

**THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE COLLEGE COUNCIL  
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS  
Monday, September 19, 2016  
McKenna Hall Auditorium**

**ATTENDANCE**

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

Chairpersons and Directors: Matthew Ashley, Michael Brownstein, Lee Anna Clark, Jim Collins, Richard Cross, William Donahue, Brian Krostenko, Jesse Lander, Sarah McKibben, Sarah Mustillo, Dianne Pinderhughes, Peter Smith, Jeffrey Speaks, Thomas Stapleford, Thomas Tweed

Elected Faculty: Carolina Arroyo, David Betson, Catherine Bolten, Liang Cai, Jessica Collett, Ann-Maria Conrado, Noreen Deane-Moran, Richard Donnelly, Mary Flannery, Curtis Franks, David Gibson, Daniel Graff, Tom Gresik, Moira Horn, Joshua Lund, Louis MacKenzie, Tara MacLeod, Marisel Moreno, Darcia Narvaez, Siiri Scott, Lynette Spillman, Erika Summers-Effler, Juan Vitulli, David Watson, Hannelore Weber

Undergraduate Student Representative: Hoira Horn, Justin Pizzimenti

Graduate Student Representative: Jessica Kim, Heather Roberts Stanfiel

Regularly Invited Guests, Observers, and Resource People: Robert Becht (*Office of the Dean*), Kasey Buckles (*Department of Economics*), Margot Fassler (*Program in Sacred Music*), Kate Garry (*Office of the Dean*), Essaka Joshua (*College Seminar Program*), Matt Zyniewicz (*Office of the Dean*)

Excused: Tom Anderson, Tobias Boes, David Campbell, Jon Coleman, Kirk Doran, William Evans, Agustín Fuentes, Richard Gray, Patrick Griffin, Mary Celeste Kearney, Tom Merluzzi, Margaret Meserve, Laura Miller-Graff, Jessica Payne, Lira Yoon

Dean John McGreevy convened the meeting at 3:30 pm.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes from the April 26, 2016 College Council meeting were approved with one change; Associate Dean JoAnn DellaNeva was present for the meeting.

## **COLLEGE BUSINESS**

### **Student Government: reserve books for classes**

John introduced the topic; representatives from student government wrote an email to Associate Dean JoAnn DellaNeva:

"Is it possible to have the current year's textbooks that are available at the Library categorized as 'Reference' and not 'General Collection' so that multiple students can use the textbook without having one person check it out, then others recalling the book only days later? As reference books, the textbooks would always be available at the library since they cannot be checked out and students can share the knowledge without having to pay hundreds of dollars for a textbook they'll only use a few times.

"This idea received over 50 positive votes from other students, which demonstrates that there is a broader interest in its implementation. After speaking to the library and some professors, the Constituent Services team feels that the best way to do so would be to ask the Deans of each college if they could make this an expectation for their respective faculties. Specifically, we envision the professor of every class that has over, say, 30 students to request that their textbooks be put on 'Print Reserve' in the library (E-Reserve would serve the same purpose). For clarification, this would not mean that the library would buy any textbooks but simply make sure that textbooks it already owns would be accessible whenever a student wished to use it. We feel that the authority of the Deans to implement this idea is both the simplest and most effective way to do so."

Assistant Dean Nick Russo stated that he spoke with the student body president, and his understanding was that the required textbook(s) would be placed in the "reference" section of the library if a class has 30 or more students enrolled.

After discussion the College Council unanimously approved the proposal.

### **Core curriculum review report**

J. McGreevy provided an overview of the Core Curriculum Review Committee's report and noted changes in the report since the first draft was distributed in November 2015 and after numerous meetings with faculty across campus.

Some of the changes to the core curriculum suggested in the report include:

- Enhance faculty ownership of curriculum and increase student flexibility by framing the core around "ways of knowing"
- Develop new "Integration" courses that can count for core credit
- Deepen Catholic identity with renewed appreciation of theology and philosophy—and develop "Catholicism and the Disciplines" courses
- Diminish number of core curriculum requirements for many students
- Ensure that the most experienced faculty teach a higher percentage of introductory courses in the core
- Eliminate the use of Advanced Placement credit to test out of core course requirements
- University support and faculty-led oversight of the core curriculum
- At least three electives regardless of major program

Some changes to the report since November 2015 include:

- Governance: final report offers more detailed vision of the course approval and governance structure
- Distribution: rearrangement of general liberal arts categories in the arts, humanities, and social sciences better satisfies our goal of intellectual breadth across disciplines and areas of study
- Clarity: revised language clarifies recommendations on areas such as AP credit, writing requirement, advising, and double-counting
- Nomenclature: still unanimously support “ways of knowing” approach, but went with more straightforward names for proposed course categories

J. McGreevy opened the floor for discussion.

Thomas Tweed (*Chairperson, Department of American Studies*) commented on the section on governance (page 35). He wondered if the chairperson of the University Committee would have enough integrity and authority to administer the new core curriculum. Further, how will the structure of the University Committee work? How will the subcommittees work? J. McGreevy answered that there would be one University Committee overseeing the core curriculum, and the provost would appoint the chairperson of that committee who would have course releases and administrative compensation in order to do the work, as well as the necessary staff. The committee would have elected faculty with some appointed faculty. The process of course approval would work through subcommittees, each “way of knowing” would have an appropriate subcommittee. A majority of those on the subcommittees would be from the most affected departments of the particular “way of knowing”.

