and non-resident aliens.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian Pacific Is.</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Native Am.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Note: This differs from Table 4 which includes non-resident aliens.
### TABLE 5.1

Minority Composition for 2001-02 Faculty Categories and Rank
U.S. Citizens and Permanent Residents Only

**NON-REGULAR FACULTY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Minority</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian Pacific Is.</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Native Am.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>335</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching &amp; Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Professional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 6
Minority Availability and Composition
Regular Teaching and Research Faculty 2001-02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Total Minority Availability</th>
<th>Minority Actual</th>
<th>Black Availability</th>
<th>Black Actual</th>
<th>Asian Availability</th>
<th>Asian Actual</th>
<th>Hispanic Availability</th>
<th>Hispanic Actual</th>
<th>Native Am. Availability</th>
<th>Native Am. Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Studies</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>3 (20.0%)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>4 (22.2%)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1 (5.6%)</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1 (5.6%)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1 (11.0%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1 (11.0%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>2 (40.0%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>2 (40.0%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>6 (27.2%)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>5 (22.7%)</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1 (4.5%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>3 (8.1%)</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2 (5.4%)</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1 (2.7%)</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTT</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German &amp; Russian</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>2 (7.1%)</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1 (3.5%)</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1 (3.5%)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>2 (5.0%)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2 (5.0%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLS</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 (7.1%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>3 (8.3%)</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>1 (2.7%)</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1 (2.7%)</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1 (2.7%)</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>3 (11.5%)</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1 (3.8%)</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1 (3.8%)</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romance Lang.</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>4 (19.0%)</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1 (4.7%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>3 (14.2%)</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>4 (19.0%)</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>2 (9.5%)</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2 (9.5%)</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>1 (2.6%)</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1 (2.6%)</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountancy</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>6 (26.0%)</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>2 (8.6%)</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>2 (8.6%)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2 (8.6%)</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>3 (11.5%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>2 (7.6%)</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1 (3.8%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>8 (27.5%)</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1 (3.4%)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>6 (20.6%)</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1 (3.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>2 (15.3%)</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>1 (7.6%)</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>1 (7.6%)</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aero. &amp; Mech.</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>3 (11.5%)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1 (3.8%)</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>1 (3.8%)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1 (3.8%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>5 (33.3%)</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1 (6.6%)</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil &amp; Geological</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>1 (5.5%)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>1 (5.5%)</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>2 (22.2%)</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>2 (22.2%)</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>1 (9.5%)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>1 (9.5%)</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>1 (3.0%)</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>1 (3.0%)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem. &amp; Biochem.</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>2 (7.1%)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1 (3.5%)</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>1 (3.5%)</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>10 (25.0%)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>7 (17.5%)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>3 (8.1%)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>2 (5.4%)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1 (2.7%)</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 (10.3%)</td>
<td>1 (3.4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3 (10.3%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Includes U.S. citizens and permanent residents.
**Awards and Proposal Summary**

**08/01/2002** to **08/31/2002**

### Awards Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$6,336,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,336,745</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposals Submitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$3,914,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$57,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,971,717</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All awards and proposals are credited in the Monthly Summaries report to the academic department of the primary principal investigator. The Office of Research proposal routing form asks principal investigators to indicate at the time the proposal is submitted which unit will be responsible for the conduct of the project. If that unit is a center or institute, the proposal/award is included in the Centers/Institutes report, which is a subset of the Monthly Summaries report.

The Office of Research is doing what it can to ensure all units receive credit for the proposals/awards they submit and receive. However, it depends on the Principal Investigator to properly identify responsibility for the project at the time the proposal is submitted. Please notify the Office of Research at research2@nd.edu or 1-4670 if you are aware of any proposals or awards that have not been properly credited to a center or institute.
August 2002 Cumulative summary

