

**THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE COLLEGE COUNCIL
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS
September 25, 2013
McKenna Hall Auditorium**

ATTENDANCE

Deans: *Dean:* John McGreevy; *Associate Deans:* Maura Ryan; *Assistant Deans:* Collin Meissner, Ava Preacher, Nicholas Russo, Joseph Stanfiel, Vicki Toumayan

Chairpersons and Directors: Briona NicDhiarmada

Elected Faculty: Cindy Bergeman, Alessia Blad, William Barbonaro, Meredith Chesson, Noreen Deane-Moran, Denise Della Rossa, Richard Donnelly, Larissa Fast, Sabrina Ferri, Claire Jones, Encarnacion Juarez, Cynthia Mahmood, Vittorio Montemaggi, David Nickerson, Brian O'Conchubhair, Abby Palko, Alison Rice, Sebastiano Rosato, Deborah Rotman, Jason Ruiz, Marcus Stephens, Carmen Tellez, Julianne Turner, Elliott Visconsi, Shauna Williams, Michelle Wirth

Graduate Student Representatives: Hilary Davidson, John Joseph Stanley

Undergraduate Students Representatives: Nikita Taniparti, Meghan Thomassen

Regularly Invited Guests, Observers, and Resource People: Martin Bloomer (Ph.D. in Literature Program), John Duffy (University Writing Program), Kate Cohorst Garry (Office of the Dean), Kathleen Opel (Office of International Studies), Matt Zyniewicz (Office of the Dean)

Excused: Tom Anderson, Matthew Ashley, James Brockmole, Jim Collins, Remie Constable, Richard Cross, Michael Desch, Agustin Fuentes, David Gasperetti, Richard Gray, Patrick Griffin, Peter Holland, Lionel Jensen, Richard Jensen, Daniel Lapsley, Liz Mazurek, Rory McVeigh, Thomas Merluzzi, Hugh Page, Gretchen Reydams-Schils, Valerie Sayers, Robert Schmuhl, Mark Schurr, Dayle Seidenspinner-Núñez

Guest: Scott Appleby, *Director of Academic Planning for the School of International Affairs;* and John M. Regan Jr. *Director of the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies; Professor of History*

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the April 29, 2013 College Council meeting were approved.

COLLEGE BUSINESS

School of International Affairs

Dean John McGreevy offered a couple of prefatory comments, explaining that two years ago Provost Tom Burish first convened a University committee to think about the possibility for a School of International Affairs at Notre Dame. The committee recommended that the University should move forward with plans for such a school. T. Burish then convened a committee to think about the finances for developing and sustaining a School of International Affairs, and this committee also recommended that the University move forward with plans.

This year T. Burish appointed Scott Appleby to serve as the Director of Academic Planning for the School of International Affairs, to develop an understanding of what the academic programming for the School would be. S. Appleby's efforts to convene discussions across campus would be part of the final efforts by the University to think collectively about the possibility of a school, and then the central administration would make a decision about whether or not to have a School of International Affairs at Notre Dame.

S. Appleby distributed a four-page document (*see attached addendum*) that reported the "significant and recurrent themes and questions voiced in nineteen meetings held this far." S. Appleby provided time for the Council members to read the document. J. McGreevy asked for questions.

Assistant Dean Joseph Stanfiel asked what the undergraduate program in the School of International Affairs would look like. Will the new school potentially take away prospective students from the College of Arts and Letters? S. Appleby stated that the undergraduate component of the School has yet to be determined. What would the undergraduate program look like? Would there be a major in the School? Would there be a secondary major? When the undergraduate program has been discussed, the assumption has been that the undergraduate major would be within the College of Arts and Letters with contributions from some School faculty as necessary. J. McGreevy asserted that an undergraduate major in International Affairs will not dramatically impact the College in terms of enrollment, and further stated that the potential undergraduate aspects of the School are intriguing. One aspect is that there is an inchoate constituency for international affairs among top college applicants, and we do not have a School of International Affairs. We lose good students to other institutions that do have such a school, like Georgetown. Further, this is the second year of the international economics major, and there are already 72 declared majors. In a few years the major may very well become one of the College's largest majors, especially as the number of possible languages coupled with economics increases. Students have responded to the phrase "international economics" and signed up for the very demanding major.

