

**THE MEETING OF THE COLLEGE COUNCIL  
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS  
February 23, 2010  
3:30 pm  
McKenna Hall Auditorium**

**ATTENDANCE**

Deans: Dean: John McGreevy; Associate Deans: Stuart Greene, Peter Holland, Daniel Myers, Maura Ryan, Dayle Seidenspinner-Núñez; Assistant Deans: Paulette Curtis, Adela Panegos, Ava Preacher, Joseph Stanfiel, Vicki Toumayan

Chairpersons and Directors: Theodore Cachey, Jr., Don Crafton, Olivia Remie Constable, Richard Jensen, Daniel Lapsley, Elizabeth Mazurek, Rory McVeigh, Richard Pierce, Charles Rosenberg (*Acting*), Mark Schurr, John Sitter

Elected Faculty: Laura Carlson, Richard Cross, Darren Davis, Noreen Deane-Moran, Jean Dibble, Richard Donnelly, John Duffy, Mary Frandsen, Sandra Gustafson, Carlos Jerez-Farran, Sean Kelly, Mary Keys, Brian Krostenko, Siiri Scott, Chris Vanden Bossche, Hannelore Weber

Graduate Student Representatives: Elizabeth Munnich

Undergraduate Student Representatives: Denise Baron, Marques Camp

Regularly Invited Guests, Observers, and Resource People: Robert Becht, *Office of the Dean*, Marie Blakey, *Office of the Dean*, Martine DeRidder, *Director, Hesburgh Program in Public Service*, Kathleen Opel, *Office of International Studies*, Errol Philip, *Department of Psychology*, Matt Zyniewicz, *Office of the Dean*

Excused:

*Chairpersons and Directors*: John Cavadini, Louis MacKenzie, Jennifer Warlick

*Elected Faculty*: Robert Dowd, David Fagerberg, Ian Kuijt, Scott Monroe, Robert Norton, Mark Pilkinton, Catherine Schlegel, John Welle

*Regularly Invited Guests*: Richard Gray

Dean McGreevy called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The November 18, 2009, College Council Minutes were approved without revision.

**COLLEGE BUSINESS**

**Department of Economics and Policy Studies**

Dean McGreevy opened the discussion about the proposal to dissolve the Department of Economics and Policy Studies by rehearsing the relatively recent history of the situation of economics at Notre Dame. There were critical external reviews of the department in 1988 and 1997, and, in 2002, the University commissioned a blue-ribbon committee to look at the situation in economics, and issued a report in November of that year, followed by conversations with faculty in economics, the provost, dean of Arts

and Letters, College Council, and ultimately with the academic council. The academic council subsequently voted to create two separate economics departments: the Department of Economics and Policy Studies [ECOP] and the Department of Economics and Econometrics [ECOE].

The blue-ribbon committee's goal of reducing tension and allowing a mainstream approach in economics to emerge at Notre Dame has been partially achieved over the last seven years, and for that Dean McGreevy thanked Richard Jensen (Chairperson of ECOE) and Jennifer Warlick (Chairperson of ECOP) for their close and careful work over the past seven years. We can see the fruits of their labors, for example, in the increase in majors since the split, from 120 majors in 2000, to about 400 majors today, now one of the three or four biggest majors in the college.

Despite the successes, however, Dean McGreevy stated that he would like to move forward to develop economics at Notre Dame. He spent the last eighteen months studying the situation, meeting several times with both departments, and meeting individually with each member of the faculty from ECOP.

While there have been some successes over the past seven years, there have also been some costs. First, undergraduates are often confused by the existence of two departments; second, prospective faculty and prospective graduate students are confused by the existence of two departments; third, there has not been much communication between the two departments, in that there was not much of the sort of economic conversation that was envisioned for the two departments working together; fourth, based on the one-on-one discussions with faculty ECOP, it became clear that some members of that department felt a certain stigma attached to being in that department.

After studying the situation, then, Dean McGreevy did not anticipate changing the current policy of not adding new lines to ECOP, and so the faculty is the same as it was in 2003. Dean McGreevy, in brief, did not anticipate hiring new faculty members in that department. In order to move forward, then, Dean McGreevy and Associate Dean Dan Myers recommend that the ECOP be dissolved, and the remaining ECOE be renamed simply "Department of Economics."

