The Meeting Minutes of the College Council
College of Arts and Letters
March 26, 2013, 3:30 pm
McKenna Hall Auditorium

Attendance

Deans: Acting Dean: Maura Ryan; Associate Deans: Peter Holland, Mark Schurr; Assistant Deans: Collin Meissner, Ava Preacher, Nicholas Russo, Joseph Stanfiel, Vicki Toumayan

Chairpersons and Directors: J. Matthew Ashley, Maureen Boulton, Jim Collins, Richard Cross, David Gasperetti, Richard Gray, Patrick Griffin, Richard Jensen, Elizabeth Mazurek, Peter McQuillian, Rory McVeigh, Hugh Page, Gretchen Reydams-Schils, Valerie Sayers

Elected Faculty: Tobias Boes, Michael Brownstein, Noreen Deane-Moran, Denise Della Rossa, Joshua Diehl, Richard Donnelly, Michael Driscoll, Larissa Fast, Robert Fishman, Liangyan Ge, Lionel Jensen, Joseph Kaboski, David Nickerson, Abby Palko, Marcus Stephens, James Sullivan, David Thomas, Kristin Valentino, Elliot Visconsi, Shauna Williams

Graduate Student Representative: Peter Campbell, Erin Drew

Undergraduate Student Representative: Arnav Dutt

Regularly Invited Guests, Observers, and Resource People: Marie Blakey (Dean’s Office), William Donaruma (Center for Creative Computing), Maria Di Pasquale, John Duffy (University Writing Program), Kathleen Opel (Office of International Studies), Matthew Zyniewicz (Dean’s Office)

Excused: Ruth Abbey, Cindy Bergeman, Susan Blum, Theodore Cachey, William Carbonaro, JoAnn DellaNeva, Kathleen Eberhard, Christopher Hamlin, John McGreevy, Brian O’Conchubhair, Jessica Payne, Carolyn Perez, Robin Rhodes, Deb Rotman, Julie Turner, Henry Weinfield

Guests: Thomas Anderson

Acting Dean Maura Ryan called the meeting to order beginning with a prayer at 3:35 pm.

Approval of Minutes
Vicki Toumayan (Assistant Dean) asked for clarification on the last page of the February 11, 2013 minutes where the minutes state: “if a course ended in a C+, C, or C- it wouldn’t count for a major or College requirement.” She suggested the following wording: “Option 2 now reads: ‘Accept for transfer only courses in which the grade is C or better, and only courses with a grade of B or better toward a major or toward a College requirement.’ J. McGreevy asked for a vote on Option 1 and on the amended version of Option 2.” The College Council agreed to the change, and the minutes from the February 11, 2013 College Council meeting were approved with corrections.

**COLLEGE BUSINESS**

M. Ryan introduced David Bailey, Associate Vice President for Strategic Planning and Tatiana Combs, Survey Program Manager & Consultant who spoke about an upcoming faculty experience survey. This survey originated in the College of Arts and Letters after a group of faculty urged the Provost to initiate it.

D. Bailey provided an update as to where they are with the faculty survey which started in 2010. Extensive input came from faculty, and they had guidance in refinement each step of the way.

T. Combs mentioned that in order to recognize the importance of comparative data for the faculty survey, the Office of Strategic Planning sought participation from a group of universities called “Colonial Group,” which consisted of five peers, who worked together on this project. The AAU instrument met the needs of this project and a working group was formed based on the core AAU questions, the needs of others schools, and input from the faculty. The survey addresses institutional climate, work load, admission process, mentoring, research scholarship infrastructure, benefits, work and life balance, and other topics. The Office of Strategic Planning is the survey host for all the institutions; and they are responsible for comparative reporting for all the institutions. T. Combs added that this survey will be launched soon and urged faculty to participate. The survey will be open for one month. D. Bailey added that they will practice great care to make sure that faculty responses will remain anonymous.

Valerie Sayers (Chairperson, Department of English) asked about comparative workload for leave policies, none of the universities listed is among what the University considers aspirational universities. Might this arrangement result in Notre Dame looking good but we would not have comparative data from our aspirational peers? D. Bailey replied that this survey initiated with Notre Dame and Tom Burish encouraged the Colonial Group and other schools to join. Notre Dame hopes that other schools join as we gain a track record. When viewing the results, the participating institutions will not know which results came from which school, but all schools will be listed. T. Combs added that institutions will have to be members of the AAU in order to participate.

M. Ryan stated that it was important to T. Burish that we have a comparison group in order to conduct the survey, and Colonial Group has its limits. It is a group of provosts who share institutional information. Further, there are questions on the survey that are particular to Notre Dame, i.e., religious questions.

D. Bailey mentioned that there are three sections on the survey: (1) core questions that every school will ask, (2) optional questions that any school who wanted to ask, and (3) “Notre Dame only” questions. The results of the “Notre Dame only” questions will not be shared with other institutions.

