

**ACADEMIC COUNCIL
THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME
MEETING OF MARCH 27, 2002**

Members Present: Rev. Edward Malloy, C.S.C., Nathan Hatch, John Affleck-Graves, Rev. John Jenkins, C.S.C., Jeffrey Kantor, Rev. Mark Poorman, C.S.C., Frank Incropera, Eileen Kolman, Mark Roche, Carolyn Woo, Jennifer Younger, Jacqueline Brogan, Melissa Rauch, Sonia Gernes, J. Robert Wegs, Joan Aldous, Susan Blum, Vittorio Hosle, Ikaros Bigi, Umesh Garg, Joseph Powers, Edward Conlon, Jay Tidmarsh, Alan Krieger, Kenneth 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 non-smokers 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 non-smokers, 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 Flanner 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 ten 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 non-voting 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 non-voting 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 MBA 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 MBA 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. Hosle 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 MBA 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, MBA, and Law students.

Prof. DeBoer said that it is not appropriate to bring up observer status for representatives of the graduate, Law, and MBA 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 (Attachment C). 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% 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:

Salaries and Wages	81.6%
Acquisitions	77.3%
Capital	346.8%
Operating	142.6%
Preservation	40.3%

Dr. Younger explained that the *Report* also identified six areas for one-time 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 one-time 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 55th. By the 1999-2000 fiscal year, it had risen to 48th 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 twelve 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% of the University Libraries' collections budget came from unrestricted funds and 39% 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 FY2001/02 the payout rate from endowments increased 20%, of which half has been reserved in the collections budget to cover inflation – now at six to ten 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 resources. A grant request to the Plym Foundation resulted in an endowment for materials in architecture, while grants from the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations support resources in the humanities and in Italian Medieval and Renaissance 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 in the cost of books and journals is a national problem and presents a serious challenge to all libraries. Since 1986, the unit cost of journals has increased by 226%, while the

unit cost of books has increased by 66%. As a result, among 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 time 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% – 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% – 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% 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%.

(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 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 Lab for Social Research, to reduce duplicate purchases in data resources. A similar arrangement in regards 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%. This demonstrates, Dr. Younger said, how the involvement of faculty members is critical in controlling the effects of superinflation on resources.

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 & 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 within societies 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 thirteen 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 the 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 cataloged at the Center appear in the University's collections data base.

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% increase, from \$3,906,936 in FY1994–95 to \$7,093,642 in FY2000-01, in library salaries. Has there been an increase in the number of librarians and staff?

Dr. Younger answered that the 81% 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 ten to fifteen years have not received sufficient increases in salary to keep pace with their newly hired counterparts.

Dr. Younger replied that salary compression affects all long-time 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. Hosle 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 in 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. She would be happy if in every First Year course in which the discipline has any connection to information retrieval, students would be introduced to library and electronic research skills.

Ms. Mapes agreed that integrating training in library resources with classroom experiences is best. She suggested classroom projects in which hour-long sessions in accessing information would be set up by faculty members and librarians.

Ms. Rauch said that approach has worked well in various business courses she has taken – for example, assignments in using on-line journals.

Prof. DeBoer said that First Year composition students attend at least one, sometimes two, electronic information sessions. That is just a beginning in learning what information is available and how to access it. Students must be able to build on those skills and enhance them in the various disciplines and in their upper-level courses.

Ms. Dayton commented that as an undergraduate, she was a student in a composition class that did receive high-quality instruction in library resources. Those library sessions, though, were only a beginning. The best model in education is to have both repetition and interdisciplinarity. For example, knowing sources germane to writing an argument in a composition class is one thing but she might also need to know resources related to genetics or architecture – just to name two examples. The best way to acquire that knowledge is within a class in the discipline itself, not in an isolated library resources class.

Prof. Roche asked Dr. Younger to comment on student use of actual library

buildings.

She responded that physical use of the libraries as measured in turnstile counts has been steadily declining for five years. The statistics for on-line questions, in contrast, have skyrocketed. While the Hesburgh Library was once extremely crowded with students several nights a week, now that is true only on Sunday nights and during final exams. As the University renovates the building, a different kind of space is needed – particularly for computers and collaborative endeavors. Long tables with students sitting one-by-one can no longer be the pattern. Rather, when students use the library it is either for collaborative or truly individual work, and configurations in the Library's physical space need to match that need.

Returning to the issue of savings in the cost of journal subscriptions, Prof. Bigi said that the issue is one that must be decided within the colleges, or even within smaller units. For example, in Physics, it is unlikely that any thesis written more than ten years ago would hold much relevance today. And, all dissertations that have been written in the last ten years are available for free on the Los Alamos data base. He suggested that departments and colleges might be more inclined to cut costs in their materials budget if they can recover some of the savings for other purposes.

Prof. Hatch asked Dr. Younger if she believes faculty across the University are able to keep up with the vast amount and kinds of new electronic resources.

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.

Fr. Malloy asked Dr. Younger: If Notre Dame were starting from scratch, with projections showing roughly the same number of undergraduate and graduate students as are enrolled today, how would you design the library system? Would the space for collections be much larger and the space for student gathering much smaller? Would data base or access to computers be enhanced significantly beyond what computers and systems are even capable of today?

Dr. Younger responded that discussion of ideal configurations of the library's physical space were discussed during the renovation process for the Hesburgh Library. They recognized at the time that the amount of space for collections, users, and staff would all go up if that kind of room were available, but that the ratio of space allocated to collections, users, and staff, respectively, would change. Due to cooperative off-site storage and electronic access, collaborative learning, and more staff, the amount of space for collections would decline relative to the amount of space for users and staff.

Fr. Malloy noted that funding for higher education in the public sector is

particularly low at this time. He asked what influence that had on, for example, building collections – both for journals and books.

Dr. Younger replied that in regard to collections, funding cuts are affecting all of Notre Dame's peer libraries. Research libraries are focusing increasingly on building collections in the academic areas in which they are already strong or in those in which they want to be strong. That is not necessarily a bad thing. It is particularly good for Notre Dame, which is in the middle tier in rankings but has aspirations to be a great library. Because libraries' reputations *do* rest to a large degree on collections, in the face of funding cuts, libraries across the nation are beginning to develop niches.

In terms of user space, Dr. Younger said, the Libraries are working with others on campus for the use of campus space as student study space. Reference librarians are experimenting with chat software so that they can interact with faculty and students via computers anywhere on campus, which would make it possible for students to study in classroom buildings yet have access to expert assistance for help in finding or using information.

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 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. Hosle said that Hesburgh Library frequently sells books for \$1.00 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. Gernes said that the committee's first agenda item – adding members to the Academic Council in connection with the restructuring of the Faculty Senate – had been completed at the last meeting. Next, in connection with a motion from the Grievance Committee of the Faculty Senate, members will discuss procedures that come into play when a faculty member is accused of harassment. The Grievance Committee's motion was discussed at the Executive Committee meeting, where it was referred back to the Faculty Affairs Committee with the suggestion that it form a joint committee with the Grievance Committee to explore the issues further.

(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