

**THE MEETING OF THE COLLEGE COUNCIL  
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS  
September 29, 2009  
3:30 pm  
McKenna Hall Auditorium**

**ATTENDANCE**

Deans: Dean: John McGreevy

Associate Deans: Daniel Myers, Maura Ryan

Assistant Deans: Adela Panegos, Ava Preacher, Joseph Stanfiel, Vicki Toumayan

Chairpersons and Directors: Theodore Cachey, Jr., John Cavadini, Olivia Remie Constable, Don Crafton, John Duffy, Stephen Fallon, Christopher Fox, Richard Jensen, Daniel Lapsley, Louis MacKenzie, Elizabeth Mazurek, Rory McVeigh, Dian Murray, Thomas Noble, Robert Norton, Charles Rosenberg, Mark Schurr, John Sitter, Jennifer Warlick

Elected Faculty: Denise Baron, Laura Carlson, Darren Davis, Noreen Deane-Moran, Jean Dibble, Richard Donnelly, Robert Dowd, John Duffy, David Fagerberg, Sean Kelly, Brian Krostenko, Scott Monroe, Elizabeth Munnich, Adela Penagos, Errol Philip, Charles Rosenberg, Mark Pilkinton, Siiri Scott, Joseph Stanfiel, Vicki Toumayan, Chris Vanden Bossche, Hannelore Weber, John Welle

Graduate Student Representatives: Elizabeth Munnich, Errol Philip

Undergraduate Student Representatives: Denise Baron

Invited Guests, Observers, and Resource People: Marie Blakey, *Director, Office of Communication*, Agustin Fuentes, *Institute for Scholarship in the Liberal Arts*, Kathleen Opel, *Office of International Studies*, Matt Zyniewicz, *Executive Assistant to the Dean*

Excused:

*Deans:* Peter Holland, Dayle Seidenspinner-Núñez

*Chairpersons and Directors:* Michael Desch, Erika Doss, Richard Pierce,

*Elected Faculty:* Richard Cross, Kevin Dreyer, Mary Frandsen, Li Guo, Sandra Gustafson, Mary Keys, William Krier, Ian Kuijt, James McKenna, John O'Callaghan

*Undergraduate Students:* Marques Camp

*Regularly Invited Guests:* Richard Gray, Gerald McKenny, Pam Wojcik

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The April 27, 2009, College Council Minutes were approved, with one correction. Tom Noble's name should be listed with the Chairpersons and Directors.

## **COLLEGE BUSINESS**

### **Collegiate Appeals Committee**

Associate Dean Maura Ryan introduced the need and purpose of the election. Only voting members would receive a ballot to elect 6 members to serve on the appeals committee. The first three highest number of votes would serve on the committee and the fourth, fifth, and sixth place number of votes would be asked to serve as alternates.

M. Ryan reported that this would be the last time to elect Collegiate Appeals Committee members. Next year there will be a university-wide committee to serve this function. The elections for that committee will be announced soon.

### **Expanding College Research Committee**

Associate Dean Dan Myers rehearsed how and why the College Council was to address this topic. Agustin Fuentes (Director, Institute for Scholarship in the Liberal Arts) asked D. Myers to expand the committee because the number of ISLA programs is growing, and there are needs for sub-committees in the humanities to review particular types of proposals. Therefore ISLA needs a larger pool of eligible persons from which to draw. Further, the College Council created the Research Committee, and so D. Myers believed that he needed to return to the College Council to seek permission to expand the committee. D. Myers requested a discussion and a motion to expand the committee to add 2 new elected members and 2 new appointed members to the committee. Because there was no discussion, Stephen Fallon moved to expand the committee to add 2 new elected members and 2 new appointed members to the College Research Committee. Laura Carlson seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

### **Proposed Graduate Minor in Screen Cultures**

Dean McGreevy called on Don Crafton (Chairperson of the Department of Film, Television and Theatre) to introduce the topic. D. Crafton reported that the proposal has been developed over the course of a year and a half. The proposal is for a graduate minor, 10 credits of course work in another Ph.D. department to add to the Ph.D. degree program. The proposal stems from students' initiative; eight students from various departments are already pursuing a film topic (at least in some partial aspects) in their respective degree programs.

