

**THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE COLLEGE COUNCIL
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS
February 11, 2013, 3:30 pm
McKenna Hall Auditorium**

ATTENDANCE

Deans: *Dean:* John McGreevy; *Associate Deans:* JoAnn DellaNeva, Peter Holland, Maura Ryan, Mark Schurr;
Assistant Deans: Collin Meissner, Ava Preacher, Nicholas Russo, Joseph Stanfiel, Vicki Toumayan

Chairpersons and Directors: Susan Blum, Maureen Boulton, Theodore Cachey, Jim Collins, Denise Della Rossa, Joshua Diehl, Erika Doss, David Gasperetti, Patrick Griffin, Louis MacKenzie, Peter McQuillan, Rory McVeigh, Hugh Page, Valerie Sayers

Elected Faculty: Tobias Boes, William Carbonaro, Michael Driscoll, Kathleen Eberhard, Christopher Hamlin, Carlos Jauregui, Joseph Kaboski, David Nickerson, Brian O'Conchubhair, Abby Palko, Alison Rice, James Sullivan, Erika Summers-Effler, Julianne Turner, Kristin Valentino, Shauna Williams

Graduate Student Representative: Peter Campbell, Erin Drew

Undergraduate Student Representative: Arnav Dutt, Carolyn Perez

Regularly Invited Guests, Observers, and Resource People: Robert Becht (Dean's Office), Marie Blakey (Dean's Office), Matthew Capdevielle (University Writing Center), Maria Di Pasquale (Dean's Office), Linda Major (College Seminar Program), Pam Wojcik (Gender Studies), Matthew Zyniewicz (Dean's Office)

Excused: Matthew Ashley, Cindy Bergeman, Michael Brownstein, Richard Donnelly, Margot Fassler, Liangyan Ge, Noreen Deane-Moran, Larissa Fast, Robert Fishman, Lionel Jensen, Essaka Joshua, Daniel Lapsley, Elizabeth Mazurek, Nelson Mark, Thomas Merluzzi, Jessica Payne, Deb Rotman, Dayle Seidenspinner-Núñez, Elliott Visconsi, Henry Weinfield

Guests: Paulette Curtis (Faculty Director of Undergraduate and Pre-College Academic Programs), Jean Dibble (Art, Art History, and Design), Martina Lopez (Art, Art History, and Design), Maria Tomasula (Art, Art History, and Design)

Dean John McGreevy called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the October 30, 2012 College Council meeting were approved without corrections.

COLLEGE BUSINESS

Proposed Minor in Studio Art

Dean McGreevy asked Associate Dean JoAnn DellaNeva to introduce the proposal for a Minor in Studio Art. Maria Tomasula (Art, Art History, and Design), Jean Dibble (Art, Art History, and Design), and Martina Lopez (Art, Art History, and Design) were also present to introduce the proposal and to answer any questions that the Council might have. J. DellaNeva noted that Undergraduate Curriculum Committee vetted the proposal for the proposed minor, and invited the authors of the proposal (M. Tomasula, J. Dibble, and M. Lopez) to explain the proposed minor's rationale and structure. M. Tomasula explained that the Department has experienced student need for such a minor in design for several years, particularly in Studio Art. One of the issues that the Department has been experiencing is that many of the Department's courses fill with seniors. As a result, the Department attempted to pursue designated seating for the courses, but even that effort did not alleviate the problem where those students who wish to pursue design or art (such as pre-med students who wish to become medical illustrators) have difficulty getting into the courses. To pursue this issue even further, then, the Department developed the proposed minor. A major was deemed too much for most of the students who wish to pursue this area of study. J. Dibble noticed that on Majors-Nights events she has students from all of the colleges asking if the Department has a minor in studio art. The Department not only would like to allow students the privilege to sign up before non-majors and take the courses but would also like to be able to expand students' methodology and expression and to add to their problem solving skills with the particular creative set that the minor would afford. The minor would be 15 credit hours. Students would be required to take a foundational course before they could declare the minor, so that the Department would be able to manage the minor. There will not be a minor in design, because there are already many who major in design. M. Lopez added that the proposed minor is similar to such minors at Cornell University or Vanderbilt University.

