

**UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME
THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL
MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2003**

Members Present: Rev. Edward Malloy, C.S.C., Rev. Timothy Scully, C.S.C., John Affleck-Graves, Carol Ann Mooney, Jeffrey Kantor, Rev. Mark Poorman, C.S.C., Frank Incropera, Joseph Marino, Patricia O'Hara, Jennifer Younger, John Robinson, Jay Brandenberger, Thomas Merluzzi, Albert Miller, Pit-Mann Wong, James Ryan, Dennis Jacobs, Patricia Maurice, Thomas Noble, Joan Aldous, Brian Krostenko, Cornelius Delaney, Vittorio Hosle, John Welle, Steven Buechler, Panos Antsaklis, Mihir Sen, Robert Bretz, Thomas Frecka, Jay Tidmarsh, J. Douglas Archer, Kenneth DeBoer, Ava Preacher, Anthony Hagale, Meghan McCabe, Bradley Buser, Sean Thornton

Members Absent: Mary Rose D'Angelo, Umesh Garg, Dino Marcantonio, Stephanie Arnett

Members Excused: Nathan Hatch, Rev. John Jenkins, C.S.C., Eileen Kolman, Mark Roche, Carolyn Woo, Michael Lykoudis, Patricia Blanchette, Teresa Ghilarducci, Mitchell Wayne

Observers Present: Mary Hendriksen, Harold Pace, Daniel Saracino

Observers Absent: Dennis K. Moore, Thomas Laughner

Observers Excused: Lt. Col. David Mosinski

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

1. Approval of the minutes of the Meeting of February 18, 2003. By a unanimous vote, the minutes of the meeting of February 18, 2003, were approved without amendment.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of March 20, 2003. On behalf of Prof. Roche, who was out of town at another meeting, Prof. Mooney suggested several minor changes to the minutes of the meeting of March 20, 2003, concerning the reorganization of the economics department.

After Prof. Bretz noted an additional minor correction, the minutes, as amended, were approved unanimously.

3. A proposal on disclosure of faculty salary information from a subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs Committee. Prof. Mooney explained that while the proposal on

disclosure of faculty salaries has been circulated to the full Faculty Affairs Committee electronically, because of scheduling difficulties, it has never been aired fully at a Committee meeting. Nevertheless, Prof. Ghilarducci, the chair of the subcommittee, asked the Executive Committee to put the item on the agenda as a discussion item – arguing that without input from Academic Council members, the proposal is not likely to change significantly – with the possibility that it may be ready for adoption. Members of the Executive Committee discussed the proposal extensively and agreed to present it to members for discussion and possibly a vote.

Prof. Frecka, one of the three members of the subcommittee [also Prof. Teresa Ghilarducci and Prof. John Affleck-Graves], presented the proposal to members:

Using processes to be determined by PAC, a University Salary Equity Review Committee shall be formed to review the salaries of the Teaching and Research Faculty. A majority of the committee members shall be elected members of the Provost's Advisory Committee. The committee shall assess, annually, the methods used by the administration to assure fairness of faculty salaries and to identify and correct salary inequities. The committee shall be subject to confidentiality and annually will issue both a public report (which upholds confidentiality) and a more detailed report for the Office of the Provost, the relevant portions of which shall be sent to each Dean.

Prof. Frecka explained that under the University's current disclosure policy, each year, Institutional Research calculates average salary and compensation by faculty rank – professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor – and reports it internally in Table 10.3 of the University's *Factbook*. He noted that there have been periodic calls for additional disclosure of faculty salary information – the most significant of which was a 1993 Faculty Senate survey. Then, over 75% of the 359 respondents – representing a response rate of 44% – favored the release of additional information on faculty salaries by college or department. As the subcommittee report notes, various women's groups have also called for additional disclosure.

Prof. Frecka continued that the subcommittee discussed the shape that additional disclosure might take, but only one member believed there to be a need or justification for disclosure of individual faculty salaries. Members then concluded that the emphasis should be on strengthening procedures and processes already in place that ensure that faculty salaries are determined in a fair and unbiased manner. Further, the subcommittee concluded that most concerns expressed about salary inequity issues relate primarily to gender inequity.