D. Crafton then fielded questions. The first question dealt with the following question: How would the minor not add to the time to degree for students. D. Crafton responded that the courses that would be a part of the minor are taken regardless of whether or not they are pursuing the minor. The only new seminar that would be necessary is the methods seminar. Further, the students will have opportunities to take summer courses.

A question was raised about the academic rigor of the courses if the model thus far has been the summer course offered that addresses topics film across the curriculum. Would the graduate courses be more demanding of the students? D. Crafton responded that the *Films Across the Curriculum* course is targeted to faculty and students in order to attract them to think about films in their own courses and curricula. The graduate courses for the minor will be more rigorous.

Laura Carlson raised a concern about recruiting issues. Will current students be able to pursue the minor, besides new students? D. Crafton thought that the minor might actually help in our recruitment

efforts, and would be open to students already in other programs. He added that the question of stipends might become an issue. Some students have stipends and some do not. In effect, the stipends available to those students in the minor would be an add-on to the departments. Decisions would be up to the department. The benefit for students, D.Crafton added, is that they can pursue the minor to enhance their teaching, for example.

What about the exam process? How would departments need to structure their written and oral examinations to accommodate the new minor? D. Crafton suggested that perhaps departments could include a question on the written examination, or replace a question. Dean McGreevy wondered if departments could include a faculty member with expertise in the minor area? D.Crafton agreed. Dean McGreevy mentioned that the requisite details would need to be worked out in conjunction with the departments, but departments would want someone who is recognized and who has the expertise to ascertain student competency.

John Sitter (Chairperson of English) raised a concern that it remains unclear about how the funding for the new minor would work. Would TAs, for example, be paid course-by-course and not with stipend funding? D.Crafton confirmed that the students who pursue the minor would not be compensated with stipend funding. It was observed, then, that the TA would be doing more work and adding more time to degree completion. D.Crafton noted that the decision about stipends and compensation by course would be left to each department.

Dean McGreevy concluded the discussion by indicating that the proposal would be amended to include more clarity about the examination structure and more clarity with regard to the funding for each student.

Ted Cachey made a motion to approve the proposal, and Ava Preacher seconded. The motion passed with four abstentions.

### **Library**

Dean McGreevy asked Associate Dean Dan Myers to introduce the topic concerning the petition about the Hesburgh Library from faculty to Rev. John Jenkins, C.S.C., President, and Dr. Thomas Burish, Provost.

D. Myers commended Sabine MacCormack (Department of History) for her passionate work on behalf of the library.

The petition brought issues to light and conversation about the library. The Arts and Letters library committee increased their involvement, including meeting with library staff to provide input on new staff budget lines and types of hires. D. Myers stated that there were two items that he would like to pursue: (1) an open conversation with the College Council, and (2) a formal endorsement of the petition by the College Council.

Elizabeth Mazurek (Chairperson of the Classics Department) noted that the will is there but it is a matter of resources. We need more involvement and an annual budget increase from the Provost. The annual budgets for various departments seem to be out of balance.

Tom Noble (Chairperson of the Department of History) observed that the library collection is mediocre. We simply cannot move the humanities at Notre Dame without more investment in the library. The

librarians tell us where they will collect resources; this does not encourage globalization. We need faculty input into library decisions about bibliographers.

Stephen Fallon (Chairperson of the Program of Liberal Studies) mentioned that the library needed more staff with linguistic competence. He wondered as well whether or not the library really needs to spend more money to make the library a more comfortable place for students. In his experience students *occupy* the library but do not *use* the library for research. The faculty have not had such an opportunity to be heard with regard to the library, as they now do with the petition. S. Fallon hopes the College Council will endorse the petition to position the library in view of the University's aspirations.