D. Myers underscored that the tenure status of the faculty in ECOP will remain no matter if the individual faculty member remains in a tenure-granting department or if he or she remains in the college; the tenure status will be protected. D. Myers also stated that the college does not anticipate any changes to the day-to-day activities of the faculty members, expecting them to teach the same kind of courses and course loads that they have been teaching.

Dean McGreevy invited a discussion of the proposal, and the faculty had a number of questions, mostly about the logistics of the dissolution and how the faculty would remain engaged in the governance of the college.

Brian Krostenko asked why the two departments could not simply merge into one single department? Dean McGreevy responded that it was an option at the beginning of the discussions, but, given that there were some bad feelings during the occasion of the split into two departments, he and D. Myers did not want to force any faculty member to join another department, and did not want to force a department to welcome other faculty members whom they might not be ready to welcome. A more intellectual reason was that they did not want to impose eight faculty on a department in one action.

Martine DeRidder asked that if the conversation between the two departments was only partially achieved over the past seven years, how will the elimination of one department help that conversation? Dean McGreevy stated that he is very confident that we will have a richer economics conversation if this proposal is approved. If we think about this matter substantively, what do we want for Notre Dame in

terms of economics? We would like Notre Dame to have a voice in the national conversation on economics. The two departments do not help us get that voice; in fact, it probably makes us look peculiar. Having one department, and having economists lodged across the university in various units, certainly on campus, and potentially nationally, allows us to engage an even better economics conversation. It is much more typical, for example, at big research universities to have an economist lodged in the public policy school, to have an economist pursuing the history of economic thought in a history of science program, to have an economist involved in public service programs, or to have an economist involved in an institute that focuses on development issues. Some of the faculty in ECOP have strong research records in those areas, and Dean McGreevy believes that those faculty will make an even bigger contribution to the intellectual life of the university affiliated with other units, than they will in their present status as members of a department that is not going to grow; the college is not going to add new lines to the department. It would be easier not to do anything; but, if we do not do anything, we would face a period of ten to fifteen years during which the department would slowly dwindle in size through retirements or through faculty leaving the university, and that does not seem to be the path to a productive economic conversation.

In short, on the one hand, the faculty could be in a department where there is no hiring and there is no growth, or, on the other hand, faculty could be in a unit that is not formally a department. These are the issues that the college needs to negotiate. When he weighs the two options, Dean McGreevy is confident that the latter is the better option.

Remie Constable (Director, Medieval Institute) asked what does it mean in very practical terms for faculty members who are not part of a tenure-granting department to function as faculty “in the college”? What about, for instance, travel money, teaching negotiations? Do we have others who are simply “in the college”? Dean McGreevy mentioned that there are no faculty at this point who are simply tenured “in the college”. The college does have multiple arrangements. For example, some faculty have joint appointments with institutes and departments, and other similarly complicated arrangements. In those appointments, and in the appointments envisioned for the faculty affected by this proposal, the college anticipates working out a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)—with each faculty member in ECOP—that would stipulate the kinds of courses that the faculty member will teach, the same travel money that everyone else in the college gets, etc. We have been clear that this has not been a punitive decision; in fact, the college has been generous in terms of travel money and support for ECOP faculty. They keep their offices, or, if they would prefer, the college will attempt to help them move their respective offices so that they are closer to the new unit that they will be affiliate with. We do not have a place for everybody at this time, in that we do not have an MOU worked out for every faculty member, but we have a place for almost everybody. Those homes will vary: a couple of faculty will likely go to the new department, at least one faculty member will go to another department in the college, one faculty member will head one of the new interdisciplinary minors (poverty studies), and one faculty member will become affiliated with the Hesburgh Program in Public Service. In short, we have some attractive options for what is admittedly a difficult situation.

Hannelore Weber asked if there is a major in economics and public policy? Dean McGreevy responded that there is not a major; the two departments have jointly administered the economics major.

H. Weber followed up, asking if students were interested in this aspect of economics, where will they get these courses? Dean McGreevy stated that the course offerings will remain the same to the extent that the economics and public policy faculty want to teach the same courses. The instructors can continue to teach their courses no matter the unit that they become affiliated with. Some faculty have mentioned that they might develop new courses based on the new unit that they are affiliated with.