Robert Fishman (Department of Sociology) shared V. Sayer’s concerns. He thought that the best way to involve faculty in achieving a high response rate might be through the Faculty Senate.
M. Ryan thanked D. Bailey and T. Combs and asked everyone to encourage their colleagues to participate. She also suggested that if they had any additional ideas or concerns, to contact D. Bailey or T. Combs.

Global Gateway Governance

M. Ryan introduced Matt Ashley (Chairperson, Department of Theology) and Robert Norton (Associate Vice President for Internationalization). They both spoke about the Global Gateway Governance Committee.

M. Ryan asked everyone to refer to the letter from J. Nicholas Entrikin (Vice President and Associate Provost for Internationalization) that listed questions for the College Council to consider.

M. Ashley noted that the letter from N. Entrikin referred to the new facility in Rome, one relatively new facility in Dublin, and revitalization of the infrastructure and renewal of Notre Dame’s lease at the Vatican for the Notre Dame facility outside of Jerusalem. N. Entrikin is trying to utilize these spaces in a more strategic and efficient manner. In the past this space has been used as locations for undergraduate study abroad programs and N. Entrikin and other central administrators would like to see more exposure of undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty to more communities in other parts of the world. A committee was formed chaired by R. Norton, including M. Ashley, and Theodore Cachey (Department of Romance Languages and Literatures) to develop a proposal primarily about how to get faculty more involved. Notre Dame will still have administrators on site in these foreign locations but also will ensure that faculty are invested in the Global Gateways and that faculty remain involved with the governance of the respective sites, especially with regard to the academic programming. N. Entrikin would like the committee to come up with proposals by May 1st. M. Ashley said that they would like input from the different faculty on the questions before submitting a proposal.

R. Norton and M. Ashley asked the chairpersons and directors to find ways to caucus faculty in their respective University units and provide feedback. The information could be sent to either R. Norton or M. Ashley. M. Ashley asked that the Council members think about different ways to energize these facilities and best ways to have faculty involved.

Denise Della Rossa (Department of German and Russian Languages and Literatures) had three concerns about the body of N. Entrikin’s letter. She questioned the line regarding the increase of the number of non-Notre Dame students and the creation of a corresponding number of additional courses. She asked for a clarification of what was meant by “non-Notre Dame students”? Does the phrase refer to US university students and/or international students? She observed that Notre Dame is expensive for many students so how are we going to help facilitate such arrangements? Would the hired site directors be from the host cities or from the Notre Dame main campus? She further asked if SPFs would be allowed to engage in these new initiatives.

R. Norton explained that the phrase, “Non-Notre Dame students”, refers to international students who would participate in the summer programs at the Global Gateway locations, an example would be the successful program in Tantur, Israel. The University has been considering the expansion of the Tantur program to the spring semester and has been inviting American universities to encourage their students to apply. This arrangement would include US non-Notre Dame students, international non-Notre Dame students, and Notre Dame students.

M. Ryan asked if part of the motivation in expanding Notre Dame programs to include international students is better integration of our English language speaking programs into the surrounding communities? R. Norton confirmed that the University would like to help better integrate Notre Dame students into the host societies. Notre Dame continues to emphasize social learning courses and internships.
Further, R. Norton asserted that it would be ideal to have the directors come from the country where the Global Gateway is located. Such persons would be more informed of all aspects of the particular culture. R. Norton also confirmed that SPF faculty would be able to engage in the new initiatives at the Global Gateways.

M. Ashley stated that one of the challenges of the process has been generating policies that make sense and respect the differences between the different institutions. Tantur, for example, is a very unique institution because it has a lot of space and the University historically has not used the space very well. Taking opportunities away from Notre Dame students by inviting other students should not be a concern; Tantur could be an example of having ample space to accommodate a large number of students.

M. Ryan asked if we move to an onsite-director model, who would control the curriculum? R. Norton asserted that the Notre Dame faculty would set and monitor the curricula. Notre Dame will oversee the curricula, but would not determine what the content should be. The Office of Notre Dame International (NDI) will develop mechanisms where all colleges will provide the appropriate oversight for the academic programming and curricula.

Gretchen Reydams-Schils (Chairperson, Program of Liberal Studies) asked about the timing of the requested input, noting that the May 1 deadline was approaching very quickly. She suggested that the deadline does not provide enough time for communication and conversation for an in-depth analysis by the faculty. She added that with regard to faculty projects, not concerning student abroad projects, these gateways have played a minor role in internalization efforts. One-on-one faculty relationships with other institutions are more effective and more cost effective. She opined that NDI should do more in supporting faculty projects. NDI has focused on centers, institutes, and gateways for support but direct support in both logistics and resources for faculty internationalization efforts has remained lacking. She applauded this initiative but thought that it is a small piece of the puzzle. She hoped that work will be done on a broader approach.

R. Norton agreed that the May 1st deadline for recommendations was poor timing. NDI will conclude with the project when they feel this project has been structured and organized properly, and when they feel they have addressed everyone’s input and concerns. If it takes longer than the May 1st deadline, they will extend the deadline.