Awards Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>$16,864,688</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>$8,937,314</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>$14,689,165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Programs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$12,644</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$907,156</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$268,133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,902,332</strong></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,844,470</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,957,298</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposals Submitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$42,398,742</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$39,567,942</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$18,492,454</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$107,295</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$67,315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42,410,242</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>$39,675,237</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,559,769</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awards Received</strong></td>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awards for Research</strong></td>
<td><strong>ACE Educational Outreach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August 1, 2002, through August 31, 2002</strong></td>
<td><strong>Johnstone, Joyce V.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fast Forward Program Foundation</strong></td>
<td><strong>$55,400 5 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering</strong></td>
<td><strong>Skaar, Steven B.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomous and Precise 3D Positioning for Panel Engagement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Corporation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundation</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,000 6 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological Sciences</strong></td>
<td><strong>D'Souza-Schorey, Crislyn</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulation of Endothelial Barrier Function</strong></td>
<td><strong>Foundation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$82,500 12 months</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hager, Kristin M. (Center or Institute)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis of Membrane Trafficking Events in the Regulation of Organelle Biogenesis and Stability of Apicomplexan Parasites</strong></td>
<td><strong>Foundation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$50,000 48 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Welsh, JoEllen J.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Identification of Vitamin D Analogs with Anti-Tumor Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Foundation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$56,589 12 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chemical Engineering</strong></td>
<td><strong>Palmer, Andre F.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characterization of Novel Lipid Vesicles for Drug Delivery by Neutron Scattering</strong></td>
<td><strong>University of Maryland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$54,909 25 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chemistry and Biochemistry</strong></td>
<td><strong>Helquist, Paul (Center or Institute)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asymmetric Synthesis of Nitrogen-Containing Organic Compounds</strong></td>
<td><strong>Corporation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$20,000 36 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computer Science and Engineering</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hu, Xiaobo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Analysis and Tradeoff for Design Exploration</strong></td>
<td><strong>National Science Foundation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$10,000 72 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kogge, Peter M.; Brockman, Jay B.; Free, Vincent W.; Schaelicke, Lambert</strong></td>
<td><strong>High Productivity PIM Computing System</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporation</strong></td>
<td><strong>$417,912 13 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fay, Patrick J.; Lent, Craig S.; Orlov, Alexei; Kogge, Peter M.; Snider, Gregory L. (Center or Institute)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nirt: Architectures and Devices for Quantum-dot Cellular Automata</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Science Foundation</strong></td>
<td><strong>$999,999 47 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Asian Languages and Literatures</strong></td>
<td><strong>Selden, Lili I.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Tale of Genji and Its Reception as a Narrative of Desire</strong></td>
<td><strong>Columbia University</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$40,000 10 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electrical Engineering</strong></td>
<td><strong>Costello, Daniel J.; Fuja, Thomas E.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bandwidth Efficient Turbo Code Design</strong></td>
<td><strong>Corporation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$26,040 12 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rosen, Elliot D.; Castellino, Francis J. (Center or Institute)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hemostatic Balance and Arterial Thrombosis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Institutes of Health</strong></td>
<td><strong>$510,050 36 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smith, Bradley D.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Synthetic Receptors for Anions, Salts, and Neutral Molecules</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Science Foundation</strong></td>
<td><strong>$342,000 36 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fay, Patrick J.; Seabaugh, Alan C.
Antimonide-based Compound Semiconductors
Hughes Research Laboratory
$64,783 46 months

Costella, Daniel J.; Huang, Yih-Fang; Collins, Oliver M.; Fujita, Thomas E.
Resource-Efficient Digital Communications: Research and Testbed Development in Support of OFW and JTRS
Department of Army
$903,000 18 months

Hall, Douglas C.
Advanced GaAs-Based Waveguide Integration for 1.3/1.55 Micron Wavelength Division Multiplexing
National Science Foundation
$110,000 24 months

Freimann Animal Care Facility

Suckow, Mark A. (Center or Institute)
Chicken Antibody to Plant Pathogens
Corporation
$1,500 12 months

History

Beatty, Edward N.
The Origins and Determinants of Technological Change in Late 19th-Century Mexico
National Science Foundation
$27,073 24 months

Mathematics

Hind, Richard K.
Complex and Symplectic Geometry of Complexifications
National Science Foundation
$84,438 36 months

Nicholls, David P.
FRG: Collaborative: Fully Nonlinear, Three-Dimensional, Surface Water Waves in Arbitrary Depth
National Science Foundation
$56,474 36 months

Office of Information Technologies

Bellina, Brendan T.; Wishon, Gordon D.
Supporting Research and Collaboration through Integrated Middleware
Corporation
$6,911 3 months

Physics

Wiescher, Michael C.; Garcia, Alejandro; Garg, Umesh; Aprahamian, Ani
Nuclear Structure and Nuclear Astrophysics
National Science Foundation
$15,500 36 months

Balsara, Dinshaw S.
Advances in Numerical Magnetohydrodynamics-Novel Schemes and Adaptive Mesh Refinement on Structured Meshes
National Science Foundation
$36,531 35 months

Bennett, David P.
Observations and Analysis of Exotic Gravitational Microlensing Events
National Science Foundation
$90,000 36 months