Associate Dean Mark Schurr asked if the development of the minor and the abilities then for minors to sign up for courses before those who are not minors or majors would create a problem for students who attempt to sign up for courses to fulfill the university-wide fine arts requirement? J. Dibble finds that most students wait until their senior year to fulfill the fine arts requirement. The creation of the minor may force students to pursue their fine arts requirement earlier in their respective student careers.

J. McGreevy observed that there might be two competing "goods" in the creation of the minor. First, the Department would have the opportunity to attract the students who are most passionate about studio art into their courses. The students would be able to commit to studio art by signing up for the minor. The other good would be that seniors often need to take a fine arts course before they graduate. The seniors in this case might be at a disadvantage to take the studio art courses because the students pursuing the minor might fill the courses. J. Dibble reminded the Council that the Department has already put into place seat allocations, and so there are not as many seats for seniors as there have been. J. DellaNeva also mentioned that students have other alternatives to pursue in terms of fulfilling their fine arts requirement. The minor would also allow students to know about the area of study and to pursue it earlier in their student careers.

J. McGreevy observed that there are currently 27 minors in the College. The College has been over the past few years trying to discontinue minors that have had a history of ten or fewer students. He asked as a friendly amendment that after three years if the minor does not have 10 or fewer students—does not have an adequate cohort—then the College should consider discontinuing the minor.

J. McGreevy asked for a vote to approve the Minor in Studio Art. 42 voting council members approved the proposal, and 1 member abstained.

Proposed Major in Gender Studies

J. McGreevy invited Pamela Wojcik (Gender Studies) and Abigail Palko (Gender Studies) to the front of the auditorium to help introduce the proposed Major in Gender Studies and to answer any questions that the Council might have. P. Wojcik stated that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee considered the proposed major in Gender Studies. Notre Dame is ahead of many other programs in the country as it is a “genders studies” program and not a “women’s studies” program but to date has only been a supplementary major and minor. Students are forced to double major if they are interested in majoring in Genders Studies. In theory the College does not encourage double majors, and such a structure does not permit students to make Gender Studies their primary major, restricting them from pursuing a thesis in Gender Studies, and students are not able to adequately prepare for graduate studies in Gender Studies. Further, the characterization of Genders Studies as a supplementary major implies that it is not a discipline. Moving Gender Studies to a major makes more sense in terms of the discipline of Gender Studies and what is happening nationally with that major. The major would provide another option for students and would not cost any more than what the Genders Studies program does without the major. A. Palko noted that the 61 or so faculty members involved with Genders Studies are very interested and supportive of the major, and there are enough seats in cross-listed courses for students to take the extra courses needed to meet the credit requirements for the major. The major would also enable students to find out about Genders Studies earlier in their respective student careers so that they will have opportunities to take more Genders Studies courses. P. Wojcik noted that entering students receive literature about majors in the College but not supplementary majors. Students learn about supplementary majors as they progress through their studies.

Assistant Dean Ava Preacher asked if the program will be a degree-granting program? P. Wojcik indicated that with the approval of the Academic Council this could become a degree-granting program. A. Preacher indicated that if the program becomes a degree-granting program, it would be a departure from the norm in the College. There are several supplementary majors in the College that are programs and not housed in departments. How could the Gender Studies program become degree granting when it does not have core faculty primarily housed in the program? P. Wojcik indicated that part of the concern raised has to do with the stability of the Gender Studies program. Gender Studies has A. Palko as a long-standing director of undergraduate studies and has senior fellows who are appointed and have MOUs with the dean and their respective primary departments similar to joint appointments, indicating that they will teach in Gender Studies on a regular basis. There is a very regular roster of courses offered. P. Wojcik was not sure, in view of the institutional structure, why a program cannot be degree granting. J. DellaNeva recalled that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee also discussed this point, concluding that this proposed major is not much different from the case in Medieval Studies which is not a department and does not have primary faculty the way a department might, and yet it offers a major.

J. McGreevy agreed that a comparable analogy would be Medieval Studies. What would we do when other supplementary majors expressed interest in becoming a major but also without primary faculty. We could deal with such cases on a case-by-case basis.

