

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
Meeting of February 22, 2011
McKenna Auditorium
3:30 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.

Members present: Panos Antsaklis, M. Brian Blake, Thomas Burish, Rev. John Coughlin, O.F.M., Greg Crawford, Darren Davis, Judy Fox, Mary Frandsen, Umesh Garg, John Gaski, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Robert Goulding, Dennis Jacobs, Rev. John Jenkins, C.S.C., Peter Kilpatrick, A. Graham Lappin, John LoSecco, Michael Lykoudis, Kelly Martin, Christine Maziar, Andrew McGauley, John McGreevy, William Nichols, Susan Ohmer, Hugh Page, Cathy Pieronek, Donald Pope-Davis, Joseph Powers, Ava Preacher, John Robinson, Jim Seida, Greg Sterling, Ann Tenbrunsel, Julianne Turner

Members and Observers excused: John Affleck-Graves, Robert Bernhard, Don Bishop, Seth Brown, Laura Carlson, Rev. Tom Doyle, C.S.C., Nick Entrikin, William Evans, Stuart Greene, Nell Newton, Mike Oliver, Cheri Smith, Carolyn Woo

Members and Observers absent: Megan Dillhoff, Dennis Doordan, Stephen Fallon, Austin Holler, Brian O’Conchubhair, Harold Pace, Cynthia Weber

Observers present: Kevin Barry, Dale Nees, Warren vonEschenbach

Guests: Liz Rulli—Office of Research

1. Welcome and opening prayer: Father Jenkins opened the meeting at 3:30 p.m., welcoming members, and invited Prof. Brian Blake to give the opening prayer.

2. Approval of minutes:

Dean Peter Kilpatrick made a motion to approve the minutes; Dean Greg Crawford seconded the motion. The minutes of the September 21, 2010 meeting were unanimously approved.

3. Proposal: Policy, Procedures and Guidelines for Postdoctoral Appointments

Father Jenkins invited Prof. Panos Antsaklis to present the proposal detailing policy for postdoctoral appointments.

Prof. Antsaklis referred to the two documents which were distributed to the members. The document entitled *Procedures and Guidelines* is an informational document in support of the policy document. He summarized the rationale presented in the policy.

Postdoctoral appointments offer recent advanced degree recipients a period in which to extend their education and professional training. The opportunity to carry out postdoctoral studies in the broad environment of research, scholarship, and creative endeavor that exists at the University of Notre Dame can significantly broaden an

individual's expertise, provide a period of more independent scholarship, and help define future career paths.

Prof. Antsaklis noted that many disciplines at institutions across the nation are increasingly requiring postdoctoral appointment experiences for new hires to tenure track positions and professional placement. Further, the contributions made by postdoctoral appointees to research and the core mission of the university are significant. Finally, the ongoing growth at ND in research centers and institutes presents rich opportunities for postdoctoral appointments, and thus, there is a need for a coherent and consistent set of policies.

Prof. Antsaklis reviewed the process by which this document has been created. The Advanced Studies committee took up the issue in the 2009-2010 academic year; they performed preliminary studies including consulting benchmarking reports that were compiled by the Graduate School from a large number of institutions, including Brown, Yale, Rutgers, Boston College, Duke and Princeton. In addition, study was made of a set of definitions of postdoctoral positions put together by the AAU (Association of American Universities). In the 2010-2011 year, the new committee took up the issue, producing this document. The committee greatly benefitted from the assistance of Liz Rulli of the Office of Research and from the Office of Human Resources in putting together a set of consistent policies. Input has been sought from a number of experts, including regular discussion with the Faculty Senate, other committees of the Academic Council, the deans, the administrators of institutional centers and institutes, and the Office of Research, which will be the prime entity to implement this policy. Prof. Antsaklis said that the new policy builds upon the framework of the existing policy, and provides a robust policy for the postdoctoral program, addresses gaps that existed in the accounting practice, and addresses best practices that exist in the academy for the postdoctoral experience. He reviewed the subsections of the document, noting that the new policy sets the terms for such topics as recruitment, terms of appointment and reappointment, salary and/or stipend levels, benefits offered, performance evaluation, teaching responsibilities, ownership of intellectual properties created in the appointment, vacation, termination, dismissal conditions, and certification.

Prof. Antsaklis introduced Ms. Liz Rulli, Office of Research, who has been invited to attend the meeting and answer any questions of members. Prof. John Robinson, president of the Faculty Senate, reported that the proposal received unanimous approval in the Senate, on the strength of its intrinsic merits and because of the success of the committee's efforts to maintain regular and informed contact with concerned Senate groups. Prof. Robinson applauded the effort to keep faculty in the loop as this policy was developed. Prof. Susan Ohmer, Assistant Provost, also offered her thanks to Prof. Antsaklis and his committee for the care with which they undertook the drafting of this policy. She noted that in her work in summer 2010 with the newly created Moreau Postdoctoral Fellowships, she was immersed in exactly the kinds of issues that are now answered comprehensively in this one document.

Prof. Antsaklis made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted; the motion was seconded by Dean Peter Kilpatrick. The motion was unanimously approved by members. Father Jenkins offered his thanks to Prof. Antsaklis and his committee.