H. Weber asked if the students will have the opportunity to take the courses that they have been taking

in the past? Dean McGreevy responded affirmatively, and the courses will count toward an economics degree.

Noreen Deane-Moran observed that she was on the Council in 2003 when the split occurred. Why could we not simply have two departments to grow stronger? Distributing the faculty around the university could lessen their respectability. Further, is the discipline of economics and policy studies—as a discipline—being dropped? Is the university basically pursuing economics and econometrics because it appears that it could be better for the university's image? Where does the function and focus of the economics and public policy go? Dean McGreevy stated that we are the only university in the country with two economics departments; it is a very unusual situation. Will this administrative shift lead to a decline or increase in the discussion, research on, and analysis of the issues that have, to some extent, been the focus of economics and public policy? Dean McGreevy is confident that it will lead to an increase. Presently those faculty are very isolated, and the very peculiarity of the situation, has been somewhat stigmatizing for the faculty members. If this proposal goes through, it would mean that economists, for instance, would lend their expertise more concretely to the Kellogg Institute, to the Kroc Institute, to the History of Philosophy of Science Program, and to a range of different programs across the College and across the university.

John Sitter (Chairperson of the English Department) asked about concerns for establishing a precedent, with tenured faculty appointed “in the college” and not in a department? Could we make this dissolution an emergency act, and make it clear that it is an emergency, and not a practice that the college will pursue in its normal operations? Dean McGreevy stated that the college should not see this action as precedent setting. In 2003, when the split occurred, all faculty in both departments received a letter stating that if a department is dissolved, the faculty would become faculty in the college. It was an arrangement that the faculty wanted back then, so that in the beginning, they knew that they would have their tenure status protected should dissolution occur. The college is following that arrangement. Dean McGreevy does not see this action as normal or as a normal precedent. Perhaps we could develop a statement to reinforce that point. We do not ever want to dissolve a department, and we need to continue to be vigilant and attentive to problems that develop in departments and address them early on. This situation festered for too long.

Denise Baron asked if there could be in the proposal a permanent mechanism or assurances that the college is committed to economic pluralism at Notre Dame? There is a sizeable movement of undergraduates who are involved with professors whose research involves economics and public policy, and those undergraduates feel marginalized. Student senate and student government have been doing much research on this, and very soon there will be a resolution proposed that will call for more transparency in this decision and for undergraduates to be recognized in a more formal way to hear the changes and the reasoning behind the decision and to incorporate how they are affected, and incorporate them into the decision making process. Further, moving the professors to many different departments appears to be eliminating economic pluralism at Notre Dame which has been one of our unique strong points of economics. Instead of having a department that uniquely addresses this, unlike other places, we are actually dividing and conquering those ways of thinking here and not assuring that there will be an official place for those ideas to live in the university. Dean McGreevy recalled that in the process he has met four different groups of undergraduate students, including the student senate leaders. In terms of economic pluralism, there are two significant misconceptions. One misconception is that this action is a huge strike against economic pluralism at Notre Dame, and he does not think that is true. Five to ten years from now, if this decision goes forward, Notre Dame will have a more diverse and more serious economics department and economics conversation than we have now. Dean McGreevy

and the leaders of the ECOE are not opposed to economic pluralism, and hope to hire historians of economic thought, people who do not do what is considered standard, mainstream economics.

A second misconception has been that only the faculty in ECOP have a deep commitment to Catholic Social Thought. Dean McGreevy takes this very seriously, and does not think that it is true, in that he has seen as much commitment to Catholic Social Thought in a non-liberal orientation toward economic policy in the new department as much as in the old department. If we look at five years out, we will see this even more vividly.

Dean McGreevy continued that everyone is in favor of transparency. In some ways, this is an administrative decision; it is not one that will change the undergraduate major in any significant way. We talked about how to involve undergraduates. When speaking with the four groups of undergraduate students, Dean McGreevy told them that he anticipated a series of forums after the discussion at Academic Council, talking about how to build the strongest possible economics culture at Notre Dame.