It was noted that the students' petition supports our interests as well; in fact, there are more signatures on their petition than there are on ours. There appear to be additional plans for the library that even the students do not approve.

One Council member reported that he read the most recent mockups of plans for the library, and he did not see plans for even one additional book.

Chris Fox (Chairperson of Irish Language and Literature) recognized that there are large institutional issues to consider. If we need books, we need to work with development officers, and connect more of our efforts with them. We have not hit our target in terms of the recent campaign for the library. We need to educate the students to let them know how important it is for the University to have a world class collection.

D. Myers reported that there is a, new staff position (a third one) and a position for a staff member with Chinese proficiency might arise as well.

Dean McGreevy thinks that we need to prioritize our issues similar to our peer institutions and show a plan about the history of the library, current needs and investment. There appear to be three issues. First, we need to continue to develop world class collections to continue to attract scholars. Second, we need more good collections, moving some collections from mediocre to good, especially with regard to our Ph.D.-granting areas. Third, we need to move from not credible to credible in our new emerging areas, especially as we try to be more global.

How do we get there? First, we need to develop price tags for what we need and present a plan to the Provost, because the library is an ongoing expense and donors are stretched at this time; and, second, we need to put funding toward professional bibliographers, to fund three or four positions in the next year. Dean McGreevy has already requested this from the Provost Office.

It was observed that this is a wise way to do this. The Russian and German Department, under the equipment grant, was able to get \$150,000 for the German and Russian collections. Perhaps other departments could pursue funding that way?

D. Myers indicated that in the near future the equipment grant will be divided so that departments can make requests such as the one the Russian and German Department requested.

A question was raised about the extent to which the library is on the Development Office's radar? Dean McGreevy replied that it is a mixed bag; the questions are: What are the Provost's priorities and if the library is not a priority, then how can we help see to it that the library is a priority?

It was asked how development strategies arose for the collection plaques? Could we, for instance, bundle collections for an area for someone who might be interested in funding it?

Chris Fox (Chairperson of Irish Language and Literature) raised the issue of faculty involvement. Faculty need to continue to express their concerns. This is not the best way to work as an institution, but faculty voices help spur policy changes.

One council member mentioned that the Library Committee needs to strategize about how to educate the Provost's Office about the seriousness of this matter.

Tom Noble (Chairperson of History) observed that when the equipment fund began, there must have been a fund. Why do we need to go backdoor? If we can give junior and senior faculty funds when they arrive, it seems that this funding should be in the general library fund now. In short, why do we not have funding in the library funds now, so that the library has collections to meet new faculty when the faculty arrive on campus? It seems that we go about this in backwards fashion.

Dean McGreevy likes the equipment restoration grants, but the difficulty is that faculty do not have time to make the purchases with the grant funds. Why not work professionally with faculty, visit with faculty, have meetings with faculty. Further, the College of Engineering library has moved all of its resources to electronic versions. This could be a partial model for us. D. Myers agrees that faculty do not have time to make purchases, and, as a result, there appears to be funds remaining in the library account funds, over \$300,000.

It was observed that there are some collections that simply are not shelved because we do not have competent staff for some collections to catalog them. If you are a faculty member working in Arabic, for example, the new collections sit in boxes because no one can catalog them.

A council member noted that professionally speaking the Notre Dame library staff rank 82<sup>nd</sup>. We ought to be able to catalog books when we purchase them. We rank behind Illinois, Chicago, and New Mexico. We have a great need for professional staffing.

Dean McGreevy confirmed that Provost Burish is open to expanding the number of professional bibliographers.

Ted Cachey (Chairperson of the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures) asserted that the library needs to be reviewed by external authorities and that might help the Council's conversation with the Provost's Office.

Dean McGreevy agreed that we are in an unusual, historic moment, and that we soon need to address the library concerns.

Dean McGreevy called for a show of hands according to the motion to support the petition. The Council voted by a show of hands. The motion passed with no votes against and five abstentions.