As to the current processes that ensure equity, Prof. Frecka noted first that normal review procedures by department chairs, deans, and the Provost's Office exist at the University. Then, periodically, the Provost's Office asks Institutional Research to perform additional quantitative analyses. The primary form of analysis is multiple regression, by college, of salary against several variables, including gender. Additional

variables analyzed are faculty rank, minority status, age, years at the University, years since attaining the highest degree, years in current rank, terminal degree, endowed-chair status, administrative appointments, and the departmental home.

Prof. Frecka said that he, Prof. Ghilarducci, and Prof. Affleck-Graves reviewed the regression analyses performed for the 2001-2002 academic year. The regressions have very high explanatory power with R-squares ranging between 76% and 94%, and the subcommittee found no evidence, at least using Institutional Research's statistical methodology, of any gender bias in University salaries. Prof. Frecka added that in addition to the standard regression analyses, under the direction of the Provost's Office, Institutional Research performs a residual analysis using a similar regression procedure. Under this analysis as well, the plots show no evidence of systematic bias in salaries of either men or women. Finally, he said, on an individual basis, the Provost's Office examines faculty salaries that produce the largest residuals.

Prof. Frecka continued that while subcommittee members concluded that the processes used by the University to address salary fairness issues are reasonably effective, they believe that concerns within the faculty about those processes could be alleviated through faculty participation in a review. Concerns are often heightened by news items such as the one Prof. Ghilarducci sent him from the April issue of the American Association of University Professors' publication, *Academe*, stating that, for full professors at Notre Dame, the average salary for male faculty members is \$113,000 but \$102,000 for female faculty members. With such reports, it may appear that there may be reason to suspect bias; yet, as the subcommittee found, examination of the regression analyses demonstrates that there are many other variables that explain average differences in salaries between men and women faculty members.

Prof. Frecka said that he, Prof. Ghilarducci, and Prof. Affleck-Graves originally believed that a subcommittee of the Academic Council would be most appropriate for the faculty oversight they envision; however, they quickly moved to the belief that, using processes to be determined by the Provost's Advisory Committee (PAC), a University salary equity review committee would be a better choice. The committee would be charged with reviewing the processes and policies now in place to ensure equity and also will reviewing evidence in that regard.

Prof. Frecka concluded his remarks by recommending discussion of the proposal today followed by incorporation of members' feedback into a proposal to be returned to the Faculty Affairs Committee for further refinement – with the expectation that a final proposal would be brought to a vote by the full Council next fall. With that timetable, there would still be sufficient opportunity to put a review committee in place for the 2003-2004 academic year.

Prof. Affleck-Graves added that the methodology the University uses to analyze salary equity follows almost exactly the recommendations of the American Association of University Professors. That methodology is outlined in *Paychecks: A Guide to Conducting Salary-Equity Studies for Higher Education Faculty*.

Prof. Welle began the discussion by remarking that the problem seems to be largely one of the perception of inequity. When that is the case, information can do much to alleviate concerns. The dean of his college, Mark Roche, addressed faculty members' perception in a lengthy e-mail last spring sent to all members of the college. Another strategy that has been successful in addressing the perception of inequity within the College of Arts and Letters, Prof. Welle related, is that, this spring, a committee visited various departments to talk about salary issues. These discussions gave faculty members an opportunity to see that, perhaps, there is not as much inequity in regard to salaries as they believe.

Prof. Mooney commented that she is very much in favor of a proposal that leads to the sharing of information with faculty, for there are misperceptions that such a process provides an opportunity to correct. Yet, she wonders about the language of this particular proposal, which does not define the sort of inequities the committee should examine. For instance, the outline in the AAUP's *Paychecks* booklet is aimed at developing regression analyses, which show problems based on sex, race, or ethnicity. Other kinds of inequities, or situations many believe to be inequitable – such as salary compression within a discipline because salaries have risen quickly in the marketplace or using outside offers to boost salary -- are not addressed by regression analyses. She believes that the intent of the subcommittee was to have the newly established committee examine inequities in salaries that may be related to race, gender, or ethnicity; yet, as written, the proposal's charge is so broad that the committee it sets up might be charged with trying to determine *any* kinds of inequities. Thus, she suggested that the proposal should be clearer about the committee's charge – lest members be accused of not doing their job.

Prof. Hosle said that a young colleague who was recently awarded tenure told him that there are some assistant professors in his department who earn more than its associate professors. This seems very strange. He would find it helpful if the administration would give some general broad outline to salary issues. While, for example, it is easy to explain the market forces that cause law professors to earn more, on the average, than faculty in some other colleges, why should an assistant professor earn more than an associate professor in the same department?

