

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS
November 18, 2009
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: Adela Panegos, Ava Preacher, Joseph Stanfiel, Vicki Toumayan

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

Elected Faculty: Noreen Deane-Moran, Jean Dibble, Richard Donnelly, Robert Dowd, David Fagerberg, Mary Frandsen, Li Guo, Sean Kelly, Brian Krostenko, James McKenna, Scott Monroe, Mark Pilkinton, Chris Vanden Bossche, Hannelore Weber

Undergraduate Student Representatives: Denise Baron

Invited Guests, Observers, and Resource People: Christopher Barron, *Classics*, Marie Blakey, *Director, Office of Communication*, Agustin Fuentes, *Institute for Scholarship in the Liberal Arts*, Hildegund Muller, *Classics*, Kathleen Opel, *Office of International Studies*, Tony Pohlen, *Ford Family Programs*, Matt Zyniewicz, *Executive Assistant to the Dean*

Excused:

Chairpersons and Directors: Michael Desch

Elected Faculty: Laura Carlson, Carlos Jeriz-Farran, William Krier, Sandra Gustafson, Ian Kuijt, Siiri Scott

Graduate Students: Elizabeth Munnich, Errol Phillip

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The September 29, 2009, College Council Minutes were approved with the following corrections: Charles Rosenberg was misidentified as Charles Barber two times in the minutes, and, on page 4, the name, Steven Fallon, should be changed to Stephen Fallon. Finally, while Thomas Noble served who served on the committee to hire faculty with multiple homes across the University, he did not co-chair the committee.

COLLEGE BUSINESS

Proposed Guidelines for Credit-Bearing Directed Readings and Special Studies

Dean McGreevy called on Associate Dean Stuart Greene to introduce the topic. “Directed Readings” and “Special Studies” have become catch-all phrases without any definition. The College is up to about 1,000 of these types of courses in 2008-09. While about 75% of these courses were one-credit courses, the

Undergraduate Studies Committee wanted to offer guidelines for three-credit directed readings that would encourage greater accountability and more mentoring from faculty. The committee heard again and again from students that when they pursued a directed readings course, they did not meet with the professor on a regular basis. There are any number of reasons why faculty agree to teach a directed readings course, but it is usually out of their generosity, and many times it comes out of work that a student has pursued in a previous course.

The committee added a GPA requirement because the committee noticed that students who sign up for a directed readings course are often working very independently and are often at a loss, and the students with GPAs of 3.0 or lower are often at the most risk. In the end, the key motivating factor for developing the guidelines was ultimately to give some definition to the different categories, directed readings, special studies, lab research, etc.

Associate Dean Peter Holland observed that in the guidelines, particularly guideline six, the idea that a faculty member may at times direct up to five directed readings in a single semester is astonishing. It depends on whether the faculty are really going to commit to the reading and contact hours that ought to be involved with a three-credit course.

S. Greene responded that 99% of the faculty are directing one or two directed readings per semester, which makes more sense; they are meeting with students every week, discussing the books or, if it is more performance based, students are spending hours in the lab.

The College also has had abuses of the directed readings option. Some faculty members for various reasons have listed up to 40 students pursuing directed readings in a semester. This sort of arrangement is not the purpose of the directed readings option. The proposed guidelines are an effort to give some guidelines to circumscribe the process and to address what became a problem to the Provost's Office concerning directed readings and special studies. Some faculty were granting directed readings or special studies for all kinds of reasons, and not necessarily having much of a bar or not necessarily meeting the bar. The limitation of the number of directed readings to five in one semester was an attempt to put some sort of cap on the number that faculty can offer.

P. Holland stated that for the Department of Film, Television and Theatre, faculty can teach a maximum of two directed readings courses per faculty member per semester. The department chairperson would have some discretion as to whether or not a particular faculty member can exceed that amount. Should there be some sort of check or guideline such that the number of directed readings or special studies would not be solely up to the faculty member?

Associate Dean Dan Myers mentioned that directed readings courses can have any number of students in them. One-on-one or one-on-two or one-on-three in terms of instructor-student ratio is sensible. Dean McGreevy asked if five separate directed readings were too many. Dean Myers responded that five separate courses are too many, but we should make distinctions between the number of students and the number of courses. James McKenna observed that it is more common that directed readings have many students enrolled.

Dan Lapsley (Chairperson of Department of Psychology) mentioned that the Department of Psychology's policy about directed readings is very much on board with the proposed guidelines and distinctions. Will the guidelines also apply to lab research as well? S. Greene answered that it is up to the arrangements of the particular department.

Charles Rosenberg (Acting Chairperson of the Department of Art, Art History and Design) commented that the guidelines need to allow for some flexibility in view of students taking studio courses. At times the Department of Art, Art History and Design will have three students in a studio course, and so the department will not offer the course as a regularly scheduled course but will instead schedule it as a directed readings course, and offer it as a group critique.