### **Collaborative Hiring**

Dean McGreevy recalled that Provost Burish observed at the beginning of his term as provost: He was impressed with the faculty and recognized how strong the programs are, but he was surprised by how isolated the colleges were. Dean McGreevy called on Tom Noble (Chairperson of History) who served on the committee to hire faculty with multiple homes across the University. The committee pursued the following question: How might collaborative hiring advance our goals? T. Noble observed that the report captures the details. The committee visited the College Council and the Deans and Chairpersons,

soliciting input, concerns, reservations. The report shows a series of responses of how to think about these issues.

This is the wave of the future, and these practices have been taking place for ten to fifteen years now. Notre Dame is behind many institutions in implementing such practices on a broader scale. Collaborative hiring provides Notre Dame with opportunities to do what we do but only better. To pursue collaborative hiring would require imagination. How can we better use our resources? The sciences have practiced collaborative hiring, and the Kroc Institute and Kellogg Institute have done this with departments, and we could do this in a more systematic way. Departments could work with each other.

Finally, one way we differ from our peers is in terms of scale. We have a 35-40 person history department, but not 60-70 persons like most of our peers. We could possibly use collaborative hiring in order to make two or three departments stronger than they are now.

One council member would like to see a broader discussion of collaborative hiring in general, including a broader consideration of appointments and not simply hires. Do we, for example, have the institutional mechanisms to hire a faculty member to teach fully for two departments? Second, do we need the prescription hires of 100 new hires over time? We need to choose our hires at the department or college levels. For example, do we have faculty now who could teach across departments?

Further, the College is limited by the number of Ph.D. programs. Collaborative hiring at Notre Dame might skip a step. Do we need to build strong departments in order to build core areas? Resources could go to departments without Ph.D. programs to build them up, rather than to collaborative hires at this time.

Chris Fox (Chairperson Irish Language and Literature) suspects that if there is a set number of collaborative hires, there would be a disproportionate number that would not go to the College of Arts and Letters.

It was noted that collaborative hiring is part of the issue, to think about crossing boundaries of how we teach graduate students? Undergraduate students pursue double majors, but not really in any collaborative way.

Tom Noble (Chairperson of History) noted that the report does not say that collaborative hiring is the model to hire at Notre Dame, but is at tool to considering when making hires. He is not in favor of putting the number "100" on the number of collaborative hires; such a number is unrealistic. That is the number, however, that the University of Michigan, or California or other peer institutions are using for their collaborative hiring plans. We ought to consider the role of tradition and innovation in the discussion. We create the departments that created us. Collaborative hiring helps us think outside the box. All hires should not be collaborative hires. The sciences will certainly receive more collaborative hiring lines because they first pursued this way of hiring faculty. The College needs to articulate our goals and needs as well. We need to discuss the matter.

One Council member suggested that the Kroc Institute and Kellogg Institute should not be the model for collaborative hiring. The departments need to think together, similar to the way that Religion and Literature pursued a recent hire that resulted in a hire in Italian literature.

Dean McGreevy summarized three dimensions to the discussion. First, appointments could be truly joint appointments, in two different Colleges; second, appointments could be appointments that could

contribute to Ph.D. programs; and third, appointments could arise from the current Notre Dame faculty. Indeed, some faculty at the University of Chicago have multiple titles as a way to be more visible and more productive.

Charles Rosenberg (Department of Art, Art History, and Design) wondered if this is a way to address weaknesses as well? Could collaborative hiring, for instance, help strengthen the area of Asian cultures? Or languages or art history? Dean McGreevy agreed, underscoring that collaborative hires would mainly be for senior faculty, and would be more difficult when considering junior faculty. The junior faculty might fear that the institution requires too much service activity from them, and so cause problems in tenure cases.

Ted Cachey (Chairperson of Romance Languages & Literatures) asked what the timetable was for the collaborative hiring initiative. Dean McGreevy reported that the Deans have met and have offered a proposal to Provost Burish for three or four collaborative appointments. If the proposal is approved, it will come to the College Council.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:52 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew C. Zyniewicz  
Executive Assistant to the Dean