Prof. Frecka replied that it is the same reason that new, first-round professional football players command higher salaries than some more-established players: It's just the nature of the beast. The market responds to whatever it takes to hire assistant professors, and in some disciplines at least, the competitive market salary for assistant

professors rises very rapidly. This is the phenomenon called “compression,” and it is one which universities find very difficult to resolve.

Prof. Incropera said that a good example of salary compression exists in the computer science and engineering department. Over a period of two or three years, the demand for good people accelerated at such a tremendous pace that starting salaries exceeded what the college was paying its associate professors. Given budgetary constraints, it was not possible to adjust to those conditions, because the department needed to recruit and bring on junior faculty. Thus, a salary compression problem exists in that department which he is trying to address over a period of time.

Prof. Incropera then agreed with Prof. Mooney’s assessment that the current proposal may be too open-ended. He is concerned about how it might be used. Having been a department chair for nine years, he said, he has spent a great deal of time explaining to faculty members the basis for decisions concerning their pay raises. Given the general sentiment that “we’re all above average,” those discussions were very difficult at times and even led to situations in which he found it necessary to become honest and blunt.

Prof. Incropera said he believes that salaries should be based – or increases to salaries should be based – on measures of productivity. He is not sure how far the subcommittee intended the proposed committee to involve itself in those kinds of issues; yet, the proposal is written in a way that opens the door to explorations that may be unintended.

Mr. Archer said that rather than being too broad, the proposal may be too narrow, for it deals only with teaching-and-research faculty. He asked whether there would be any consideration to including the special professional, library, and research faculties in some way in the proposal and in the proposed committee’s work for next year.

Prof. Affleck-Graves said that he agrees completely with Profs. Mooney and Incropera that the proposal is too broad. When many faculty look at the results of the regression analyses performed by Institutional Research, they comment that the percentage of the variation in salaries it explains is only 74 to 80 percent. Yet, that is exactly what one would expect. The University is not going to get a regression that fits exactly because there are merit differences between people and differences in such areas as performance.

Prof. Affleck-Graves continued that it is very important to remember that the type of analysis undertaken in the area of salary is extremely weak at the unit level. It is an average study. That is what regression does. It is very good at saying, for example, whether a particular subset of people, on average, are paid below or above a norm. Yet, regression analyses are very, very weak at saying whether an *individual* is paid

below or above a norm. The AAUP's *Paychecks* offers a good explanation of the purpose of a regression analysis, pointing out that its objective is not to capture quality measures. There will always be some residual, and the presumption is that the residual captures merit issues.

Prof. Affleck-Graves added that he believes the committee could expand its scope to consider salaries of the special professional, library, and research faculty. Whenever a salary analysis is undertaken, the issue is whether there are enough people in each group to make it worthwhile. If there are only one or two people in a group, then the regression model is much weaker. That is not the case with the other three groups classified as regular faculty. Including them is certainly something the committee should explore.

Prof. Robinson said that his understanding of the language of the proposal may differ from Prof. Mooney's, in which case he needs some clarification. As he sees it, the task of the proposed committee is not to ensure fairness or equity or anything other than to make sure that the *methods* used by the administration to ensure fairness are correct. Certainly, debates exist over which methods of analyzing salary equity are best, and the methodologies for assessing equity change over time. To take one example, if the issue of salaries and age were to be considered by the proposed committee, the question before its members would not be whether the current salary structure is fair or equitable; rather, it would be simply whether the *method* used to analyze the issue is appropriate.

Prof. Mooney responded that Prof. Robinson's question centers on the meaning of the third sentence of the proposal: "The committee shall assess, annually, the methods used by the administration to assure fairness of faculty salaries and to identify and correct salary inequities." The issue is whether the word "methods" applies only to the words "assure fairness" and whether "to identify and correct salary inequities" is a separate duty. Or, she asked, does the word "methods" apply also to the second half of the sentence?

Prof. Mooney continued that the confusion as to the meaning of the third sentence is confounded, in part, by the last sentence: "The committee shall be subject to confidentiality, and annually will issue both a public report (which upholds confidentiality) and a more detailed report for the Office of the Provost, the relevant portions of which shall be sent to each Dean." That sentence suggests that the committee is looking not just at the administration's methods but at the answers the methods produce. Otherwise, there would be nothing warranting confidentiality. Given the totality of the paragraph, she assumes that the proposed committee's task is to examine more than methodology.

