ATTENDANCE

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

Chairpersons and Directors: Susan Blum, Theodore Cachey, Jim Collins, David Gasperetti, Patrick Griffin, Daniel Lapsley, Louis MacKenzie, Elizabeth Mazeuk, Peter McQuillan, Rory McVeigh, Thomas Merluzzi, Hugh Page, Gretchen Reydams-Schils

Elected Faculty: Cindy Bergeman, William Carbonaro, Noreen Deane-Moran, Denise Della Rossa, Joshua Diehl, Richard Donnelly, Erin Drew, Michael Driscoll, Robert Fishman, Liangyan Ge, Carlos Jauregui, Lionel Jensen, Joseph Kaboski, Brian O’Conchubhair, Abby Palko, Alison Rice, Marcus Stephens, Kristin Valentino, Henry Weinfield, Shauna Williams

Graduate Student Representative: Peter Campbell

Undergraduate Student Representative: Carolyn Perez

Regularly Invited Guests, Observers, and Resource People: Robert Becht (Dean’s Office), Marie Blakey (Dean’s Office), Maria Di Pasquale (Dean’s Office), Matthew Zyniewicz (Dean’s Office)


Guest: Charles Hurley (Director of the Summer Session, Interim University Registrar)

Dean John McGreevy called the meeting to order at 3:36 pm.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the September 24, 2012 College Council meeting were approved without corrections.
COLLEGE BUSINESS

Summer Session

John McGreevy welcomed Chuck Hurley, Interim University Registrar, who began the session by reminding the Council members that the Council passed a motion in February 2011, indicating undergraduate summer three-credit courses had to be at least four weeks in duration. The Registrar reviewed national norms in terms of summer courses as well as looked at Notre Dame’s summer session courses back into the 1970s. Notre Dame has regularly offered two-, three-, four-, six-, seven-, ten-, and twelve-week courses in the summer session. Notre Dame has a perpetual calendar for the fall and spring terms but does not have a perpetual calendar for the summer term. Academic Council has been silent on the summer session perpetual calendar. The only consideration that Academic Council has recently given the summer session was a vote to recognize the fourth of July as a holiday if it occurs during the week. It has been a “tradition” that the summer session begins during the fourth week in June, and that the summer session offer seven-week courses. Now, however, only about half the courses during the summer have a traditional, seven-week format.

C. Hurley proposed that the Council members vacate their vote, allowing the vote to go to the Academic Council in order to build a perpetual calendar for the summer. The perpetual calendar—courses begin and end in the same weeks in June and July every summer—would hopefully allow the possibility for three-week undergraduate summer courses if it made pedagogical sense to the dean of the respective college and to the chairperson of the respective department. It would not be required for any college, school or department to offer three-week courses during the summer.

J. McGreevy asked for questions or discussion.

Susan Blum (Chairperson, Department of Anthropology) asked why the University needs a perpetual calendar in terms of pedagogical needs of the instructor and department, because it appears that having a flexible schedule in the summer months can be beneficial. C. Hurley indicated that such a question would be part of the discussion in the Academic Council, but the perpetual calendar would apply to courses taught on campus and in our classrooms during the summer.

Assistant Dean Joseph Stanfiel observed that the College will only accept transfer credits from four-week or longer courses taken at other institutions during the summer months.

Joseph Kaboski (Department of Economics) asked if the perpetual calendar would apply to both graduate and undergraduate courses. C. Hurley indicated that there are graduate courses in the summer that are three weeks in duration, but the vote that the College Council passed indicating that summer courses be at least four weeks in duration was for undergraduate courses, not graduate courses.