Garnavich, Peter M.
Light Echos and the Nature of Type Ia Supernovae
Space Telescope Science Institute
$23,307 24 months

Furdyna, Jacek K.; Dobrowolska-Furdyna, Malgorzata; Janko, Boldizsar
NIRT: Formation and Properties of Spin-Polarized Quantum Dots in Magnetic Semiconductors by Controlled Variation of Magnetic Fields on the Nanoscale
National Science Foundation
$1,080,000 48 months

Safronova, Marianna; Johnson, Walter R.
Simulation of Quantum Logic Processing with Trapped Neutral-Atom Systems
National Institute Standards and Technology
$63,000 12 months

Kolata, James J.; Wiescher, Michael C.; Garcia, Alejandro; Garg, Umesh; Aprahamian, Ani
Nuclear Structure Research
National Science Foundation
$56,010 48 months

LoSecco, John M.
Research in CP Violation in the B Meson Sector
Department of Energy
$60,000 12 months
Ruchti, Randal C.
Waveshifters and Scintillators for Ionizing Radiation Detection
Corporation
$32,000 6 months

Ruchti, Randal C.
QuarkNet
National Science Foundation
$530,903 60 months

Psychology

Borkowski, John Gregg; Maxwell, Scott E.; Whitman, Thomas Lee
Precursors of Retardation in Children with Teen Mothers
National Institutes of Health
$249,404 48 months

Sociology

Cárdenas, Gilberto (Center or Institute)
IUPLR Latino HIV/AIDS Education and Promotion Project
Health and Human Services
$149,512 42 months

Yamane, David A.
Religion in the Statehouses: Negotiating Prophetic Demands and Political Realities
University of Virginia
$1,000 12 months

Proposals Submitted

August 1, 2002, through August 31, 2002
Proposals for Research

Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering

Mueller, Thomas J.; Morris, Scott C.
Development of Experimental Inversion and Simulation Techniques to Study Propeller Blade Response to Inflow Distortions
Department of Navy
$81,923 12 months

Anthropology

Sheridan, Susan G.; Haak, Robert D.
Biocultural Reconstruction of Byzantine Urban Monasticism
National Endowment for the Humanities
$281,210 36 months

Art, Art History and Design

Rhodes, Robin F.
Project for the Study and Publication of the Greek Stone Architecture of Corinth
National Endowment for the Humanities
$257,922 36 months

Biological Sciences

Hollocher, Hope
Genetic and Developmental Analysis of Hybrid Female Sterility Rescue Between Drosophila Melanogaster and Drosophila Simulans
National Science Foundation
$60,310 7 months

Welsh, JoEllen J.
Identification of Vitamin D Analogs with Anti-Tumor Activity
Corporation
$56,589 12 months

Chemical Engineering

Varma, Arvind
Novel Membrane Trickle-Bed Reactor for Pharmaceuticals and Fine Chemicals
National Science Foundation
$367,943 36 months

Chemistry and Biochemistry

Goodson, Holly V.
Biocomplexity and the Microtubule Cytoskeleton: The Need for Interdisciplinary Research and Teaching
Corporation
$75,000 12 months

Smith, Bradley D.
Measuring the Efficacy of Anticancer Drugs in Early Stages of Treatment
Corporation
$414,315 36 months

Civil Engineering and Geological Sciences

Jain, Jinesh C.
An Improvement of Plant-Based Technology for Removal of Radio-Nuclides and Heavy Metals from the Environment
National Research Council
$7,460 12 months
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Investigator(s)</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>A Parallel High-Bandwidth Network Audit Trail Platform</td>
<td>Schaelicke, Lambert; Freeland, Joseph C.</td>
<td>$99,597</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>Electron Beam Lithography System for Direct-Write and Mask Making</td>
<td>Bernstein, Gary H.</td>
<td>$518,800</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Metal-Molecule Interconnects and Nanomachines</td>
<td>Seabaugh, Alan C.; Liberman, Marya</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Enhancing the Potential for Higgs Discovery at the Fermilab Tevatron</td>
<td>Hildreth, Michael D.</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Latino HIV/AIDS Education and Promotion Project</td>
<td>Cárdenas, Gilberto</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>The Dead Sea Scrolls Project</td>
<td>Ulrich, Eugene C.</td>
<td>$413,191</td>
<td>24 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>Second International Workshop on Quantum Dots for Quantum Computing and Classical Size Effect Circuits</td>
<td>Porod, Wolfgang</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Awards and Proposal Summary