Prof. Frecka pointed out that the proposal before the Council today is not the subcommittee's original proposal; it is the Executive Committee's refinement of its proposal.

Prof. Mooney said he was correct.

Prof. Tidmarsh commented that he agreed with Mr. Archer that the scope of the committee should be expanded to include all segments of the regular faculty – teaching-and-research, special professional, library, and research. While PAC may not be the appropriate body to review salary issues for all faculty – for its expertise is with the teaching-and-research faculty – there are other mechanisms appropriate for review of salary equity for the other members of the regular faculty.

Prof. Noble said he wonders about the notion of a committee whose purpose is to review numbers and then pronounce on matters of equity. He agrees with those who consider the proposal too broad. Equity is a matter of departmental culture, college culture, and the work of particular individuals. He does not know how a committee like the one described in the proposal could decide what is equitable or not. What it *could* identify are possible anomalies in large groups of numbers. Then, those anomalies could be highlighted for units, subunits, college departments, and individuals to examine and discuss with chairs, deans, and others.

His point, Prof. Noble said, is that there is not some absolute thing called “equitable” against which every case can be measured. Thus, he does not know how a committee like this could, in a sense, do its job. Once it got its numbers, what would it do next? While generating numbers and making them widely available is a wonderful idea, he finds it difficult to imagine a committee charged with deciding the import of those numbers.

Prof. Frecka answered that, again, the intent of the proposal is simply to review processes and procedures now in place designed to ensure fairness and equity. Part of that process involves looking at outliers from the regression analyses. There is a process in place, he believes, in which deans and department chairs are asked to explain those outliers.

Prof. Aldous said that she is uncomfortable with the proposal because there is nothing in it related to the gender of department heads or deans. In her own college, she does not believe that any women hold the position of departmental chair. Yet, to have an open handling of an issue central to a large number of people who do not earn a great deal of money, it must be absolutely clear that the procedures used by administrators are entirely fair. For that to occur, the University must empower some women.

Prof. Mooney said that in fact, there are two women department chairs in the College of Arts and Letters: Jeanne Day in psychology and Dayle Seidenspinner-Nunez in Romance Languages. Prof. Aldous responded that she understands Prof. Day is stepping down.

Prof. Mooney said that is correct; however, her point is that there are currently two female department chairs in the College of Arts and Letters.

Prof. Mooney continued that as for gender equity in general, the purpose of the proposal is to look at methodologies for assessing fairness – again, not to look at individual salaries. What Institutional Research has done for the Provost's Office in the past is to take the salaries of all the teaching-and-research faculty in the University broken down by college – and, even within the College of Arts and Letters, broken down again by such classifications as faculty within the social sciences, the arts, and so on – and, using large regression analyses with the factors Prof. Affleck-Graves has outlined (for example, years in rank and years since attaining a Ph.D.) and examine if, at a systematic level, there is disparity in the income levels between men and women.

Prof. Mooney continued that based on the regression analyses performed, which, as has been said, utilize methods that follow the AAUP guidelines, there has been no evidence of gender inequity at Notre Dame. Thus, the purpose of the proposal is to bring faculty into the process of examining the methodology used and disseminating information about how the Provost's Office studies these various issues, and the kind of results the analyses produce.

Prof. Aldous said her point is that the gender of a department head may be a confounding variable. Aside from the Law School and the Mendoza College of Business, deans and department heads at the University are primarily men. The gender of department heads is simply another variable that can be added to the regression analyses.

Prof. Krostenko suggested a minor change to the proposal. He pointed out that the correct word is to “ensure” fairness rather than “assure.”

Further, Prof. Krostenko agreed with Prof. Mooney that the language of the proposal produces ambiguity on the proposed committee's task. Changing “used by the administration” to “which the administration uses” would clarify that ensuring fairness is the administration's function while the committee's role is purely advisory, which, he believes, is what the subcommittee intended.

Prof. Frecka agreed that that was the subcommittee's intent.

Fr. Malloy thanked members for their comments on the proposal, which will be returned to the Committee on Faculty Affairs for further refinement.

4. A fourth Academic Council subcommittee charged with making recommendations about the Council's subcommittee structure. Prof. Mooney explained that the second discussion item grows out of a suggestion from the Graduate Studies Committee, whose members have said from time to time that they are unsure what their current function is within the Council. Thus, Graduate Studies Committee members have asked the Council to rethink its current three-committee structure. They have proposed a four-committee structure for next year, with one committee being charged with examination of the Council's committee structure. One specific question for that committee is the role of the Graduate Studies Committee and whether it might be melded into one of the other two committees. The proposed committee would also examine other ways the Council's committee structure might be changed to more effectively accomplish the work of the Academic Council.