Thomas Noble (Chairperson of History) wondered if the number of directed readings offered by a faculty member would count toward a course reduction for the faculty member. We might want to address that up front because it could arise at some point. There might be some justice in allowing a faculty member to have a course reduction if he or she teaches many directed readings in a short span of time.

T. Noble also questioned what item seven in the guidelines means, "formal proposal." Is it to be vetted by the department chairperson, or by the DUS? What does formal proposal mean? S. Greene said the guidelines allow departments to decide, yet some assessment and outcome is required. The key element is that the guidelines ask for some accountability, that someone will look at the curriculum to determine what courses constitute three-credits. Dean McGreevy noted that the proposal requires the signature of the student, faculty member, director of undergraduate studies and an assistant dean, which shows some system of formality and accountability. Assistant Dean Ava Preacher asked that processes outlined in the guidelines are for three-credit courses, but how does it apply to one- and two-credit courses? Further, one must be careful when addressing psychology lab research and how the one- or two-credit directed readings are applied to the major.

D. Lapsley wondered about the limitation of the Grade Point Average (GPA) when considered whether or not a student can take a directed readings course. S. Greene pointed out that the GPA was a matter of much discussion. Is a student with a 3.0 GPA or lower ready to take a directed readings course, read the material on his or her own? Should it be up to the faculty member to make the decision?

A. Preacher noted that the proposal includes guidelines, not rules, and so faculty will have the opportunity to use their judgment.

Mark Schurr (Chairperson Department of Anthropology) wondered if there would be some flexibility when considering directed readings for laboratory work? M. Schurr's department uses the term, "directed research," which is different from what is understood as a directed readings. Can the department still use that term? S. Greene agreed that there would be some flexibility.

Louis MacKenzie (Chairperson of Music) asked if it would be appropriate to hold a directed readings course if the regularly scheduled course is cancelled because the course did not attract the minimum number of students? Dean McGreevy responded that the College does not have a policy that allows a faculty member to offer directed readings courses in lieu of a regularly scheduled course. We want to be cautious with directed readings. As S. Greene mentioned, faculty engage in offering directed readings with the best impulses and generosity that we want to reward. There is a good bit of evidence, however, that regularly scheduled courses are generally superior to directed readings courses, and the harried faculty member who promises in June to teach a directed readings course might be less motivated to carry out that course in November or December. It is unlikely that we will substitute a directed readings course for a regularly scheduled course that did not have the minimum number of registered students. The message must be clearer to faculty that we need to develop our curricula and course schedules such that we are able to get the minimum of eight students registered in scheduled courses in order to use our faculty resources efficiently.

Elizabeth Mazurek (Chairperson of Classics) wondered if there would be a fruitful dialogue between this discussion and the discussion to attract more students to write senior theses? It seems odd that we are considering a document that reminds us that we need to be cautious with the types of courses that are directed readings or special studies, when we are also attempting to raise the percentage of students who pursue senior theses. There might be some synergy here.

Dean McGreevy agreed but he would want it to be demonstrated. You would want to see that the directed readings have lead to senior theses. Dean McGreevy was involved in the drafting of the proposal and he supports it, but he would like to see evidence. We do have some anecdotal evidence that this was a problem for two or three faculty in the College where the directed readings courses were not intellectually serious. There seemed to be a culture of directed readings going on that we needed to address. Dean McGreevy wants to promote senior theses but wants to confirm that what we are doing is leading to more theses.

E. Mazurek wondered if we could speak with students as they are engaging in directed readings courses, so that when they are completing a project for the directed readings course, a faculty member could encourage students to pursue a senior theses based on the directed readings work.

Rory McVeigh (Chairperson of Sociology) proposed that we could also encourage students to do the senior thesis rather than pursue the directed reading. The number of students pursuing directed readings is staggering, and if we could encourage many of them to pursue theses instead, then we would approach the 30% of the students doing theses.

Dean McGreevy asked if the council would like to make any formal amendments to the proposal. P. Holland suggested that an amendment to read: "Group directed reading: faculty may normally direct up to two directed readings or special readings courses per semester, to exceed that number would need the approval of the departmental chairperson." The department chairperson might be more appropriate because the directed readings courses would have to do with the faculty member's work load, how a faculty member is spending his or her time.

The amendment is number 6, on page 2 of the proposal: "Faculty members may normally grant up to two separate directed readings or special studies per semester. Requests to exceed that number would require the approval of the department chairperson." In some departments where this would be more of a norm, then the department chairperson would simply sign off on it very simply and straightforwardly. This would also hold true for a course with three students in it. That would count as one directed readings course, as J. McKenna had mentioned.

For that reason, Associate Dean Dayle Seidenspinner-Núñez would insert the word, "courses", so that the amendment would read: "up to two directed readings courses" indicating that one directed readings can have more than one or two students.