D. Baron asked if Dean McGreevy considered putting into this proposal or other proposals a formalized mechanism to assure pluralism? Dean McGreevy could not imagine what such a formalized mechanism would look like. It is difficult to include a mechanism that would state that the university would sustain idea "A" or idea "B" in an academic department; such a mechanism would be a violation of the department's autonomy and would tie us in ways that we would not desire because intellectual fields change. Indeed, part of the economics history at Notre Dame is an ability to change in some ways with the field. We have to be nimble enough to change with fields.

Assistant Dean Ava Preacher recollected that when the split was originally made the ECOP faculty and department were clearly stigmatized. A. Preacher is apprehensive about the ECOP faculty's concern that they expressed in a letter that this action continues to stigmatize them. What does it mean, for instance, to be a professor in the college? They do not have a field; what does that mean for their research; what does that mean for their continuing academic work, and what kind of status do they have? This particular plan seems to set up such a structure. Dean McGreevy agreed that we need to choose between the stigmas at this point. One stigma is that a faculty member is part of a department where no resources are put in, where we will go year-by-year with no new faculty, no promotion cases, no new energy, and ultimately wait until all the faculty either leave the university or retire. That is a profound stigma. When meeting one-on-one with the faculty members in ECOP, we heard this very clearly.

Another issue is the public discussion we are having now; it is awkward and regrettable. Dean McGreevy did not look forward to making this proposal but thinks that it is his responsibility to do so. Looking five years down the road, however, it is hoped that the faculty are in their new environments, and are flourishing more than they have in the past, and that we have injected some new intellectual life across the college. This will go a long way toward erasing the stigma. There will not be any real practical disadvantages, in terms of travel, funding sources, by not being a member of a department. If the faculty member is part of a vibrant unit, even if it is not a part of a department, there is some significant reward in that.

R. Constable suggested that in an attempt to preserve economic pluralism, one way might be for the college to create new lines in the Department of Economics with the understanding that the lines would be used to diversify the department. The Department would of course determine how to allocate the lines, but they would receive the lines with the understanding that they would need to diversify. She was also troubled that there was not a representative from ECOP present, given the letter that the

department sent before this Council meeting expressing that they wanted to remain a department. She would have preferred that someone was present on their behalf.

Stephen Fallon (Chairperson of the Program of Liberal Studies) appreciated the point that there are faculty committed to Catholic Social Teaching in ECOE, but he asked if there is some disagreement as to what counts as economics research. There has been concern of ECOP faculty, historically, going back several years, about the animus people have against the sort of research that they do versus the kind of research done by faculty in ECOE. Will there be an openness by the ECOE faculty to the sort of research done by the ECOP faculty? Indeed, Dean McGreevy noted, that was part of the disagreement, what counts as economics research. Another dimension of the disagreement was the research record of some of the members. Dean McGreevy stated that there will be an openness to alternative views of economics in the new department, and we need to review that case by case. One cannot make a case that we need to accept one kind of work; we also need to keep in mind that we need to hire excellent scholars. If one looks at a great economics department at Harvard, that is a more diverse department than our current Economics and Econometrics Department, and the Harvard department is a great department. We can have as a goal that sort of diversification, but our current structure of two departments will not get us to that sort of diversification and excellence.

H. Weber observed that there appears to be a circular argument operative in this discussion in that we are stating that because the department is not thriving, we should close it. What did the department do to deserve to be closed? Why have not funds been given to the department? Dean McGreevy stated that he is continuing the policy of Dean Mark Roche in the sense of not investing in the old department for various reasons, one of which has to do with academic quality: Is the academic quality sufficient to build in this area? These are real concerns.

One council member asked if there has been growth in the number of economics majors? Where are the students situating themselves in the two departments? Dean McGreevy observed that the students pursue a fairly set curriculum. Some of the faculty in ECOP are terrific teachers and attract many students; the vast bulk of students are focusing on the new economics methods. Both departments, however, get credit for the growth in the major since the split. We should recognize that students have, in a way, voted with their feet. Economics was a languishing major, and it took something dramatic, like the split, to build an economics program that is now on a parallel in terms of student enrollment to what we see across the country. We were in a very anomalous situation in 2000, with a small enrollment in economics at a moment when economics is the leading major at many, if not most, of our peers. We are now slowly approaching where our peers are, and that would not have happened without the split.

