

**THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE COLLEGE COUNCIL
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS
Tuesday, February 11, 2014
McKenna Hall Auditorium**

ATTENDANCE

Deans: *Dean:* John McGreevy; *Associate Deans:* James Brockmole, Maura Ryan, Mark Schurr; *Assistant Deans:* Ava Preacher, Nicholas Russo, Joseph Stanfiel, Vicki Toumayan

Chairpersons and Directors: Thomas Anderson, Matthew Ashley, Maureen Boulton, Jim Collins, Richard Cross, Agustín Fuentes, David Gasperetti, Richard Gray, Patrick Griffin, Daniel Lapsley, Elizabeth Mazurek, Rory McVeigh, Peter McQuillan, Thomas Merluzzi, Hugh Page, Gretchen Reydams-Schils, Valerie Sayers, Robert Schmuhl

Elected Faculty: David Betson, Cindy Bergeman, Alessia Blad, Tobias Boes, William Carbonaro, Meredith Chesson, Noreen Deane-Moran, Denise Della Rossa, Richard Donnelly, Larissa Fast, Sabrina Ferri, Encarnacion Juarez, Vittorio Montemaggi, David Nickerson, Alison Rice, Sebastiano Rosato, Jason Ruiz, Marcus Stephens, Julianne Turner, Elliott Visconsi, Shauna Williams, Michele Wirth

Graduate Student Representative: John Joseph Shanley

Undergraduate Students Representatives: Meghan Thomassen, Nikita Taniparti

Regularly Invited Guests, Observers, and Resource People: Martin Bloomer (Ph.D. in Literature Program), John Duffy (University Writing Program), Geraldine Meehan (Faculty Engagement/Global Gateways at NDI), Jane Murphy (Dean's Office), Matt Zyniewicz (Dean's Office)

Excused: Michael Brownstein, Peter Holland, Lionel Jensen, Richard Jensen, Essaka Joshua, Cynthia Mahmood, Collin Meissner, Brian O'Conchubhair, Robin Rhodes, Deb Rotman, Peter Smith, Henry Weinfield, Carmen Tellez

Guest: Sunny Boyd, Professor, College of Science

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the November 12, 2013 College Council meeting were approved.

COLLEGE BUSINESS

B.A./B.S. in Neuroscience and Behavior

Dean McGreevy asked Prof. Sunny Boyd from Biology and Chairperson Dan Lapsley to introduce a new B.A./B.S. degree in neuroscience and behavior in the College of Arts and Letters and in the College of Science. D. Lapsley observed that neuroscience is a fundamentally interdisciplinary program of study, involving the study of the brain and nervous system at multiple levels (from cells to neuro-systems, to models of thinking, to affect and behavior). This complexity requires the coordination of multiple disciplines across the sciences and humanities, and creates a context for scholarly conversation about mind, brain and behavior, about health, disease, and remediation treatment.

Neuroscience programs are pervasive across the country. There are over 125 doctoral programs in neuroscience across the United States; more than 100 universities and colleges have undergraduate programs in neuroscience, including liberal arts colleges, and our aspirational peers in the AAU. The proposal lists 22 programs and describes the types of degrees and curricula for those programs. D. Lapsley concluded that the centrality of neuroscience is not going to go away but will only gain in importance, which is why Notre Dame should have a program as well.

Currently, there is a critical mass of faculty in the departments of Arts and Letters and the College of Science, to deliver the course work. Further, D. Lapsley assured the Council that the proposal for the new degree program is compatible with the strategic plan of the College of Arts and Letters. The external review of the Department of Psychology practically required that the Department develop the degree program and was reinforced by the mid-cycle review of the Provost's Office. The proposal is compatible as well with the objectives of the College of Science.

D. Lapsley noted that undergraduates are very interested in curricular options in neuroscience, and the major itself should grow to about 40-50 majors, drawing initially from pre-professional students and those with biology and psychology double majors. This new major will fill an obvious gap in the academic preparation of Notre Dame undergraduates, and should be a strong recruiting tool for prospective students as well, especially for prospective students who might otherwise seek such a major elsewhere.

Graduates with the major will most likely pursue graduate training in a variety of health professions and graduate research programs, such as in neuroscience, biology, and psychology. With 125 doctoral programs across the country, there are ample opportunities for graduates. D. Lapsley noted that students do not necessarily have to have a neuroscience major to enter into such graduate programs, but it helps and the trend is growing.