Stephen Fallon (Chairperson of the Program of Liberal Studies) seconded the amendment. Dean McGreevy asked for any comments on the amendment. D. Lapsley had one further comment, that this would have one more signature, and that would be the department chairperson, delete DUS and substitute department chair. Dean McGreevy understands the amendment to mean that in the normal process, the signatures would include the director of undergraduate studies, assistant dean, faculty member and the student. It is the extraordinary process where there is a number of directed readings

courses, then the department chairperson would need to approve, because it gets into faculty usage of time in some ways.

S. Fallon wondered if we need to think about junior faculty who might want to accommodate students, and the department chairperson at that point might also want to have input. Dean McGreevy agreed, recalling that as chairperson he used to advise junior faculty not to offer directed readings courses, focus on getting better enrollment in their regularly scheduled courses, and that would be a better use of their time. No junior faculty member is under any obligation to approve a directed reading. This is a purely voluntary activity, and so there is no expectation that a junior faculty member would do a directed reading, or any faculty member for that case, unless there was mutual enthusiasm.

T. Noble is nervous about inserting the word "course" in the amendment. A course could be called a "course" and that in turn might have some ramifications for understanding someone's teaching load.

John Sitter (Chairperson of English) wanted to clarify that we are voting on recommending these practices to the departments. Dean McGreevy agreed.

Dean McGreevy stated that the College will first vote on the amendment and then on the document.

Dean McGreevy asked D. Seidenspinner-Núñez if she wanted to remove her suggestion to add the word "course" in view of T. Noble's concerns. After she agreed, Dean McGreevy stated that as a friendly amendment the council will withdraw the word "courses" and will have time to think about another appropriate term to use. We do not want faculty to begin to think that directed readings or special studies offerings can be understood as a "course" as we think of our regularly scheduled courses.

P. Holland hoped that the word, "separate", would carry that distinction between a directed reading that was shared by a number of students, implying that it was not a "course".

Dean McGreevy asked for a vote on the amendment proposed by P. Holland to number 6 on the proposal. The vote was unanimous, with 44 affirmative votes. Amendment passed with no further discussion.

A college council member asked what proportion or percentage of students has a 3.5 or above GPA in the major, as is going to be required in this proposal? S. Greene would say 75%; A. Preacher would agree. About 50% to 75% have that as a GPA in their respective majors.

Dean McGreevy asked for any other amendments or commentary on the general proposal. With none, he asked for a vote for those in favor of the general proposal for guidelines for directed readings and Special students. There were 44 in favor, none opposed and no abstentions. The proposal passed.

Proposal for New M.A. degree in the Classics Department

E. Mazurek welcomed the opportunity to present the proposal to the College Council and introduced the faculty members who helped produce the proposal for the new M.A. degree in the Classics Department. Those faculty members are Christopher Barron, Hildegund Mueller, and Brian Krostenko who is also a member of the College Council. The proposal is the result of several years of discussion in the department about the ability and feasibility of a purely Classics degree program at Notre Dame. Discussion became more focused and serious as the department prepared for their external review in fall 2008. And the result of the external review and self-study process was that as a unit they were able to see how faculty and the curriculum have grown and developed in the last decade, particularly in the

department's contributions to graduate education in the humanities. The launch of an M.A. program in Early Christian Studies in 2001, an M.A. program administered jointly between the Classics Department and the Department of Theology, is one sign of a greater momentum as she sees it in the humanities toward more training in the classical languages and Greek and Roman literature and culture, and she would argue that this is a momentum in the humanities in the academy beyond Notre Dame. There is a push toward better advanced training in the classical languages. The external reviewers strongly agreed with the department in their self-study that a purely classics M.A. be developed within the department and thus the proposal under consideration. The format of the proposal follows the guidelines of the Graduate School as they are currently laid out, a somewhat new set of guidelines.

The main features of the proposal that she wants to underscore are the following features. On page three there is a comparison chart for the curriculum of a purely classics M.A. versus the curriculum currently in the early Christian Studies M.A. There are significant differences, not least the fact that the training in the advanced levels of Greek and Latin in the classics M.A. will be much more extensive; there will be more of an emphasis on Greek and Roman cultures, more broadly understood, and that would apply to the electives as well. There would also be a thesis option that you do not have in the Early Christian Studies M.A. curriculum.

Another feature of the proposal is that the department has experienced an increase in enrollments in the Latin and Greek courses, particularly Latin, and it is more and more pressed to hire T.A.s to teach beginning Latin and Greek. The T.A.s that the department hires are not its own graduate students and so the faculty work with the T.A.s, but the T.A.s are not trained or vetted by the department in any kind of elaborate process. The department would like a greater control in the T.A.s formation as they go forward to teach the beginning Latin and Greek students.

There is a demand nationally for such an M.A. program. E. Mazurek would like to propose that the council not think of the M.A. as a terminal degree program, but as a foundational degree program. With such a degree a student could then more successfully apply to Ph.D. programs in any number of the humanities programs or disciplines in the humanities. She thinks that there is great opportunity for the students in the M.A. program, to especially use the M.A. as a platform to get into Ph.D. programs at Notre Dame, particularly in the Medieval Institute, Theology, Philosophy and the Ph.D. in literature.