Associate Dean Peter Holland indicated as a matter of reassurance that sometimes Genders Studies courses are not cross-listed with a faculty members’ home department because of the nature of the topic. There may be negotiations necessary with departments if the number of Gender Studies courses need to be increase, because there may be instances when a department may lose a course because a faculty member plans to teach a course specifically for Gender Studies. P. Wojcik observed that senior fellows’ courses are almost always also offered in

their primary departments and so courses usually are not add-on courses. The Gender Studies major will not require more courses, in fact Gender Studies has more courses than it can fill even while recently increasing the rigor of crosslisting. The program simply needs more students to take advantage of the program in a different way, through the major.

William Carbonaro (Department of Sociology) asked how many minors and supplementary majors there are currently in Gender Studies. J. McGreevy stated that there are 26 minors and 7 supplementary majors. A. Palko polled the students recently and all but one of the minors and supplementary majors indicated that they would have pursued Gender Studies as a primary major.

J. McGreevy asked what would be the smallest number of students that would still make a sufficient cohort to allow students to educate each other? P. Wojcik mentioned that if there is a cohort of 30 minors, supplementary majors and majors, it would not matter for the students' experiences how many majors there are; there would still be a sufficient cohort. Alison Rice (Romance Languages and Literatures) added that graduate students could be included when thinking of a cohort of students. Even in her current course on gender, theory and practice, there are three graduate students, and the undergraduates and graduates have developed as a cohort in the course. P. Wojcik recalled that there are 23 graduate students pursuing a minor in Genders Studies.

J. McGreevy asked what would be the indicators of success for the major? Is there a sufficient cohort of students? Are all majors pursuing a year-long senior thesis? What students are getting national fellowships? That would tell us something important, beyond the numbers of the program. P. Holland replied that it might be too rigorous an expectation for any program, much less a small program, to have undergraduates who win Marshalls or Rhodes scholarships.

J. McGreevy summarized two friendly amendments. The proposal should indicate the number of current minors and supplementary majors and the target number of students over time, especially for the proposed major, and to define what success might look like for what will most likely be a small—perhaps “boutique”—major (e.g., what percentage of students are doing a senior thesis, what percentage of students are pursuing undergraduate research experiences, what percentage are integrating foreign languages in their studies)? Emphasizing the aspirations for a high-quality program will be important in order to argue why it is valuable for a program without a department to have a major.

Theodore Cachey (Chairperson, Department of Romance Languages) asked if there was any discussion about embedding the program in a standard department? And in terms of our peers, what percentage has Genders Studies as a free standing program? What percentage has such programs embedded in a department? As for the the second question, P. Wojcik referred to an appendix that she distributed ahead of the meeting. The appendix shows a number of universities that offer Gender Studies as a discipline. Most often Gender Studies is listed as a program at other institutions because of the interdisciplinary nature of the field. Such programs draw on faculty from across their campuses, but that does not make the discipline any less coherent or rigorous. Notre Dame's Gender Studies program does not anticipate becoming a department at this time because such a change seems overly ambitious. P. Wojcik does not worry about whether Gender Studies is a program or embedded in a department. Increasingly there are PhD programs in Gender Studies. Notre Dame students have a good record of getting into law school, business school or medical school, but have a more difficult time getting into Ph.D. programs in Gender because they do not have a full undergraduate major. In terms of the first question, there is not an obvious department with which to align because Gender Studies is its own discipline and is very interdisciplinary (including such disciplines as history, sociology, anthropology, theology), and yet there are a core group of texts and thinkers in the discipline who focus issues in gender and who draw from the other disciplines but are free standing gender studies theorists.

Jim Collins (Department of Film, Television, and Theatre) asked what would happen if faculty who teach the required courses in the major go on leave at the same time? And have the faculty all agreed to serve as directors of theses or advisors? P. Wojcik confirmed that those faculty who are affiliated with Gender Studies in a research capacity have tacitly agreed to supervise a thesis. Recently, however, for the most part students have been pursuing senior theses within their primary departments; last year about 60% pursued a cap stone essay with Gender Studies or with their department. All the theses were informed by the students work in Gender Studies.