Prof. Antsaklis, chair of the Graduate Studies Committee, said that there are several reasons why the Academic Council should reexamine its committee structure. First, conditions have changed. The number of Academic Council members has increased with the restructuring that occurred last year with the Faculty Senate.

Second, Prof. Antsaklis said, the existence of the University's Graduate Council, which decides many important matters, makes the function of the Academic Council's Graduate Studies Committee unclear. Graduate Studies Committee members have pointed out this problem on several occasions. Some time ago, it was decided not to duplicate the efforts of the Graduate Studies Committee in the Academic Council but to forward decisions approved by the Graduate Council directly to the Executive Committee. This, he believes, is a good idea. Yet, it leaves the Graduate Studies Committee without its traditional tasks – or at least not as much work as either the Undergraduate Studies Committee or the Faculty Affairs Committee. Thus, it is time to look at the Council's committee structure again and, perhaps, to re-balance it.

Prof. Antsaklis said that the Executive Committee of the Academic Council has had extensive discussions in several meetings on possible restructuring. At this point, the suggestion is to form a special committee of the Academic Council to examine the issue and to make recommendations.

Prof. Mooney said that the proposal asks for approval to divide Academic Council members into four committees in the fall. The purpose of the fourth committee would be to study whether amending the Council's entire committee structure is a good idea and, if so, what form that restructuring should take.

Fr. Malloy said he does not understand what the possible additional committees might be.

Prof. Kantor responded that the issue is not whether there should be more committees than are currently assigned. Rather, it is whether the Graduate Studies Committee has a role within the Academic Council, whether and how its duties should be reassigned to the other two committees, and if so, how the names of the committees should be changed. Should, for example, some of the issues that would currently be assigned to the Graduate Studies Committee go to the Undergraduate Studies Committee?

Prof. Mooney explained that the discussion at the Executive Committee meeting focused on the fact that, for the last several years at least, the committee with the heaviest workload has been the Undergraduate Studies Committee; yet, it is of equal size with the others. Members suggested that perhaps the Graduate Studies Committee could be folded into that committee. Then, with an expanded size, it could deal more adequately with a heavy workload.

Prof. Kantor commented that the redundancy between the Graduate Council and the Graduate Studies Committee is problematic as well. That is another piece of the puzzle to be sorted out.

Fr. Scully asked whether the concerns members raise could be met by a few sessions of the Executive Committee. One of the roles of the Executive Committee is to think about structural issues of this sort and then come forward with recommendations to the body as a whole. He wonders if creating yet another committee of the full Council to address this issue is necessary.

Prof. Mooney responded that while that is certainly an option, discussion at the Executive Committee meeting was in favor of having a committee look at the issue over a period of time rather than adding to the Executive Committee's workload. She added that Prof. Antsaklis tried several times this year to have the Executive Committee focus on the issue of restructuring the Council's committee, but because of other business at hand, it was not able to do so.

Prof. Kantor said that given the *ad hoc* nature of the issue, perhaps there is an alternative to a separate committee with independent membership, either within or external to the Executive Committee.

Fr. Scully suggested creation of an *ad hoc* committee to examine the Council's committee structure.

Prof. Mooney agreed that an *ad hoc* committee could accomplish the task, explaining that the reason for calling for a fourth committee was that, next year, service on it would take the place of a member's other committee assignment.

Prof. Noble said that if the question is what the role of the Graduate Studies Committee should be in the current configuration of responsibilities, it is unnecessary to form a committee to advise the Academic Council on that issue. Rather, the Graduate Studies Committee itself could reflect on what its responsibilities are. If, on the other hand, the question is the configuration of the committee structure as a whole, then that opens up a larger discussion.

Prof. Kantor responded that the issue is whether whatever oversight the Academic Council wishes to have with respect to graduate studies is accommodated appropriately within the current committee structure. Graduate Studies Committee members concluded in their discussions that resolving this issue is beyond the scope of just one committee.

Prof. Antsaklis said that throughout the committee's discussions, members contributed their knowledge of other institutions' oversight of graduate studies as well as knowledge of the focus of other Notre Dame committees. Their thinking was that if the proposed committee is to examine the role of the Graduate Studies Committee, that process affords an opportunity as well to examine the entire committee structure of the Council, which has not been done for some time.