The budget is required in the proposal according the Graduate School guidelines. The tuition rates are going to be higher in 2011-12 when the department hopes to see the program launched, but the tuition rates probably will not be so much higher than the overall annual cost of \$250,000 per year, not a small figure.

The proposal has been approved by the Classics Department faculty in a full meeting and has been vetted by Edward McGinn, Associate Dean of Academic Programs in the Graduate School, and has been read and vetted by the Dean's Executive Committee in Arts and Letters. If the proposal is approved by the Council, it will go forward to the Graduate Council in January 2010, and from there to the Academic Council in the Spring 2010. We are about halfway through the realization of this process.

Robert Norton (Chairperson of the Department of German and Russian Languages & Literatures) mentioned that he chairs a program that had an M.A. program that was eliminated several years ago for a variety of reasons. He was curious to hear about (1) where the money indicated in the budget is going to come from, especially given our current circumstances, and (2) who really is going to be interested in an M.A. in Classics? Classics obviously appeals to a different clientele than German (the M.A. was in

German not in Russian). There are different kinds of needs for those who would like to have an M.A. in Classics, although similar, such as secondary school teachers, community college professors. One of the problems the M.A. in German had for years was recruiting sufficiently qualified students. Those students that the faculty would most like to have would be more interested in going into a Ph.D. program. So, they continuously had problems recruiting highly prepared and qualified students, and tried a number of ways to broaden the applicant pool and to deepen it as well, but all were largely fruitless. The program did have fundamental difficulties getting desirable students.

E. Mazurek responded that the answer to the first question, from where will the money come, it is not going to come from Classics, because its modest endowment will not be able to pay that bill. This proposal is being put forth in good faith with the dean, the Graduate School and the Provost's Office, in that the money is going to be forthcoming. The money put into the program will determine the quality of candidates that it attracts. This program is not going to attract top candidates if it does not have decent stipends to go along with the tuition scholarships. We know for a fact that Vanderbilt, for example, is offering master's stipends in the \$17,000-\$20,000 range. We need to spend money if this is going to work.

Given the faculty's experience with undergraduates at Notre Dame, there is room for this kind of program to prepare students to get into the top Ph.D. programs. That is how E. Mazurek sees this program; getting students so well trained that they are competitive in getting into programs like Chicago, Princeton, and Stanford in Classics. Currently Notre Dame students—if they did not have Latin in high school, and they begin Latin as a freshman at ND—have difficulties competing to get into those top programs. An M.A. program like the one proposed will give them a better chance. Also, from speaking with Medieval Studies graduate students, this kind of program will also give them a competitive edge in applying to Ph.D. programs in Medieval Studies.

Remie Constable (Robert M. Conway Director, Medieval Institute) sees two great advantages to the M.A. in Classics. First, the ability to provide graduate level courses in Greek and Latin for students in this program and for students already here in Ph.D. programs would be tremendously useful in having graduate level advanced courses. And, second, it would be a promising feeder to programs like the Medieval Institute. It was notable last year that two people admitted to the Medieval Institute had completed the Early Christian Studies program, and having an ND M.A. program that had excellent students that worked with a professor and knew qualifications that these two students had, was a treasure when it came to looking at applications. There are a number of reasons from the Medieval Institute's perspective, that Medievalists in history or in English, or anyone for any reason needed a background in Greek or Latin in their Ph.D. programs would benefit from this program tremendously.

Dean McGreevy went back to the financial question. Referring to the budget on page 9 of the proposal, the number that jumps out for him is \$62,500. Effectively we are not charged for the tuition costs in a real way and can set that aside. The \$62,500 per year is a real cost, 5 fellowships at \$12,500 each. We would fund five Classics M.A. students at \$12,500 each (the College and Graduate School would contribute to these fellowships). The interesting intellectual question is should the College and university make a commitment to this? That is the equivalent of 2.5 full stipends for a Ph.D. student; it is the equivalent of a junior faculty position. That is the kind of choice that we are forced to make. On balance, Dean McGreevy is convinced by the Classics proposal that the proposal is indeed an investment in Classics, which has become increasingly better. The college wants to support the department, and the external review panel thought that an M.A. program is necessary for this faculty. The proposal, further, is an investment in other Ph.D. programs, notably Theology, Philosophy and the Medieval Institute,

where we are trying to recruit some of the very best students in the country, but with language preparation. Our hope is that the language preparation that they will receive in the Classics Department will propel them into the very best Ph.D. programs, including our Ph.D. programs, and make them even more competitive than they already are. The final piece is the Ph.D. in Literature, which has not had a large classics component. There has been a fear that the Classics students in the Ph.D. in Literature program are not sufficiently prepared. This should help alleviate that problem as well.