Assistant Dean Ava Preacher reminded the Council that the duration options for three-credit undergraduate courses during the summer session are seven weeks, five weeks, four weeks, and three weeks. There seems to be an enormous amount of flexibility for scheduling summer courses. The Council’s vote was simply to indicate that undergraduate courses could not be shorter than four weeks in duration. This was to address an issue that undergraduates could take only one three-week course in the summer because of the amount of time that the students had to be in class and do the homework. The work load turned out to be too much, and so the Council voted to have undergraduate three-credit summer courses to be no less than four weeks. This arrangement does not really affect the calendar. Why should the College Council or Academic Council need to address this again when there appears to be a flexible calendar in place? C. Hurley recalled that the Carnegie definition of a
credit hour is 750 minutes of classroom instruction equals one credit hour. The definition also entails two hours of work outside the classroom per hour of work inside the classroom. The Department of Education has essentially adopted this understanding of a credit hour, and this has implications for financial aid if such a definition is not followed by institutions. Notre Dame, especially the summer session, has rigorously adhered to the 750-minute rule. If the Academic Council allowed for undergraduate three-credit courses to take place in the summer within a three-week timeframe, C. Hurley would ask them to also stipulate that undergraduate courses could not simultaneously take more than one three-week, three-credit course. Further, if the Academic Council developed a perpetual calendar for the summer session, that would not mean that the University would have to get rid of all flexibility during the summer session. A perpetual calendar would provide certain institutional parameters for faculty when they are considering when to offer courses in the summer months; faculty could not simply negotiate the days, weeks, or months that they will teach during the summer. A. Preacher did not see a conflict with any future perpetual calendar. The College is simply indicating that undergraduate three-credit courses will not be shorter than four weeks. C. Hurley responded that the Academic Council would like to have a University-wide discussion about undergraduate three-credit, three-week courses.

Assistant Dean Vicki Toumayan noted that the College has already considered the pedagogical implications of three-week, three-credit summer undergraduate courses, and decided that three-credit undergraduate summer courses cannot be less than four weeks in duration. If four-week courses fit into any future perpetual calendar, why is it an issue that summer undergraduate courses are to be four weeks or more in duration? C. Hurley responded with a question: Why did the College and University allow three-credit, three-week summer undergraduate courses for four decades? Many of Notre Dame’s peer institutions offer three-credit, three week undergraduate courses in the summer. Further, such courses appeal to students because the duration allows students to work in the summer, conduct research if they would like, or pursue internships. Instead of spending seven weeks on campus in the summer, the students would have the possibility of spending only three-weeks on campus. Some faculty even prefer to offer three-week, three-credit undergraduate courses in the summer, because it frees up time for them to pursue their research and writing during the remainder of the summer months. J. McGreevy asked how C. Hurley might respond to the argument made in February 2011 when the Council took up the issue, and considered three weeks an insufficient amount of time pedagogically speaking for adequate student learning. And, even though the University might have offered such courses in the past forty years, that in itself is insufficient reason to continue to offer such courses. C. Hurley noted that a number of peer institutions do think that three-weeks is a sufficient amount of time for three-credit undergraduate courses in the summer.

Associate Dean Peter Holland noted that the College was attempting to bring order to the undergraduate summer courses, by indicating based on a theory of pedagogy that there is an effective minimum duration for effective teaching and learning at the undergraduate level for three-credit courses. It would seem that the University could establish a perpetual calendar, and allow for colleges to establish their own parameters within the perpetual calendar that would reflect their collective pedagogical commitments. The College of Arts and Letters for instance would not schedule three-credit undergraduate courses for a duration less than four weeks. Other colleges could establish their own parameters based on their own pedagogical commitments. Meanwhile, the Academic Council could offer a plan to which the College Council could ascent concerning three-week courses; this way the Academic Council is not denying the reasons that the College Council put forth so recently concerning the duration of such courses. P. Holland was loath to vacate a decision when there Academic Council decision or plan to replace the College Council’s decision. The Council can wish to vacate its earlier decision when it has another plan to consider. Academic Council can perhaps even impose a plan on the College Council but perhaps it would be done in view of the College Council’s expressed opposition.
Associate Dean Mark Schurr made a plea to the Council to be more flexible with the duration of the courses, having taught in the summer session for a number of years. The norm has been one week of field work, in his case, for one credit hour. And, Notre Dame competes with other institutions that offer three-week to six-week sessions. If we do not offer three-week to six-week summer courses, then we might lose students because they might go to a Big Ten school, for example. There may be some pragmatic value in having three-week courses, while not being pedagogically poor in some circumstances.