Fr. Malloy summed up by saying that the will of the Council as a whole is to create an *ad hoc* committee next fall to study the Academic Council's entire committee, as well as the specific question of how oversight of graduate studies should be treated. While service on the *ad hoc* committee would be equivalent to serving on one of the other Council committees – at least while it was engaged in its business – he would hope that the committee could offer its recommendations speedily rather than waiting until the end of the year.

Seeing that his suggestion to create an *ad hoc* committee was acceptable to Council members, Fr. Malloy said a vote on the matter was unnecessary.

5. Committee reports

(a) Undergraduate Studies Committee. Prof. Preacher, a member of the Undergraduate Studies Committee, said that the Committee worked on two major items this year: curriculum review, for which a proposal was passed at the last Academic Council meeting, and course scheduling. Members continue their work on a course scheduling proposal. Late in the semester, they still had a series of questions that had not been answered, so they need a bit more time to finish up their work. She said that

there will be a proposal on course scheduling by the first meeting of the Academic Council next year.

(b) Graduate Studies Committee. Prof. Antsaklis said the Committee's major item of business was the previous discussion item.

(c) Faculty Affairs Committee. On behalf of Prof. Ghilarducci, Prof. Mooney reported that the Faculty Affairs Committee had three items on its agenda this year. One was the salary equity proposal already discussed today. Committee members have also worked with a subcommittee from the Faculty Senate on faculty discipline and faculty grievance procedures. That matter is not concluded, but there is a three-hour joint meeting scheduled for tomorrow morning. Members hope to have a proposal ready very early in next year's fall semester. The third item is whether the University should designate Presidents' Day and Labor Day as holidays. She called on Prof Aldous to address this issue.

Prof. Aldous said that when the question of University holidays is discussed, she always thinks of Arthur Miller's line at the very end of *Death of a Salesman*: "People have to pay attention." It is extremely important that the University recognize these national holidays, particularly at this time in our nation's history. While she is happy that Labor Day is a holiday for Notre Dame staff, all at the University should be given the opportunity to honor Mr. Washington and Mr. Lincoln and their contributions to our country. As for Labor Day, even though faculty are fairly well off and do not need to work by the sweat of their brow, declaring the day a University holiday affords the opportunity to recognize that this country has been built on labor – and hard labor at that.

Prof. Aldous continued that recognizing these two national holidays as University holidays includes the duty of discussing their importance with students. One need not be a historian to do this; it is necessary only to be an old-fashioned patriot. Prof. Aldous added that she also advocates declaring Martin Luther King Day a University holiday.

Prof. Mooney said that because the subcommittee has not yet completed its work on this issue, it will take it up with dispatch in the fall.

Prof. Aldous said that one of the ways that things are not done and by which administrators can escape making hard decisions is referring issues to committees. She thinks the Council could take some sort of vote now to be passed on to the committee next fall. She raised this issue in the fall term.

Prof. Mooney responded that as seen earlier today on the salary equity issue, until a committee is finished with its work, it is not this body's practice to vote a

proposal. First, the issue must be worked through the appropriate committee and the committee must come forward with a proposal. That is why the committee structure exists.

Prof. Aldous said she rests on what she said before.

Prof. Incorporera said that if the Faculty Affairs Committee comes forward with a recommendation that the University make Presidents' Day and Labor Day University holidays, he hopes that recommendation also includes adding a class day for students. He does not want to see additional University holidays come at the expense of students' education.

Prof. Mooney said that while it is unfortunate the Committee was not able to come forward with a proposal on the holidays this year, keeping the issue in committee is not a delaying tactic. She pointed out that Prof. Incorporera's recommendation will require some committee work – specifically, looking at the master calendar and whether adjustments in it are necessary. In the Law School, for example, there are a certain number of class hours required per semester to meet accreditation requirements. She recalls that the last time the Council adjusted study days and the exam schedule in an effort to recapture class time, it had to recraft the master calendar as well. That kind of detail work, assuming that the committee is in favor of adding Presidents' Day and Labor Day as University holidays, takes time.

Fr. Malloy thanked Academic Council members for their contributions this year. He said that several very substantive issues have been discussed and resolved. He appreciates members' efforts at the committee level, as well as on the Council as a whole.

There being no further business, Fr. Malloy adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Ann Mooney