And if all the senior fellows manage to be on leave at the same time, P. Wojcik confirmed that there would still be enough courses for the Gender Studies majors to pursue electives. The two core courses at some level are the DUSs and Director's responsibilities. Others however are now teaching those courses so that the responsibilities to cover those classes are broadened. There are systems of backups in place.

J. McGreevy summarized three friendly amendments to the proposal: (1) The Council wanted to see a clearer description of the numbers—who is in the program now? How has that changed over time?; (2) What would mark excellence—especially for a program not embedded in a department—three years out for the Gender Studies major in order to assess how well the major is working? Excellence in terms of the number of students, the quality of the experience? (3) Describe the concentrations in the proposed major in further detail.

J. McGreevy called for a vote for the proposal of a primary major in Gender Studies to move to Academic Council's consideration. In favor, 39 votes, 1 vote was opposed, and 4 voting members abstained.

Transfer Policies

J. McGreevy recalled that the Council had an initial discussion about transfer policies in December 2012, and mentioned that there are three follow up items to vote on. College of Arts and Letters transfers used to be wholly the responsibility of the College. Currently, the Admissions Office has much more oversight than in the recent past of the transfer process and policies when a student from outside the University applies to the College of Arts and Letters after his or her first year elsewhere. The Admission Office, then, needs clearer guidance of what the College's procedures and policies are in terms what courses count for credit if a student transfers to Notre Dame.

Transfer Policy Issue #1: What credit to transfer for courses that carry fewer than three credits per semester?

Current policy, J. McGreevy explained, is that the College does not accept courses for transfer credit if the course was fewer than three credits. This practice is typical at other Universities. Even for students at Notre Dame, the University only counts up to three of such credits toward the 120 credits needed for graduation. The Office of Undergraduate Studies suggested the following options for the Council to consider for this issue: Option 1: keep current policy and not accept such courses with fewer than three credits per semester for transfer. Exceptional cases will be referred to the Office for Undergraduate Studies. Option 2: Accept no such courses for transfer without exception. Option 3: Accept for credit only those courses with demonstrable academic merit, with a limit of 3 credit hours that can count toward a student's 120-credit degree requirement total. All cases will be referred to the Office for Undergraduate Studies. After some discussion, J. McGreevy called for a vote.

Option 1 received 10 votes, Option 2 received 9 votes, and Option 3 received 21 votes.

Transfer Policy Issue #2: What business courses to accept for transfer credit in the College of Arts and Letters?

J. McGreevy explained that the current policy is to accept only one accounting course and one finance course for transfer credit. The options for the Council to vote on were: Option 1: Continue current practice, accepting only two courses, one from accounting and one from finance. Option 2: Accept for transfer credit courses from any business discipline to a limit of three 3-credit courses. Option 3: Accept for transfer credit any business discipline courses at the discretion of the Office for Undergraduate Studies. After much discussion, J. McGreevy called for a vote:

Option 1 received 25 votes; Option 2 received 12 votes; and Option 3 received 2 votes.

Transfer Policy Issue #3: What grade is acceptable for courses to transfer? J. McGreevy explained that the current policy is that only courses with a grade of B or better may transfer, and that the previous policy was only courses with a grade of C or better may transfer. The Office for Undergraduate Studies presented two options for the Council to vote on. Option 1: Accept for transfer only courses in which the grade is B or better. Exceptional cases will be referred to the Office of Undergraduate Studies. Option 2: Accept for transfer only courses in which the grade is C or better. After some discussion, J. McGreevy asked for a vote on a friendly amendment to Option 2 suggested by P. Holland: add the phrase: “such courses will not count for courses in a major or toward a College requirement.” The amendment passed with 32 votes in favor, 5 votes against, and 5 abstentions. 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.”

After some discussion, J. McGreevy asked for a vote on a friendly amendment to Option 2 suggested by P. Holland: add the phrase: “such courses will not count for courses in a major or toward a College requirement.” The amendment passed with 32 votes in favor, 5 votes against, and 5 abstentions. 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.

Option 1 received 13 votes; Option 2 with the amendment received 27 votes, and 1 abstention.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew C. Zyniewicz
Dean’s Executive Administrator