The Romance languages department has a fairly significant M.A. program. When Dean McGreevy began as Dean, he wondered why the College is funding an M.A. program at all. M.A. programs do not buy as much prestige as Ph.D. programs and in some ways one could say that we should take all of the funds in the non-terminal M.A. programs and put the funds toward the Ph.D. programs. But Dean McGreevy has become convinced that the M.A. in Romance Languages serves a number of purposes, and will build the cohort that we want in the Ph.D. in Literature. We are able to identify the really talented students, and some of those students are going to enter the Ph.D. in Literature.

R. Norton is very much in favor of advanced degrees in Classics; it is appropriate for the institution, and in general has its own merits. We need to offer the best kinds of support to attract the best students, otherwise, the degree program will not thrive. He wonders if \$12,500 is enough money.

Dean McGreevy imagines that if the degree program is approved, and two or three years later we conclude that the degree is working very well—similar to the M.A. in Italian—attracting the very best students. Or, we might find that we will need to fund fewer students with more money to attract the right students. It is difficult to judge in the abstract.

D. Myers also supports the proposal in principle, but is very worried about the funding. He knows it is not a large sum of money when compared to our overall budget; it's only about \$50,000 per year when you take out the compensatory factors that E. Mazurek put together. In the current climate, it is not simply a matter of opportunity costs; we might need to cut funding from some other program in order to fund this program. We are going to be faced at some point with a decision about what it is we are going to cut. There are not new lines for another program. We will need to come up with \$50,000 somewhere. D. Myers is not sure that, given the economy, this is the right moment to be starting a new program. We should consider openly how this program might have to be funded.

John Cavadini (Chairperson of Theology) observed that the Early Christian Studies program does not have fully funded stipends. Should we have two M.A. programs located in the same department? Will they compete with each other? Should the Early Christian Studies program have fully funded stipends so that the programs do not compete?

D. Myers responded that there are a couple of fully funded stipends for the Early Christian Studies program. They have chosen to fund more students at lower levels in order to have more students in the program. All graduate programs can shift their funds in similar fashion if they would prefer. In principle, Classics can do that as well. Basically, the proposal funds the students at the same level as the Early Christian Studies, but it is up to the program to decide how to use that funding.

Dean McGreevy added that the Classics department has considered revenue generation. There are M.A. programs on campus that generate a good deal of revenue, because the students pay full tuition. If there is a market for Classics students to pay full tuition, for example, in the five-year, B.A./M.A. program, or in any other way, we should look into those options.

Don Crafton (Chairperson of Film, Television and Theatre) likes the proposal very much. The trend, however, over the past three seasons has been the elimination of programs. The Music M.A. was eliminated awhile ago, and the FTT M.A. was eliminated. The scenario sketched in the proposal is one that all programs would like to have. At this point, why do we want to fund a Classics program? Why not some other program? It would seem that almost any program could put together a viable M.A. program if the faculty knew it would be funded. What are the priorities that are driving the support of the M.A. in Classics? Why take money from adjuncts, for example, that you are hiring to teach courses, and put the funds in an M.A. program? How many undergraduate students are in your program? E. Mazurek responded that there are about 100 majors and minors students.

R. Constable was troubled by questions of equity. She realizes that there is a limited amount of funding for programs, but it is troubling how faculty treat the terminal M.A. students as second-class citizens who are not fundamentally different from people who are the same age who are getting an M.A. but in the course of getting a Ph.D. The students in many cases take the same classes, and the terminal M.A. students are often hoping to get into a Ph.D. program. In this case, we are talking about students whom we might want to groom for our own Ph.D. programs, and yet we give them just a pittance. If we can make a good argument that the amount we pay in stipend funding to a Ph.D. student is not a living wage, then the amount that we are planning to give to an M.A. student is really unethical. If it were possible money-wise, we should be giving these students the same amount that we are giving our Ph.D. students. If not, we will not recruit the highest quality students; it does have relevance to the market. Vanderbilt is offering \$17,000-\$20,000, which is what we are offering in our Ph.D. programs at the moment, and we are having trouble with recruitment. We may need to offer that amount if we want the best students for our M.A. program. It is not worth having an M.A. degree program if we are not recruiting the best students.

If we are talking about a pie of funding that is only so large, and we are trying to strategize about how to cut the pie in different ways, that is a problem. Has there been talk about fund raising, about going to development to see if we can raise money for an endowment for the M.A.? It seems like something one should be able to interest donors.

E. Mazurek responded that the Classics Department faculty frequently talk about such development efforts, but are discouraged as a faculty about approaching development directly. We have discussed very informally the idea of generating a scholarship fundraiser through the Alumni Office, but we have yet to put that mechanism in play.

Dean McGreevy said that as a general rule, raising funds for graduate education is very difficult for development, not simply for Classics but for any department. It takes about \$600,000 to fund a graduate stipend, and that is hard to generate. It is easier to raise funds for faculty lines and transfer money across our budget into graduate funding.

Jean Dibble asked about teaching stipends. When does the Classics Department expect these students to teach?