If we develop an international affairs major, we could also have a very stiff language requirement as well as a demanding curriculum similar to the international economics major. The major could be a stand-alone major housed within the Department of Political Science, or the College could offer international affairs as a second major, similar to the second major that Yale University just adopted. Students could pursue, for example, a major in history and a second major in international affairs, or finance and international affairs, or classics and international affairs. A second major in international affairs could globalize the entire curriculum, and could potentially draw students into a good sequence of Arts and Letters courses, not simply a random collection of courses, such as biology and international affairs or chemistry and international affairs.

McGreevy maintained, however, that the core of the international affairs would be a master program. Notre Dame must focus most of its resources on the Ph.D. and master programs in order to have a reputable School of International Affairs.

Meghan Thomassen (Undergraduate Student Representative) asked how the proposed School of International Affairs would work with the current Notre Dame study abroad programs. J. McGreevy replied that ideally, if the proposed international affairs program has a stiff language requirement, students would go abroad to deepen their knowledge of the respective languages. The College at this time does not require students to study abroad for the international economics major, but the College strongly encourages students to do so. S. Appleby noted that the University hopes to develop greater coherence in a student's overall educational experience, particularly with regard to the proposed School of International Affairs. Venues in London, Rome, Jerusalem, Chicago, China and Dublin are now called "global gateways" with the intention of better coordinating and integrating the educational experiences abroad with the educational experiences here on campus.

Cynthia Mahmood (Department of Anthropology) noted that there are stronger and weaker forms of internationalization. The weaker form has been the institutional practice of creating educational experiences abroad or schools of international affairs in addition to the main campus as it already exists. The stronger form has been the institutional practice of creating educational experiences abroad or schools of international affairs in addition to the main campus but to internationalize across the curriculum as well. How would the proposed School of International Affairs contribute to the internationalization of the main campus? S. Appleby responded that at the undergraduate level the University has been attempting to internationalize the student body, and the hope would be that a School of International Affairs would help the University attract a more international student body. Further, another hope would be that the School would work collaboratively across the University, where students would take courses offered by different colleges across campus. And perhaps the School can be a catalyst for more joint appointments in different colleges, for example, joint appointments for the Department of Economics and the School of International Affairs.

Martin Bloomer (Director, Ph.D. in Literature Program) wondered if the suggested cost of developing a School of International Affairs is underestimated. M. Bloomer researched some of the institutions that already have Schools of International Affairs: Georgetown has 22 faculty in East Asian, whereas we have 15 faculty. Georgetown has a linguistics department; we have none. Georgetown has 12 faculty in Arabic; we have 5. They have a Slavic department, but we do not. They have nine faculty in the Slavic department; we have 4 in related disciplines. How can we generate enough funds to rival Georgetown's School? S. Appleby stated that the question is: How is Notre Dame going to compete with institutions that already have well-established Schools of International Affairs? Notre Dame will not try to accomplish all that Georgetown tries to do in its School. We will attempt to educate and train students to be leaders in global civil society. We will not narrowly focus on training diplomats, government leaders as such. And yet how can we achieve excellence in a relatively short time? Some faculty lines will be absolutely essential. The fundraising strategies and 5 to 9 prominent key hires in International Affairs must be in place before the University opens the School. Notre Dame will have a smaller, niche School that would try to excel in the areas of religion, ethics, culture, global civil society, partnerships between governmental and non-governmental entities, and would try to develop a method that begins from the ground up and is sensitive to cultures.