D. Lapsley reviewed the proposed requirements for the major. The major requirements are essentially the same for the B.A. and B.S. tracks. There is a foundational requirement of an introductory neuroscience course with lab typically taken in the spring of the sophomore year. Otherwise the tracks differ in how they satisfy college requirements. Both required courses and elective courses that will satisfy the major are drawn approximately in equal numbers from Psychology and Biology. In addition,

research and electives will be available in departments other than Psychology and Biology, such as in Anthropology and Philosophy.

D. Lapsley stated that the design of the major follows the blueprint of the undergraduate neuroscience education articulated in the 2005 Neuroscience Conference. The proposed major, then, may well be a best-practice in the field.

D. Lapsley indicated that the B. A. includes 40 university credits, 12 credits to meet College requirements, Psychology's research and methods course, 3 credits of statistics (met in one of three departments), and 12 credits of biology. There are 27 elective credits, with 9 credits selected from a set of Psychology courses, 9 credits selected from Biology, and 9 credits in courses in other departments, or 6 credits of undergraduate research with an approved faculty advisor. The total number of credits is 98, leaving 22 free electives to meet the 120-credit minimum for a B.A.

D. Lapsley reported that the proposal had been vetted through the Assistant Deans, with Associate Dean Jim Brockmole's assistance, and through the Undergraduate Studies Committee.

S. Boyd added that the College of Science is also very excited about the major. The core faculty in Biological Sciences has been working with some faculty in Psychology on the development of the proposal. The proposal has strong support from the Dean of the College of Science, and from the Chairperson of the Department of Biology.

J. Brockmole noted that neuroscience is no longer its own discipline, but is now extremely interdisciplinary. The Undergraduate Studies Committee unanimously recommended that the College Council adopt the major.

Assistant Dean Vicki Toumayan noted that a semester of language was missing from one track of the proposed curricula (pre-med track), and a second math University requirement was missing from another track of proposed curricula (non-pre-med track). V. Toumayan observed that students will need to begin pursuing the major in their first year, given how involved the major is. Other issues that could be addressed are: how AP credit will count; how study-abroad courses might be viewed; and, how transfer credit might be accepted.

D. Lapsley observed that students would enter the neuroscience in the second semester of their sophomore year. The students would have the full experience of the First Year of Studies to acclimate to Notre Dame and to figure out their respective majors. Advising would help the students plan to become neuroscience majors. There is some freedom on the backend of the major, with 22 free electives. Further, there are numerous institutions abroad where students can take relevant courses for the major. S. Boyd indicated that the College of Science has 10 universities that are well supported by the College for students to go abroad, and most of those overlap as major destinations for College of Arts and Letters students as well. At 9 of the 10 institutions mentioned above, students would have 12 or more possibilities for required courses and elective courses that would count toward the major. The tenth institution is in Senegal, which is more restrictive; students would have opportunities to fulfill University-level requirements but not specific, major-related requirements.

D. Lapsley mentioned that the authors of the proposal have not thoroughly discussed implications of AP credit. Psychology does accept AP credits for the introductory course.

V. Toumayan cautioned that taking math and two sciences each semester in the first year would not be typical. Further, V. Toumayan noted that some of the science courses would have pre-requisite courses for students to take, thus adding to the number of required courses. One potential remedy would be to drop the prerequisite course, but then the science courses should be adjusted so that students would indeed not need to take prerequisite courses to succeed in the required courses.

S. Boyd observed that there is a group of 8 faculty in the biological sciences that have been discussing the proposed major. That group specifically discussed the prerequisites for the biological sciences courses that are a part of the set of electives and requirements. In the case of the electives, the upper-level elective courses, the faculty discussed the prerequisites and the necessity of the prerequisites, and it appears that many of the prerequisites can be dropped. In the end, there is flexibility on the part of the faculty to drop some of the prerequisites.

Dean McGreevy asked for a vote to approve the major, B.A./B.S. in Neuroscience and Behavior: 50 votes in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

J. McGreevy thanked D. Lapsley and S. Boyd for their presentation and for their work on the proposed major.

College Council—A Proposal to Establish Standing Committees

J. McGreevy briefly introduced the proposal to establish standing committees on the College Council. He thought that the College Council needed more structure and more faculty ownership of the agenda of the Council's meetings. J. McGreevy invited the committee members to address the proposal. The committee members were: Associate Dean Maura Ryan, Chairperson Patrick Griffin (Department of History), Chairperson Elizabeth Mazurek (Department of Classics), and Chairperson Valerie Sayers (Department of English).