E. Mazurek responded that the students would most likely be ready to teach in their second year. It is not unusual, however, that if you have a student with unusual ability in Latin or Greek, a student with a B.A. in Classics for example, can be ready to teach beginning Latin or Greek. They would be trained on the job; however, now that the department has in place a mentoring structure for the graduate TAs

teaching Greek and Latin. Tadeusz Mazurek coordinates a program for all the TAs who are currently teaching; he has a common syllabus, and meets with them once a month to talk about how their classes are going. The normal trajectory would be that in the first year the students would lead a larger discussion section for one of the lecture courses, and then teach in the second year.

One council member mentioned that based on her experiences in the German department, she wonders whether E. Mazurek will be happy when she has the TAs once she gets them, because there is no continuity. The idea of preparation for teaching without a methods course in her department did not work very well. If students are not happy in the beginning courses, if they are not engaged or encouraged or motivated, the department will feel the results. As someone who only works in the beginning and intermediate classes, she is very happy that her department no longer has TAs.

E. Mazurek replied that the Classics Department is already staffing 90% of the beginning Latin courses with TAs whom we have not admitted to any graduate program. We vet them rather informally through their professors, asking the professors if the students are ready to teach Greek or Latin. The proposed program is going to help with greater quality control on the TAs. The Classics Department does not employ the spoken language acquisitions that the modern languages employ. It is a different process, with different challenges, which is not to say that the TAs do not need training. It is the norm, even in top Ph.D. programs, to take students who simply have a B.A. in Classics and throw them into an introductory Latin class the very first semester. It is the norm in the discipline.

Dean McGreevy revisited the issue about how to assess priorities. Dean McGreevy mentioned that any department can propose a new M.A. degree program, and we can think together about whether or not it makes sense for the college or university, which is what we are doing with the proposal at hand. This program will contribute a good deal not only to Classics but also to other programs, as mentioned previously. The proposal also shows careful reflection about the implications of a graduate program. We could not go forward with an M.A. program that we thought was going to damage our undergraduate program. The TAs and graduate students that we educate through this program will enhance our undergraduate program. If that proves not to be true, then we can discontinue the program. Finally, this program was recommended by outside experts in the external review of Classics; it was their top recommendation. The Classics Department needed an M.A. given the size of the department, the aspirations of the department, and where they were in terms of faculty strength. We can have similar conversations about other proposals as well.

Rich Jensen (Chairperson of Economics and Econometrics) asked if there was any other M.A. or Ph.D. program currently under consideration.

Dean McGreevy said that as a practical matter, this will be a central question in Anthropology's external review this year. There has been some more or less informal conversation up until now, and it will be a serious topic about whether or not to fund a Ph.D. program in Anthropology, which is a much different conversation in terms of finances. This proposal indicates \$50,000 per year, which is not trivial, but modest in the scope of our overall budget. A Ph.D. program is entirely different in terms of finances. If you enroll one Ph.D. student for five years, and you need to have a certain cohort of students, that costs a great deal more. We would need to think about whether or not that makes sense for Anthropology, especially because they have such a successful undergraduate program. We want to make sure that a Ph.D. is the correct next step for that department. It is an open question.

E. Mazurek imagined that the money would come mainly from the Provost's Office, placing funds into the College budget. Dean McGreevy did not know the details of the cost-sharing that the College and Provost's Office will have to fund the program. The money certainly will not all come from the Provost's Office. The Graduate School, perhaps more so than the Provost's Office, is reflecting on whether or not the Graduate School will want to commit at a 50-50 level, for instance, which is a difficult choice for the Graduate School as well. The Graduate School has had a difficult time over the past seven or eight years to even get the Ph.D. stipends close to respectability, given the costs of living in South Bend. The improvement over the last two or three years, especially in view of inflation, has been fairly dramatic. We are at the theoretical level, knowing that it is financially possible to fund this program, but we have not guaranteed any funding.

R. Norton summarized that it seems that council members are very much in favor of the proposed program, and that it makes sense that we explore the possibilities. He worries about whether or not we are trying to fund a program on the cheap. We need more Ph.D. programs, not more M.A. programs, especially if we want to address the question of the research profile of the university, and we know that new Ph.D. programs are not going to be created any time soon. We should consider the resource question that D. Myers alluded to, that is, the funding must come from somewhere, but further, perhaps the money might even be badly spent with the program.

Dean McGreevy might frame the problem this way: How do we enhance that research standing of the college and university? That is not necessarily at stake with this proposal, given the modesty of the funding requirements. It is a legitimate frame around which to examine the proposal.

E. Mazurek stated that the department has aspirations to expand beyond the M.A. program, and thinks that the department should do so. If we are going to be competitive with Toronto in Medieval Studies, with Catholic University in Early Christian Studies, we should have a Ph.D. in Classics. The M.A. is a stepping stone to that reality.