A. Preacher agrees that it might be helpful to correlate Notre Dame’s summer session with other institutions’ summer sessions. Many schools, for example, have two four-week sessions, and some have a six- or seven-week session at the same time. This might help Notre Dame draw more outside students in the summer besides Notre Dame students. C. Hurley stated that Notre Dame would like to become more competitive with other institutions when it comes to summer session, and most recently the summer session has been bringing in income because more non-Notre Dame students have been attending the summer session. Last year (summer 2012), Notre Dame drew about 700 students from other institutions to the summer session. We find that we are competing with Indiana University and Purdue, and more broadly, University of Chicago, Northwestern, NYU. Most of those schools offer a three-week session within their summer session, but that is not the only length of course that they offer.

J. McGreevy noted that the motion on the floor is the following: a vote to vacate the College Council decision made last year requiring that summer undergraduate three-credit courses must be a minimum of four weeks. A “yes” vote vacates that decision and C. Hurley will go to Academic Council as a part of a larger effort by the University to systematize the procedures and policies of summer school. A “no” vote means that C. Hurley goes to Academic Council in an effort to systematize the procedures and policies of summer school but there will be a discussion and road block at Academic Council if it is understood that the College of Arts and Letters has a four-week minimum. The Registrar’s Office can propose to the Academic Council that it would like a three-week minimum for various reasons, but the College Council’s decision to have a four-week minimum will also inform the discussion of the Academic Council.

Theodore Cachey (Chairperson, Department of Romance Languages and Literatures) asked for a point of information. Is it the case that the three-week courses do satisfy the Carnegie standard for credit-hour work outside of class? C. Hurley confirmed that three-week courses do satisfy the Carnegie standard.

J. McGreevy asked for a vote: 16 (yes to vacate the vote); 25 (no, not to vacate vote). Ramifications: C. Hurley will bring the issue to the Academic Council, but will inform that discussion with the College Council’s decision to require undergraduate summer three-credit courses to be a minimum of four weeks based on pedagogical reasons.

P. Holland asked if a document could be circulated that explains the pedagogical reasons why the Academic Council will vacate the College Council’s decision, should that come about? J. McGreevy agreed that such a document or reasons would be circulated should that occur. In response to Lionel Jensen’s (Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures) request, McGreevy also reminded the Council that he would be present at Academic Council during its discussion about this matter, and he will also explain the College Council’s decision.

Transfer of Credit

J. McGreevy noted that the Council would next discuss four individual issues about how the College should handle transfer of credit for students coming into the University. He invited Associate Dean JoAnn DellaNeva to introduce the issues. J. DellaNeva indicated that she had distributed a sheet that listed four informal policies
that the Office of Undergraduate Studies had been practicing. She and her colleagues in the Office wished to make the policies more formal, and so wanted to have them first discussed by the College Council. A more formal presentation and acceptance of the policies would provide further evidence that the College considers transfer of credits in a systemized fashion, particularly for accreditation purposes.

The first issue dealt with students who had been admitted by the University’s admissions office and have been deemed to have completed roughly the same curriculum as Notre Dame’s First Year of Studies with the expectation that the students would be given sophomore status when they arrive at Notre Dame. What particular courses would transfer with credit and which would satisfy College of University requirements?

Classes for which Notre Dame has not equivalent discipline, such as Polish, Swahili, geography, etc. are examples. The current policy is that the University does not accept such courses for the transfer of credit. An alternative policy would be that the courses would be accepted with credit as elective credit because they would not be within a discipline that Notre Dame offers.

V. Toumayan offered a point of clarification. The acceptance of students and the transfer of credits are not completely distinct. What courses are transferable matters when it comes to whether or not the University should accept the student. The current admissions structure is that admission to the University is made, and then what courses are transferable is established.

Henry Weinfield (Program of Liberal Studies) asked what the rational was for the policy not to accept credits when Notre Dame does not have an equivalent discipline. A. Preacher responded that the University does not accept credit for courses that Notre Dame does not have an equivalent course or discipline whatsoever. There are fields that Notre Dame simply does not offer and the University or College are unable to assess how pedagogically sound the courses are; there could be not one faculty member who can review a course and advise the Office of Undergraduate Studies about what Notre Dame courses might be equivalent or what particular requirement the transfer-course might fulfill.

H. Weinfield asked what if the course is from a good institution? Why not transfer the credit, even though we do not have the expertise to evaluate the course’s content? A. Preacher observed that even if a course was taken at a reputable institution, Notre Dame does not have a way to determine how much credit should be awarded.