M. Ryan explained that if the proposal is passed, the changes would begin with the spring elections this year (2014), and would establish the following standing committees of the College of Arts and Letters College Council: Committee for Membership and Agenda, Undergraduate Studies Committee, Graduate Studies Committee, Research/Library Committee, and Faculty Affairs Committee. We would also do away with the Undergraduate Committee, the Research Committee, and the Library Committee that are currently in place.

The committee generated the proposal for two major reasons: (1) There has been a growing sense that the College committee structure has not been very efficient and only sometimes effective. The Dean's Office has also had difficulty recruiting faculty to serve on the committees; and (2) there are a number of very complicated issues that the College will need to address in the next few years that call for vibrant faculty governance. For example, faculty will need to address the question of online education or the matter of new educational technologies, or the opening of a school for international global affairs, or the new oversight that the College has for graduate programs, or the likelihood that the University will have a comprehensive curriculum review.

Given those reasons, M. Ryan suggested that it is an opportune moment in the College to establish procedures and committees that would enhance and elevate faculty governance.

M. Ryan recalled that the proposal had been circulated to the entire College of Arts and Letters faculty in January 2014, asking for feedback. Not many faculty provided feedback, but those faculty who did respond were generally positive about the idea of the revision of the Council's structure. One faculty member worried about having a membership committee that is in-part elected and in-part appointed gives the Dean too much power; the Agenda and Membership Committee should be entirely elected. M. Ryan reported that the committee thought that by having both elected and appointed members on the Agenda and Membership Committee allowed the Dean to balance the Membership and Agenda Committee, so that there would not be, for example, a committee made up of all Political Scientists. It would allow the Dean to provide for some sort of balance and diversity on the Committee.

V. Sayers mentioned that the committee members were enthusiastic about the idea that the Council will spend its time in a more useful and focused way if the proposal passes. E. Mazurek supported what M. Ryan mentioned about the role of the Dean having the power to appoint members to the Agenda and Membership Committee. P. Griffin agreed that the proposed committees would help the College faculty address issues with greater urgency, such as online learning.

Meghan Thomassen (Undergraduate Student Representative) asked if the new committees would have undergraduate student representatives. M. Ryan expects to have an undergraduate student representative on the Undergraduate Studies Committee, and she will make a friendly amendment to the proposal.

Rory McVeigh (Chairperson, Department of Sociology) expressed concerns that the new committees will demand even more work from faculty, especially from department chairpersons. M. Ryan observed that the College Council currently has 72 voting members, and with a Council that size, the committee that authored the proposal thought that the Council could easily staff the subcommittees and not everyone would have to serve on a subcommittee every year. J. McGreevy reiterated R. McVeigh's concern: Will chairpersons need to serve on subcommittees when they already attend a monthly Deans and Chairpersons meeting and a monthly College Council meeting? M. McGreevy thought that the Council might limit the service of the chairpersons on the subcommittees.

Denise Della Rossa (Department of German and Russian Languages and Literatures) asked how many of the College Council members are elected and how many are deans or chairpersons. M. Ryan stated that there are 36 elected members, 22 chairpersons or directors, and 10 who are a part of the Dean's Office. D. Della Rossa rehearsed that the College already has an Undergraduate Studies Committee, a Library Committee, and a Research Committee, and wondered if the faculty on those committees are also on the College Council. M. Ryan stated that some of the faculty on those committees also serve on the College Council, but not all of them. D. Della Rossa opined that if the membership of the new committees is limited to College Council members, then the point of views expressed on the committees will be limited. M. Ryan expressed another way to look at the new structure: Currently we have a very difficult time filling those three committees. If we were to make the elections more efficient and make the role of College Council robust and meaningful, then we might be able to recruit more readily faculty to serve on the committees.

Assistant Dean Ava Preached asked if there would be specific terms to the committee membership. M. Ryan mentioned that the College would not change the election procedures for the College Council, with the same election terms that the College currently uses.