4. Proposal: Addition to Summary of Classification Characteristics, Section IV, Guidelines for University Centers and Institutes

Father Jenkins invited Dean Peter Kilpatrick to present the proposal to make an addition to the summary of classification characteristics, which proposes a new definition of the term "University Research Center."

Dean Kilpatrick said he was representing the Office of Research, as Dr. Bob Bernhard is traveling. He reviewed the two-fold rationale behind the proposed change: [1] It meets the criterion of symmetry for the classifications, and [2] There is a need for a classification that acknowledges the interdisciplinary nature of a large research center that is well funded but does not meet the criterion of 'endowed,' which a university institute is now required to meet.

First, Dean Kilpatrick noted that the university has college centers and college institutes, and it has university institutes. However, it does not have university centers. At the college level, the distinction between institutes and centers lies primarily in the magnitude of research activity and the amount of funding associated with that, as well the number of faculty connected with each entity. For university institutes, the criterion is largely size-of-program, and it does not include an interdisciplinary criterion. The new classification will be used only in cases where the activity is substantial, primarily across-college in consultation with the deans of the college, and meets the three criteria in the new classification:

- i) Annual budget exceeds two hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000);
- ii) Ten (10) or more faculty actively participate in the unit's activities from across schools/colleges; and
- iii) Unit's mission involves substantial research activity.

This parallels the definition of the university institute without the criterion of a \$15 million endowment. The impetus for this proposal is the existence of at least two very interdisciplinary research centers on campus, one of which has a large endowment but not yet at the \$15 million level. There is a desire to recognize the activity of these entities as substantially interdisciplinary and across-college. The final characteristic of the proposed center is that it would report to the Vice President for Research or his/her designee.

Prof. Joseph Powers asked if there are any current institutes which would be promoted or demoted under this new classification scheme. Dean Kilpatrick said that to his knowledge no institute would be 'demoted' by the new classification. He reiterated that there are two large research entities on campus which would be renamed university research centers. These are the Interdisciplinary Center for Network and Computer Applications and the ND Energy Center. The latter has grown substantially in the last twelve to eighteen months, due to SAPC investment and \$31 million in grant funding generated. Prof. Robert Goulding asked if any

college centers will become university centers; again, Dean Kilpatrick said that he was unaware of any such plan. There are currently 83 centers on campus; the two programs named above are the current legitimate contenders for reclassification.

Mr. Andrew McGauley, student representative, asked if the reclassification will impact operational decisions. Dean Kilpatrick said that the motivation for the reclassification is primarily one of recognition rather than of operation. The deans have recognized that there is a large across-college collaboration occurring for which it would be beneficial to have a university level convener. It is possible that at a future time there will be consideration of modifying governance; a steering committee format might be optimal. Currently, however, there will be no operational changes.

Prof. Gaski wondered why there need be a budgetary criterion in the classification; might it become a disincentive for careful budgetary management? Dean Kilpatrick noted that it is agreed that a floor was needed; it is prudent to have a demarcation so that a group of faculty do not simply band together and form a university research center. The activity of such a group must be substantial and externally funded. He agreed that the \$250,000 number could be debated; nonetheless, a hard number is useful in that it demonstrates peer external review that results in external funding.

Prof. Chris Maziar stated that the language of demotion and promotion is inappropriate in the context of this proposed change. The intent is to clarify organizational distinctions. The new term provides the university with an organizational tool for responding to each entity. Prof. Graham Lappin echoed this statement. He noted that as the ND Energy Center, initiated in the College of Engineering, has grown and broadened its focus, with a significant increase in the contributions from faculty in other disciplines, the implementation of a new label helps to more accurately describe this program.

Members discussed the possibility of a minor for undergraduate students being administered by a university center. The change in reporting to the Vice President of Research should not impact the existing rules about the administration of minors. Graduate School Dean Greg Sterling noted that the guidelines for graduate degrees that are administered by centers, such as the two degree programs housed in the Kroc Institute, fall under the guidelines which govern all other graduate programs. If a program is part of a department, even though the student works at the center or institute, the department is responsible for administering that program. This is true also for faculty who work at a center but through a departmental program. Dr. Tom Burish, Provost, noted that there are anomalies in many campus centers and institutes. The language of the classifications is 'normally exhibits' or 'typically reports' to allow flexibility for the anomalies. Further, the established lines of administration will and do

hold for any educational program on campus. Thus, he suggested that there is no semantic obscurity in the language of the proposal.

Prof. Robinson asked if the definition should include a reference to the necessity of external funding as a characteristic of a university center. Dean Kilpatrick noted that the three qualifiers do speak of external funding, which are requirements for all centers and institutes. Dr. Burish noted that the funding does not have to be external funding; it doesn't have to be a grant or contract. It could be philanthropy or a small endowment. The intention is to guarantee that some substantial research activity is occurring. The word 'normally' also allows for an exception if the program happens to be very efficient or the research can be done without expense. The language is a proxy for the concept that the budget is in support of some substantial research activity. It could be funded in different ways; the College of Arts and Letters might fund quite differently than Engineering does. But there should be some kind of budget. Dr. Don Pope-Davis offered further clarification, noting that the larger document on centers and institutes articulates the criteria which stipulate budget requirements.

Dean Kilpatrick made the motion that the proposal for a new classification of university research center be approved; Dean Michael Lykoudis seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

As there was no new business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.