R. Constable thinks that if we see this program as seed money, it is a very fertile seed. Having an M.A. in Classics will be very supportive of the Ph.D. programs that we already have; it will be so important to students who are already in programs and who are coming into our programs. That is aside from being a feeder for incoming Ph.D. students. This degree program is much more than simply an M.A. in one department.

J. Cavadini stated that it is true that Ph.D. programs buy prestige, but master's programs also buy prestige. Master's students apply every two years, and faculty write letters for those applicants. This process gives us currency; students and faculty think about our departments, and this buys us more than we think.

R. Jensen thinks that an M.A. in Classics will be more useful to us than say a Ph.D. in Classics.

Dean McGreevy called for a vote in favor of forwarding the proposal to the Graduate Council. The votes were as follows: in favor (33 votes), opposed (1 votes), and abstention (5 votes). The College will forward the proposal to the Graduate Council.

Proposal for an Interdisciplinary Minor in International Development Studies

Dean McGreevy asked Fr. Bob Dowd and Tony Pohlen to introduce the discussion. Fr. Dowd thanked Tony Pohlen, assistant Director of the Ford Family program in human development studies in solidarity, who has been working hard on this minor for the past year.

The proposal represents an attempt to meet the growing demand among Notre Dame students for an interdisciplinary minor that tackles development related questions. There is a great deal of anecdotal evidence to support the assertion that the demand among our students is growing, and there is some hard evidence as well, which can be found in the proposal. Essentially, the minor is trying to integrate the field experiences of students in the developing world and their course work at Notre Dame. This proposal represents the culmination of more than a year of conversations with various faculty members, including Jennifer Warlick. At one point, there was conversation about partnering with the poverty studies minor, establishing an international track. After discussions, it became clear that the questions that would be addressed would be substantively different, so significantly different so as to justify another minor in international development studies. The minor would be administered and funded by the Ford Family Program.

The program will be interdisciplinary, so much so that it will have courses in the sciences, engineering, and perhaps business courses integrated into the minor over time.

S. Greene added that as the committee reflected on the proposal, the committee reflected on the larger issues that have arisen over the years about interdisciplinary minors, and we have seen a proliferation of minors. We were also concerned about what this might cost the College. The proposal is pretty clear that among other things that the program will not cost the College any money. Typically, minors receive \$1,500 toward the operating budget, \$1,500 for the director, and up to \$3,000 once there are up to 20 students in the minor. Key points that the committee considered that did not touch on the content of the minor, grew out of discussions in College Council about what criteria we will use. About three years ago the Council passed a set of criteria that emphasized whether or the minor was timely, whether it offers something new that we do not already offer in the curriculum, is there faculty support, is there student support, are there sufficient numbers of courses taught in the past and in the future that will ensure that students can indeed complete the minor? Is there an introductory course? Is there going to be someone administering the program to advise students, helping the students navigate the curriculum. Will there be a capstone project? The committee was unanimously persuaded that that proposal met each criterion, which was why the proposal was forwarded to the College Council.

Sean Kelly asked about the inclusivity of the list of electives? He likes the idea that the minor goes across disciplines, such as social sciences, hard sciences, but there is a very long list of electives, compared to other programs. At some point, is there some utility in having a smaller group of faculty that is already associated with teaching in the minor? Clearly the approach was to be very inclusive.

T. Pohlen responded by stating that the list is a comprehensive list of courses that in some way touch on issues of international development. If the courses will be a part of this minor, the courses would then tailor aspects of the course toward international development issues.

M. Schurr has a concern about the way the list of courses was generated. A large portion of the courses, at least in terms of Anthropology, are courses taught by visitors or adjuncts that are not in the department. Further, a number of the courses are restricted to Anthropology majors only, and those courses will not be available for another program, because of staffing concerns. He does not object at all to the minor program, but the Anthropology Department could not agree to the list of classes in the

proposal. The proposal should be more specific about which courses will actually be available for the minor. Perhaps the one could identify courses that would be available for the minor, and trim down the list of courses stated in the proposal.

D. Crafton asked if someone could speak to the similarities and differences to the interdisciplinary minor in European Studies.

S. Greene mentioned that there was an early concern that it might be the same constituency of students, students who have been drawn to the courses, but it seems that it would attract a different constituency than European Studies, for example those who have traveled to Uganda. The field component is the signature component of this minor.

Fr. Dowd underscored, as well, that the minor will require field research or internship experience. And on page 7 of the proposal, the application process for the minor is described, an essay of 400-600 words, explaining why the student wants to be in this minor, and how it contributes to his or her academic career goals. The application also encourages a recommendation. The hope is that the minor would not attract a group of students that would necessarily minor in this rather than in European Studies.