R. Norton also announced that a proposal will soon be submitted to Provost this week called the Global Collaborative Initiative that will give grants of $10,000 to $20,000 to faculty members who propose collaboration with international colleagues. Up to five grants will be awarded annually; more details will soon be announced. This will provide institutional and financial support, and encourage more faculty to participate.

Maureen Boulton (Acting Director, Medieval Institute) observed that when universities try to integrate students into the host societies, having flashy buildings as the students’ homes and as the educational facilities isolates the students and faculty from the host society. The programs in Mexico, Spain, and France do not have such buildings and receive little support from the University; and notably the students live with families and are well integrated into the culture. Notre Dame has ambitions to be more international but must be more aware and intentional about not creating a “glass-box” to set ourselves apart from host societies.

R. Norton agreed that NDI would like to find more appropriate ways to use the buildings at the various sites. First and foremost the buildings should be for study abroad programs, and perhaps for recruitment of students to Notre Dame, international conferences, and symposia. Flashy buildings have a purpose but R. Norton agreed that such venues do not solve all problems but in some ways create additional issues.

Patrick Griffin (Chairperson, Department of History) hoped that the discussion was the beginning of a dialogue for this project and that the May 1st deadline does not remain too firm. Further, a faculty person who knows the
curriculum and the Notre Dame processes should be on board for each of these Gateways. It is important to have faculty institutionalize the process by which these programs will run effectively.

M. Ashley noted that Notre Dame currently has an academic faculty board for the undergraduate program in Tantur. The program was suspended in the recent past and when it started up again there were a lot of complex issues about collaborating with Hebrew University and Bethlehem University. One of the issues is that some of the buildings are new or the situation is changing and anything we put in place has to be accessed on a yearly basis. R. Norton agreed that the use of the Global Gateway Governance Committee has become apparent, and the Tantur faculty advisory board can become a model for the other international venues.

R. Norton noted that the Global Governance Committee would like faculty to discuss the issues related to the Global Gateways as mentioned in N. Entrikin’s letter and come back to the Committee. The Committee will then generate a draft and address the faculty again for comments and feedback. The Committee will finally draw up a proposal and submit it to N. Entrikin for discussion and implementation. R. Norton noted that Dennis Doordan (School of Architecture) is in charge of the Rome Center’s working committee. He plans to have a large informational meeting to inform interested people concerning the plans for Rome. The Notre Dame building in Rome will be ready on September 1st.

Lionel Jensen (Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures) asked how admissions processes would be handled for the students for the Global Gateway programs? How will NDI appoint a director from the host area, and will faculty have some representatives on the appointments committee? Will administrators and academics from the host area also have some representatives on the committee? L. Jensen suggested that NDI form an advisory committee for each of the international sites to assist NDI with academics and assistants who are brought into the venue. And there should be an initial review after the first three years of operation to find out how the program is working. R. Norton replied that he will find out more about the actual selection process. M. Ashley invited L. Jensen to submit his recommendations as to what role faculty should play with the Gateway programs. The programs will also have annual reports to assess how well the students are integrating into the host communities.

Jim Collins (Chairperson, Department of Film, Television, and Theatre) asked if there will be University-wide competitions for funds to hold conferences at the sites. Will such competitions be held annually? Would the competitions be the only funding source? Will advisory committees for each site, if they are formed, have a say in the competitions for funding? In short, who will decide the winners of the competitions? R. Norton stated that a committee with broad representation from across the University will make the decisions and there will be a formal vetting process. R. Norton expressed that he hopes there will be many applications for the funds. The funds are not permanent funds at the moment, but NDI continues to work on establishing a permanent funding source.

Mark Schurr (Associate Dean) asked where do faculty go to get more information on the Gateway sites? R. Norton responded that his office continues to develop ways to get the word out and will soon hire a communications specialist to help develop a comprehensive communication strategy to help communicate with faculty, students and staff about the Gateway opportunities.

M. Schurr noted that for historical reasons (more language based, etc.) in the past some populations of the University have been shut out of OIS (Office of International Studies) activities, such as the social sciences. R. Norton noted that Ken Henderson (Senior Assistant Provost for Internationalization) and Sharon Hu (Senior Assistant Provost for Internationalization) are new to NDI, and they will work to ensure that the Colleges of Engineering and Science are included in the new initiatives.
Elizabeth Mazurek (Chairperson, Classics Department) noted that Notre Dame is part of the consortium of schools that participate in the Intercollegiate Center for Classical Studies in Rome, a unique program for Classics majors to study in Rome specifically on Classics. Will growth in the Global Gateway in Rome jeopardize Notre Dame students’ ability to participate in that consortium? R. Norton replied that NDI will facilitate what faculty want to do and students in Rome will continue to have the opportunity to take part in the consortium.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew C. Zyniewicz
Dean’s Executive Administrator