**Centers and Institutes Report**

08/01/2002 to 08/31/2002

#### Awards Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department or Office</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center for Orphan Drug Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Transgene Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$510,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Tropical Disease Research &amp; Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freimann Life Science Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Latino Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$149,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nano Science and Technology Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$999,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>$1,731,061</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposals Submitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department or Office</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center for Flow Physics and Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$81,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Molecularly Engineered Materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$367,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Molecular Science Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$7,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Latino Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nano Science and Technology Center</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,122,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walther Cancer Research Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$414,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>$2,144,291</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The figures attributed to centers/institutes in these reports are also included in the general reports for all awards and proposals. However, they are listed under the department of the Principal Investigator rather than the center, institute, lab, or significant University program.*
# Awards and Proposal Summary
## Centers and Institutes Report
07/01/2002 to 08/31/2002

### Awards Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department or Office</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for Catholic Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Environmental Science and Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Orphan Drug Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Transgene Research</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,023,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Tropical Disease Research &amp; Training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,953,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freimann Life Science Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Latino Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$149,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nano Science and Technology Center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,159,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIO Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$243,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$4,697,151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposals Submitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department or Office</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center for Astrophysics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$918,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Flow Physics and Control</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$117,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Molecularly Engineered Materials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,051,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Tropical Disease Research &amp; Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$117,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Molecular Science Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$7,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freimann Life Science Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$309,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higgins Labor Research Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Latino Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellogg Institute for International Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$103,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nano Science and Technology Center</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,272,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanovic Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$14,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bend Center for Medical Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$395,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walther Cancer Research Center</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$811,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$5,282,603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Awards Received

August 1, 2002, through August 31, 2002

**Awards for Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Center for Orphan Drug Development</strong></td>
<td>Asymmetric Synthesis of Nitrogen-Containing Organic Compounds Corporation</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>36 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Center for Transgene Research</strong></td>
<td>Hemostatic Balance and Arterial Thrombosis National Institutes of Health</td>
<td>$510,050</td>
<td>36 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Center for Tropical Disease Research and Training</strong></td>
<td>Analysis of Membrane Trafficking Events in the Regulation of Organelle Biogenesis and Stability of Apicomplexan Parasites Foundation</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>48 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freimann Life Science Center</strong></td>
<td>Chicken Antibody to Plant Pathogens Corporation</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institute for Latino Studies</strong></td>
<td>IUPUR Latino HIV/AIDS Education and Promotion Project Health and Human Services</td>
<td>$149,512</td>
<td>42 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nano Science and Technology Center</strong></td>
<td>Nirt: Architectures and Devices for Quantum-dot Cellular Automata National Science Foundation</td>
<td>$999,999</td>
<td>47 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposals Submitted

August 1, 2002, through August 31, 2002

**Proposals for Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Center for Flow Physics and Control</strong></td>
<td>Development of Experimental Inversion and Simulation Techniques to Study Propeller Blade Response to Inflow Distortions Department of Navy</td>
<td>$81,923</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Center for Molecularly Engineered Materials</strong></td>
<td>Novel Membrane Trickle-Bed Reactor for Pharmaceuticals and Fine Chemicals National Science Foundation</td>
<td>$367,943</td>
<td>36 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Molecular Science Institute</strong></td>
<td>An Improvement of Plant-Based Technology for Removal of Radio-Nuclides and Heavy Metals from the Environment National Research Council</td>
<td>$7,460</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institute for Latino Studies</strong></td>
<td>Latino HIV/AIDS Education and Promotion Project Health and Human Services</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nano Science and Technology Center</strong></td>
<td>Metal-Molecule Interconnects and Nanomachines Corporation</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nano Science and Technology Center</strong></td>
<td>Nirt: Architectures and Devices for Quantum-dot Cellular Automata National Science Foundation</td>
<td>$999,999</td>
<td>47 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nano Science and Technology Center</strong></td>
<td>Electron Beam Lithography System for Direct-Write and Mask Making Department of the Air Force</td>
<td>$518,800</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nano Science and Technology Center</strong></td>
<td>Electron Beam Lithography System for Direct-Write and Mask Making Department of Navy</td>
<td>$518,000</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Applications of MoS2 and WSe2 Nanotubes
National Research Council
$5,850 12 months

Walther Cancer Research Center
Measuring the Efficacy of Anticancer Drugs in Early Stages of Treatment
Corporation
$414,315 36 months

Proposals for Instructional Programs

Nano Science and Technology Center
Second International Workshop on Quantum Dots for Quantum Computing and Classical Size Effect Circuits
Department of the Air Force
$10,000 12 months

Second International Workshop on Quantum Dots for Quantum Computing and Classical Size Effect Circuits
Department of Army
$30,000 12 months