A. Preacher noted that there is another issue: The Office of Undergraduate Studies does not at this time determine who is admitted to the University as a transfer student; it is the Office of Admissions. The Office of Admissions has no reliable way of determining what credits will transfer at the time of offering admission, and subsequently the Office of Undergraduate Studies must attempt to determine how credits transfer after the student is already admitted to the University. In brief, Notre Dame could be admitting students through the Office of Admissions, but in the end could be admitting students who do not have enough credits to be at Notre Dame.

J. McGreevy reiterated the issue at hand, noting that offering admission before determining what credits would transfer is an important but separate issue. The question at hand is how and in what circumstances should the College transfer credits that the College or University does not offer?

David Gasperetti (Chairperson, Department of German and Russian Languages and Literatures) asked if this would be a model that would not provide some discretion for the College? That is, would the College determine that credits from one institution for a given course are acceptable whereas credits for a similar course from another institution are not acceptable? J. DellaNeva responded that assuming a student has been deemed
acceptable and his or her first year was roughly equivalent to Notre Dame’s first year, we expect the transfer student to progress at the sophomore level. The decision about the institution from which a transfer student is admitted has already been made at time of admission. It is a question of whether we accept credits based on our curriculum that may not have a discipline that the student’s previous institution offered.

Kristin Valentino (Department of Psychology) wondered if a maximum number of credits from courses without equivalents at Notre Dame could be established for students coming into the College.

P. Holland observed that even with courses from other institutions for which we have equivalent courses, we have no way of determining how well the courses were taught at the other institutions. One can take a good Shakespeare course or a bad one, but we could not tell simply from a transcript. Yet, we have no difficulty giving credit for such courses. The decision to transfer courses without equivalents should be no more difficult than when we have equivalents for courses.

Assistant Dean Nick Russo noted that if the College Council decides to allow transfer of credits from language courses that Notre Dame does not offer, then the courses should also count as fulfilling language credits for the College. J. McGreevy agreed. Transferred credit for a language could fulfill elective credit and language requirements.

J. McGreevy stated the second of four issues involving transfer of credits: transfer of credit from courses that are fewer than three credits. J. DellaNeva explained that the current policy is that the College does not accept credits from courses that are fewer than three credits. An alternative policy would be to accept credits from such courses (one- or two-credit courses) as elective credit. There are many first-year courses at Notre Dame that are one and two credits. Notably, the issue of one-credit courses is currently under review by the College. J. McGreevy asked why we do not accept transfer credit from one- or two-credit courses when we do accept credit for our own one- or two-credit courses. A. Preacher observed that it is standard practice across the nation not to accept transfer credit from one- or two-credit courses.

J. Stanfiel provided some context for the issue. The reason for the current practices with regard to transfer of credits is that generally transfer students are not the same as those who enter Notre Dame as First Year Students. Further, the institutions from which students transfer are not the quality of Notre Dame or Notre Dame’s peer institutions. The College as a result has in the past looked on marginal courses with some skepticism when evaluating a transfer candidate. The one- or two-credit courses tend not to be academic courses.

Elizabeth Mazurek (Chairperson, Department of Classics) offered that there might be instances where transfer of credits from a two-credit course might be advisable. For example, a music student might have a two-credit music course that could be reasonably transferred. J. Stanfiel replied that in such cases the College asks the respective department whether or not to allow the transfer of credits.

Dean Hugh Page (Chairperson, Department of Africana Studies) suggested that it might be worth checking with the Registrar to see what the implications might be of the embrace of the Carnegie regulations at the national level on any decision we make here.

J. McGreevy introduced the third issue of the four transfer-of-credits issues, business courses. The current practice allows one finance course and one accounting course to transfer. J. DellaNeva mentioned that other business courses might be eligible for transfer into the College, for example credits from a three-credit general introduction to business course might warrant transfer. The College does transfer credit from Notre Dame’s
Mendoza College of Business beyond one finance course and one accounting course. Those credits count toward the students’ progress toward graduation. Should the College allow more credits from business courses to transfer for students transferring from other institutions?