Julianne Turner (Department of Psychology) asked if 36 elected faculty would be enough to staff the subcommittees. M. Ryan thought that the College Council would have enough members to staff the committees because some of the committees would not need to be very large. She also suggested that perhaps after two years we could revisit the question about whether or not the Council needs to be expanded to accommodate the new structure.

Acting Associate Dean Jim Brockmole added that from his own experience with the Undergraduate Studies Committee, there are issues related to recruiting members to sit on the committee when a committee member, for instance, goes on leave. It can take 2.5 months to recruit and elect a new committee member. The new structure would alleviate that sort of problem because a new member can simply come from the College Council. Currently only two members of the Committee are on College Council, which means that the Undergraduate Studies Committee is not fully represented at the College Council meetings.

M. Ryan offered that the College Council could recruit members to the committees if there are particular sets of expertise needed to address certain issues. Thomas Merluzzi (Director, ISLA) and J. Brockmole seconded that suggestion.

David Gasperetti (Chairperson, Department of German and Russian Languages and Literatures) asked about the types of issues that the Faculty Affairs Committee might address. M. Ryan stated that there are no particular issues in mind but there are many decisions that the College makes that affect the faculty in particular ways. Some faculty at times perceive that there are not appropriate vehicles for faculty input. One example might be faculty interaction with Notre Dame International and how the University might formalize certain relationships with other institutions. V. Sayers thought that faculty hires might be another issue that the Faculty Affairs Committee could address, and teaching loads for faculty might be another issue.

Gretchen Reydams-Schils (Chairperson, Program of Liberal Studies) suggested that some issues can be addressed at the College level, and then some issues can be addressed by the Faculty Senate if the issues have a university-wide impact.

Cindy Bergeman (Department of Psychology) offered that the Council should separate the work of the proposed Research Committee from the review of ISLA proposals. There are many research-related issues that should be discussed as a College, such as cost-share, grants, and teaching loads. Associate Dean Mark Schurr seconded C. Bergeman's suggestion, because he is often asked for faculty input from the Office of Research. He also supports incorporating the work of the current Library Committee into the work of the proposed Research Committee.

J. McGreevy summarized some friendly amendments to the proposal: (1) That the Undergraduate Committee have an undergraduate member, and the Graduate Studies Committee have a graduate student member; (2) That the Dean could appoint non-College-Council members to the committees when particular expertise is needed, and the Dean would report back to the Council in such cases; (3) That the College Council will evaluate how the new system is working, and to make any adjustments to the College Council structure at that time. There was a strong majority of approval for each friendly amendment.

J. McGreevy asked for a vote on the proposal to establish standing committees on the College Council: 50 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstained.

Transfer of Credit Policy

J. McGreevy introduced the topic of online courses for transfer credit if the courses are delivered through *Semester Online*. The College has a policy that the College does not accept credit from online courses for transfer credit. The policy was put in place because the faculty and administration were not comfortable with the quality of teaching and learning in online courses, and so the College created the current policy of accepting no transfer credit for online courses. The University subsequently developed an agreement with the company, *Semester Online*, which includes some online courses taught by Notre Dame faculty and departments have the right to accept or reject such courses for credit. *Semester Online* also includes online courses taught by faculty from other institutions (such as Emory or Northwestern), and in order to accept the transfer credits from such institutions for the online courses, the College needs to change its policy. J. McGreevy called on Elliott Visconsi, Chief Academic Digital Officer, who was available to answer questions. J. Brockmole stated that the Undergraduate Studies Committee proposed the following for the College Council to consider and vote on:

“The College will only consider online courses for transfer credit if they are delivered through Semester Online. Transfer of credit is not automatic and students must seek approval (preferably in advance) from their advising dean and/or director of undergraduate studies in the same manner ascribed to all courses taken at other institutions.”

E. Visconsi added that one of the advantages of *Semester Online* courses is that such courses are more easily vetted, reviewed and verified for quality than most courses that are accepted for transfer credit. We can actually evaluate student performances, and we have a clear sense of who the faculty are because the courses are offered by institutions who are part of a consortium.

J. McGreevy opened the floor for discussion. With no questions or comments, J. McGreevy called for a vote on the proposed policy above from the Undergraduate Studies Committee: 50 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstained.

ADJOURNMENT

J. McGreevy adjourned the meeting at 4:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew C. Zyniewicz
Dean's Executive Administrator