Assistant Dean Joe Stanfiel asked if the closure of ECOP will change the experience of undergraduate majors in any way? D. Myers responded that the students will attend the same classes with the same instructors, so we do not anticipate any changes.

Brian Krostenko asked if the college is guaranteeing that the courses offered by those faculty in ECOP who do not join the new department of Economics will be crosslisted in the new department? Dean McGreevy stated that the college is guaranteeing that the courses will be crosslisted, but, like all new courses, will need to be approved. We do not want the new department to have to approve a new course, but the courses people are currently teaching will be crosslisted. D. Myers stated that each faculty member's teaching requirements will be spelled out in their individual MOU.

Richard Cross spent some time on this issue as a member of the faculty affairs committee of the Faculty Senate, and observed that he was in the minority both on the committee and on the Faculty Senate who

thought that the proposal was very reasonable and exactly the right thing to do, given all of the evidence. It seems harsh, however, to rename ECOE as the department of economics, because we could understand the renaming of the department as creating a new department or as closing the old department of economics and econometrics.

Dean McGreevy observed that name of “economics and econometrics” has a less than mainstream understanding than does “economics”, which is the standard name for such departments across the country. “Economics and econometrics” made sense in the context of two departments. It makes much less sense in the context of one department because Dean McGreevy believes it will be a pluralist department. To call the department “economics and econometrics” then would send the wrong signal about pluralism in the economics discussion at Notre Dame. The name of “economics” implies a more wide-ranging discussion, to include the history of economic thought and economic policy studies, for example. The change in the name is a step toward conventional nomenclature in U.S. universities, and toward a vigorous economics conversation in the department.

S. Fallon added that with the dispersal of ECOP faculty across the campus, most of these units are not tenure granting units but rather are institutes or centers. How would the faculty in the college continue to engage the faculty governance structures? How would they have access to discussions about hiring future faculty? They will probably have very little opportunity to engage in matters of governance. What happens to faculty who are not fully involved in the governance of the college? Dean McGreevy said that more faculty will move to other departments. There will be a few faculty appointed to units outside of a department. What does that mean for a faculty member in terms of governance? What are the two options? On the one hand, the faculty would be in a department where there is not any hiring or any growth; and, on the other hand, the faculty member would be in a unit that is not formally a department. We need to negotiate these matters. When one weighs the two options, it is the latter that seems to be the better option.

### **Proposal for a minor in Korean Studies**

Dean McGreevy called on Associate Dean Stuart Greene to discuss the proposal for the Korean Studies minor. S. Greene reported that many students over the past five years have proposed to have a minor in Korean studies, and the department over the years has met this need by hiring someone who can teach Korean studies. The undergraduate studies committee was pleased to receive the proposal for a minor in Korean studies from Dian Murray. S. Greene visited with the department and talked about the rationale for the proposal and the courses that were available and whether or not such a minor would be tenable. The proposal then went to the undergraduate studies committee who unanimously supported the proposal and subsequently spoke with Dean McGreevy.

Associate Dean Dayle Seidenspinner-Núñez described the proposal as a fifteen-credit-hour minor, which is in line with the department’s other two minors offered in the Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures. It is a language based minor, as are the other two minors in Chinese and Japanese. It would include two semesters of second-year Korean, additional course work in literature and culture or Asian Studies. One of the compelling arguments for the minor is that summer language abroad grants are offered to majors or minors in the foreign languages and Korean students without the minor do not qualify for such grants, which are very important for the study of Asian languages. A student’s typical pattern is that the student would pursue a year of language study in Chinese or Japanese or Korean, and then go abroad the summer following their first year of language studies. Those studying Korean attend Sogang University, and, because of their experience in a six- to eight-week immersion in the language, the students finish about three-quarters of a year of Korean language, based on pre- and post-

proficiency testing by the Center for the Study of Languages and Cultures. It is therefore very important that the students have access to the summer language grants.

Dean McGreevy stated that he is generally opposed to minors, but likes this proposal. He is always concerned about the proliferation of minors in the college. This proposal is nicely pitched along the lines of the Japanese and Chinese minors, does not require any new resources, and it has a sunset clause.