David Nickerson (Department of Political Science) noted that the report distributed to the Council members indicates that the proposed School would have administrative autonomy similar to the Law School that makes its own hires. But when the report indicates that the proposed School would have to make 5 to 9 faculty hires, it seems that the departments would make the hires whereas the School would need to have the approval of the departments. S. Appleby confirmed that the School would be autonomous, not within a college with the ability to make its own hires. On the one hand, autonomy is critical, especially in the area of policy studies. There are different faculty across campus who do applied and translational work, but the University has few faculty who pursue international policy studies. Departments would understandably not want to hire faculty who pursue policy studies in different areas. The School must have key hires in policy studies from the very beginning, and it must have the power of appointment to fill in gaps in faculty expertise in policy studies. On the other hand, the University has a long way to go to build up the faculty for a School in International Affairs, and so the School needs to collaborate with departments to make it successful and to integrate its curricular emphases throughout the University. J. McGreevy added that the School will need to have good relationships with departments in order to attract top faculty. The School should have some of its own faculty, but the rest of the faculty should be joint appointments with departments.

Vittorio Montemaggi (Department of Romance Languages and Literatures) mentioned that religion will undoubtedly be very important for the School, particularly with regard to interreligious matters. If that will be the case, will the School attract a more religiously diverse faculty pool? S. Appleby observed that if the School is going to be global in terms of its footprint, then it must welcome various religious and non-religious groups to better understand various cultures and religions. Notre Dame has so much strength already in so many areas related to religion, ethics and culture (i.e., human values, human flourishing, and integral human development).

Denise Della Rossa (Department of German and Russian Languages and Literatures) asked if the University will have funding for competitive graduate stipends to attract top students. And, who would have curricular oversight, the School itself or other departments? J. McGreevy asserted that the School would have curricular oversight for the master program. The University has yet to sort out who will have curricular oversight for the undergraduate program. S. Appleby offered that the University will need to attract—with good tuition advantages for five years or so—students to the School focused on global civil society and leadership, and away from other schools with their respective emphases.

John Joseph Shanley (Graduate Student Representative) asked about the placement efforts of the new School. How will the School's placement efforts differ from the placement efforts across the University? Will the School have to develop a new placement strategy? S. Appleby restated that the master program will be the core of the School, but also as part of joint degree programs, for example, a Ph.D. in economics and a master degree in international affairs, or law degree and MA in international affairs. If that is the case, then the placement efforts will not compete with other placement efforts across campus.

William Carbonaro (Department of Sociology) emphasized that it would be very helpful and perhaps more successful if there was an extra year of time built into the joint degree programs (e.g., Ph.D. in Sociology and MA from the Kroc). Students have a difficult time working through all the demands of joint degree programs in the same amount of time and same funding. S. Appleby noted that the School will learn from the already existing joint programs.

M. Thomassen asked why the University wants to build a School that is independent from other Colleges, but depends so heavily on the other colleges and school across the University. How will the

University measure the success of such a School? S. Appleby stated that the School will have its own mission, core faculty, leadership structure, funding sources, and its own particular educational goals, as an independent entity but related to other units. The School will have its own distinct intellectual core, concerning especially peace building, human rights, and human development, but its core will especially be integrative, bringing together in collaboration units in the University that are already working on major problems such as climate change, shrinking middle class, economic underdevelopment or conflict. Very few schools have such an approach.

Sebastiano Rosato (Department of Political Science) wondered what the burdens will be on existing faculty when the new School is introduced. J. McGreevy observed that the sheer number of master students will not be overwhelming, but the one-on-one work will be significant, which is why the School will need to hire more faculty. The new students will also enrich the already existing graduate seminars.

Sabrina Ferri (Department of Romance Languages and Literatures) mentioned that it appears that the proposed School will try to place its own graduate students in the same areas that other departments have had success in placing students. S. Appleby mentioned that the Mendoza College of Business raised the same issues. The School will hopefully help place graduate students from other units across campus, and given the differences in the degrees, students will not always compete for the same positions.

Dean McGreevy thanked S. Appleby for his presentation and discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

Dean McGreevy adjourned the meeting at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew C. Zyniewicz
Dean's Executive Administrator