H. Weinfield asked why the College decides whether or not to transfer credits from MCOB at all? Is not that a University decision, because the credits would transfer as University credits. J. DellaNeva explained that the College determines how many credits will transfer into the College and University. A. Preacher added that the College is the arbiter of the transfer of credits both for College credits and University credits because transfer students apply to come into the College of Arts and Letters and not the University more broadly. When students apply to come to Notre Dame as first-year students, they apply to come to the University and the First Year of Studies. First Year of Studies is a very generalized program and student can then go into the colleges. Transfer students must choose the college into which they wish to transfer and up to this year the College was making the admission decisions. Two or three years ago MCOB determined that it would no longer accept transfer students into their College. The reason why the College of Arts and Letters limits the transfer of business credits to the two courses is to make it clear to transfer students that they will not be able to transfer to MCOB once they are accepted to the College of Arts and Letters. We would like the transfer students to take Arts and Letters courses, not business courses. If we allow more business credits to transfer from other institutions, more and more students would graduate as Arts and Letters students with a major portion of their curriculum being business courses. J. DellaNeva underscored the importance of having a policy with regard to the transfer of credits from business courses. Transfer students need to know that their business credits beyond the two courses will not be transferred and they will not be able to transfer to MCOB.

Denise Della Rossa (Department of German and Russian Languages and Literatures) asked if this issue is only about business students. What about students coming out of an engineering program, for instance. Do we not accept the credits from science courses or engineering courses as electives when coming into the College of Arts and Letters? A. Preacher noted that there are very few students who apply to the College from engineering, mostly because someone transferring from an engineering program typically has a low grade point average.

S. Blum asked if transfer students would still have to fulfill all the Arts and Letters requirements no matter what or how many credits transferred. J. DellaNeva confirmed that students would have to fulfill all the College’s requirements. Such students would simply graduate with more than 120 credits.

J. McGreevy introduced the fourth issue of the four transfer-of-credit issues. Currently only courses with a grade of “B” or better transfer with credit. Should the practice be changed to allow transfer of credit for courses with a grade of “C” or better? N. Russo explained that the rationale for a grade of “B” or better for a course was because it parallels with the policy for Notre Dame students who take courses from other institutions. Notre Dame students need to have their courses from other institutions pre-approved by the relevant Notre Dame department and need to achieve a grade of “B” or higher in order for the credits to transfer into their Notre Dame degree.

Peter Campbell (Graduate Student Representative) asked if there is any provision made for grades from other countries. For example, a “B” or “C” grade in Great Britain often means something much different than what such grades mean in the United States. J. DellaNeva further noted that the point could also be applied to credits transferring from institutions that do not have grade inflation due to an imposed bell curve or some other policy.

J. Kaboski asked why the College would like to lower expectations from transfer students? Why lower acceptable grades for courses to transfer? J. DellaNeva observed that the Office of Admissions is encouraging students who did not quite make admissions for the first year to apply as transfer students. J. McGreevy imagined a student
who struggled with Math during the first year but was strong in history, for example. If the student earned a “C” in Math at the other institution, the student would then need to take Math again while at Notre Dame instead of a course in the humanities. Should there be some discretion to allow the “C” in Math to transfer?

Dan Lapsley (Chairperson, Department of Psychology) stated that he did not hear compelling reasons to change the current practice. Are we being asked to change existing practice to policy? Or whether we are being asked to adopt alternative practices and make them into policy. If the College was to change existing practice, it would take up each issue separately. J. DellaNeva and the Office of Undergraduate Studies wanted the College Council to consider current practices before the practices become codified. To consider current practices, then, is to ask if the current practices are adequate.

Abbey Palko (Gender Studies) stated that if we keep grade of “B” or higher for courses that will transfer, it makes it more manageable to allow more courses to transfer for which Notre Dame does not offer courses.

J. McGreevy summarized three options: (1) vote on the proposals and the proposals become policy of the College; (2) do note vote but pursue more discussion about the proposals, including discussions in each department; (3) do not vote and ask the Office for Undergraduate Studies to develop more formal proposals about changing existing practices into College policies and the College then could consider the proposals and take a vote.

J. McGreevy asked for a vote on each of the three options; option one had 7 votes; option two had 1 vote; and option three had 28 votes. Based on the votes, the College will develop more formal proposals for the College Council to consider during the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:43 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew C. Zyniewicz
Dean’s Executive Administrator