Charles Rosenberg (Acting Chairperson of Art, Art History, and Design) asked about the number of students already in the language courses. D. Seidenspinner-Núñez responded that there are about 14 students in the first year, and about 16-18 students in the second year.

Given that it will be a minor, S. Fallon asked about what lower division courses would be available beyond language courses, or could students have the option of taking courses in other cultures altogether? D. Seidenspinner-Núñez responded that the current minor in Chinese and Japanese would be the second year language study, a mandatory course in literature in Chinese or Japanese and an additional course which does not need to be in Chinese or Japanese. For this minor, neither would have to be in Korean. She is anticipating having a visiting scholar from Seoul National University every other year, and this person would offer the content courses to make sure that one of the courses would be in Korean. The minor could also draw from course offerings in Film, Television and Theatre that could encompass Korean.

Assistant Dean Vicki Toumayan noted that there is a problem for Korean Studies students to be eligible for summer grants but it would seem that the issue could be resolved in other ways than by creating another minor. She thought that if the college had heritage speakers who seem to be a good part of the impetus for the minor, the students could, technically speaking, take three credits in Korean, and then take Introduction to Chinese Culture and Civilization, Twentieth-Century Chinese Literature, Chinese Politics, History of Modern China, and they could end up with a minor in Korean Studies. It would not be ideal, but given the way that the proposal is written, that could happen. S. Greene recognized that indeed such a scenario could occur, but he also recognized that the students will be advised about their courses so that they take appropriate courses for their minor. V. Toumayan noted that students do not always get such advice and could take the courses mentioned and make the case that, based on the minor's description, he or she would have a minor in Korean Studies. Dean McGreevy asked V. Toumayan to collaborate with D. Seidenspinner-Núñez and S. Greene to generate language that more narrowly defines what two courses could count beyond the language courses to make sure that the description is not Pan-Asian but Korean.

Assistant Dean Paulette Curtis asked why advanced study in a language would not be considered part of a major, reserving a minor for even more advanced study? Are students required to pursue only one year of a language for a major in Japanese or Chinese? D. Seidenspinner-Núñez recalled that for majors in Japanese and Chinese, students are required to take three years of language for Chinese and four years of the language for Japanese.

A council member asked how the purpose of this minor compares to the purpose of other minors elsewhere in the college. Is a minor supposed to cross departmental boundaries? Is the minor an invitation to students to take more than one course in a department? Is it simply a specialty area or a way to recognize a specialty area within East Asian Languages, in this instance? D. Seidenspinner-Núñez said that she could not compare it to other minors, but that the proposed minor gives a certain degree of equity to students who are specializing in Korean Studies and acknowledges the course work that they have done.



Dean McGreevy said that there are two or three different types of minors in the college. One minor has content that does not fit within a department, such as Philosophy and Literature; another type of minor is more regionally specific but not language based, for example, Russian and East European Studies as a minor. This proposed minor and minors like them are housed entirely within departments, and are really about language instruction. The larger question of what is the role of a minor versus a supplementary major or the major is an interesting question that we have not really figured out at this point.

A. Preacher voiced two concerns. The first concern was a general one about starting with a minor in a content area without first having a major established in that area. In the past we have for the most part proposed a minor once we have a major. The second concern was that the minor will rely heavily on one person's instruction or administration. D. Seidenspinner-Núñez noted that we have in the past started a minor without a major in the area. Rory McVeigh asked if there will be a need to hire additional faculty for the minor. D. Seidenspinner-Nunez does not anticipate having to hire additional faculty, and plans to continue the partnership with the Daesan Foundation and Seoul National University. Faculty from other departments could also teach relevant courses for the minor as well.

Dean McGreevy summarized that he heard one friendly amendment, that was to clarify what courses beyond the language courses will count toward the minor, and then stated the options for a vote. There were three options: (1) vote to approve the minor knowing it would go back to the undergraduate committee to examine what courses would count beyond the language courses; (2) vote to send the proposal back to the undergraduate committee to examine what courses would count beyond the language courses, and have the proposal return to the College Council for approval; and (3) a no vote.

The first option received 32 votes; the second option received 7 votes; and the third option received 0 votes.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew C. Zyniewicz  
Executive Assistant to the Dean