D. Myers raised two issues. First, there is a concern that the gateway courses rely on only two people. This might be a problem if someone goes on leave, or leaves the university. What would happen? We have other minors and even interdisciplinary majors where it has been a struggle to staff gateway courses, and have tried many different strategies to do so. It would be helpful to recruit more faculty to commit to the gateway course, so that there is not an issue about who will cover the course at some point. The second issue is that we have many interdisciplinary minors, some may think that we have too many such minors, or too many with too few students in them. There is not a concern about demand for this minor, in fact, there seems to be pent up demand for it. Should there be an evaluative point at which there may be a sunset to the minor, because it is more difficult to discontinue a program than it is to create a program? We might want some sort of sunset clause if the minor is not working. How we might assess the program and when we might do so? That way we can then turn the resources to other programs.

Dean McGreevy agreed that we need to have a sunset clause. We have 14 interdisciplinary minors, and 21 majors, and 18 supplemental majors. We have been trying to reduce the number of interdisciplinary minors, which on occasion have been started by a charismatic faculty member in year one, and then the charismatic faculty member is less interested in year four, and does not have a faculty member who will take up the direction of the minor, and the number of students in the minor then dwindles. We will need a sunset clause, but that will not prohibit approval of the proposal in general. Going forward with any interdisciplinary minor, we will need a clause that says: "If the interdisciplinary minor does not have X number of students in year 3 or year 4, it will phase out." That would put pressure on the administrators of the minor to make it work, or the College would move on to something else. Minors can rise, and then fall. That is not a problem. Such a clause will be a requirement from now on.

A. Preacher observed that she has concerns about an application process for a minor. She brought it up in the committee. There is one precedent, and that is with PPE, but PPE is already delimited by the fact that it is limited to students in Philosophy, Politics or Economics. The students must be in one of those three majors to even approach PPE. A. Peacher agrees that there is a pent-up demand for this minor. There are students in the Rogers internships, students who want to and are doing internships all over the world. There will be many students who want to pursue this minor. The self-selection of students is a very important point. How is the program going to grow, and how big does the director see it growing?

There is a qualitative difference in having the students apply and be accepted into the minor, a precedent that the College has never set.

Fr. Dowd stated that the minor will begin small in order to see how it goes. The Ford Family Program does not have the capacity to administer a minor that is large. He thinks it would be too big too quickly if there was not a selection process at the beginning. It is crucial to begin small, and grow it gradually over time.

A. Preacher asked if this minor will accept students from other colleges as well, given that it is an interdisciplinary minor with courses across the curriculum in a number of colleges? Does that change the approval of the minor? This is a minor administered by the college, would Arts and Letters students be given preference? Fr. Dowd stated that the vision is to include students from other colleges, so that it is truly interdisciplinary. The idea is to integrate a course of study that includes the hard sciences, questions of technology together with social science questions and philosophical questions, and even theological questions.

R. Constable asked about the reaction of the deans of science or business school to the proposal. Are they willing to encourage their students to take this minor? Fr. Dowd responded that the deans are open to the minor, but await the full details.

P. Holland wished to confirm that the reluctance to open up the minor to any students is because of an anxiety of a developing administrative structure. Fr. Dowd agreed, but also underscored that faculty resources were also a consideration. Does the minor have enough faculty support for a large number of students? The proposal writers were in fact concerned about whether or not there would be enough faculty to begin the minor at this point.

Denise Baron asked if the study abroad experiences in Uganda and Santiago will be included in the minor? Fr. Dowd confirmed that such experiences would be included.

Dean McGreevy summarized the conversation, stating that the proposal would include a sunset clause and a more accurate list of courses, and more consideration will be given to who might be willing and able to teach the gateway course.

S. Fallon noted that the proposal includes a unique way of capping the number of students to 10-12 students. Should this be reconsidered? Dean McGreevy noted that if the minor initially attracts 40-50 students, the administration of the minor might be overwhelmed. S. Fallon observed that there is a plan to expand the program over the years, and ultimately to open up enrollment. A. Preacher recognized that the British Studies minor was not approved two years ago. This program, however, has a natural constituency for students of Uganda, and from other similar experiences; it might be more sensible to focus on that rather than on caps.

R. Constable asked about how the Office of International Studies (OIS) is involved with this minor. Could not a student say that he or she is pursuing a minor in development, and so he or she needs to be accepted into the Ugandan program, for example? T. Pohlen responded that the minor will not be limited to those with semester-abroad experiences. Dean McGreevy noted that the students who pursue the minor will be required to engage in substantial field experience, and in most cases, this would take place in the developing world.

Assistant Dean Adela Panegos asked if students who are pursuing a minor in journalism could apply as well, and if so, then the application for this minor would have some precedent. A. Preacher confirmed that students do apply to the minor in journalism.

S. Greene suggested that the Council bracket the question about selectivity and growth of the minor. We can begin small, so that much attention can be paid to the senior thesis or capstone project.

Dean McGreevy asked for a vote: (1) vote with conditional approval, and not have the proposal return to the College Council; (2) vote with conditional approval, and have the proposal return to the College Council with changes; (3) vote to oppose the proposal. The votes were: (1) 24 votes; (2) 16 votes; (3) 0 votes.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:04 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew C. Zyniewicz
Executive Assistant to the Dean