As a text case to see how this might work, some members of the Core Curriculum Review Committee (CCRC) convened some faculty to attempt to write the learning requirements for the proposed quantitative reasoning “way of knowing”. The resulting proposed text was attached to the report. J. McGreevy reported that the process worked well, very collaborative, and he recalled that when talking to other universities about how they went about developing similar “ways of knowing,” he found that disagreements about the learning goals were rare. Associate Dean Peter Holland stated that approval of a course would not mean it will remain approved; the subcommittees should remain attentive to changes in content or changes in instructors.

Michael Brownstein (*Chairperson, Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures*) recognized that many students pursue two majors or supplemental majors. He wondered if the CCRC considered the issues related to double counting, to help students fulfill two tracks of courses. J. McGreevy responded that the CCRC was enthusiastic about double counting. The CCRC was unanimously in agreement to state that students could not count one course for two core requirements. Kasey Buckles noted that one place where the CCRC would like to see more double counting is where core courses could double count to fulfill the core writing requirements, for example an economic course that is writing intensive could count for the second writing requirement and the social science core requirement. Currently University seminar courses can double count for another core requirement or for a course in a student’s major. M. Brownstein asked about courses that students take while abroad. Could those count as core courses if they are approved by the relevant subcommittees? J. McGreevy stated that such courses could count.

Catherine Bolten (*Department of Anthropology*) observed that the report calls for more tenured and tenure-track professors to teach the core courses. She wondered, however, what would happen to the

teaching experiences for graduate students and adjunct instructors. Would they still have opportunities to develop their teaching skills? J. McGreevy replied that Notre Dame has a really low contingent of adjunct faculty teaching courses, fewer than 5% of courses, and an even smaller percentage of adjuncts teach core courses. He observed that on balance graduate students teach too many courses. The departments should provide just enough teaching opportunities for the graduates to be credible on the job market. Graduate students should typically teach upper-level courses and smaller courses.

Darcia Narvaez (*Department of Psychology*) inquired about how core courses will be approved. She also wondered whether or not the CCRC considered requiring an infusion of some issues across the core courses, issues like the environment or diversity. J. McGreevy replied that the CCRC did not spend much on themes across the disciplines; but rather had more discussions about what thematic courses Notre Dame should have, a required course on the environment or on diversity. K. Buckles noted that the CCRC wanted to see Catholic identity addressed more broadly across the core, which was how the CAD course was developed. J. McGreevy stated that the subcommittees will review and approve the courses. There would be more scrutiny than there is now. P. Holland noted that the committee recognized that the University will need to incentivize faculty to develop Integration courses and CAD courses. There probably will not be an enormous number of such courses in the beginning but hopefully more and more faculty would want to teach such courses. J. McGreevy observed that Notre Dame has 8200 undergraduate students and, if the CCRC would suggest requiring an additional core course, the University might not be able to handle the volume of courses needed. The CCRC wanted to develop some innovative courses, and the CAD and Integration courses were ways to introduce some new courses without having to develop a course for every undergraduate.

T. Tweed wondered how the University will assess the core curriculum. Every year, two years, three years? J. McGreevy acknowledged that there is a section in the report that addresses assessment. Most likely assessment will take place every three to five years; by the end of three years the University Committee should know what is working and is not working. P. Holland mentioned that the University Committee will have an ongoing review procedure, pretty much whenever the University Committee would meet; there would be much greater continuing investigation of success. J. McGreevy also recalled that, similar to other University committees across campus, the University Committee will have to submit an annual report to the Academic Council, and in turn, a report to faculty.

Tom Stapleford (*Chairperson, Program of Liberal Studies*) had a question related to the proposed CAD and Integration courses. In his view, one of the challenges of the CCRC must have been developing the ideals for the core curriculum and then translating the ideals into pragmatic action in a given context. T. Stapleford thought the CAD and Integration sections slid too far to the pragmatic side. Both requirements are intellectually incoherent. Why are CAD courses and the second philosophy courses treated equally? He wondered if the core curriculum rather could keep the second philosophy course, and not require CAD courses or Integration courses in order to have a more coherent intellectual structure. The University Committee could establish a pilot program for the CAD courses and Integration courses, evaluate how those courses worked after a given time, and make decisions based on the evidence. Further, T. Stapleford asserted that the team-teaching model does not belong in the core curriculum. J. McGreevy underscored how coherence can be elusive in general education. The CCRC believed that CAD was and will be a good idea, and so the subsequent question was about how to incentivize it. If CAD would not count for core curricular credit, the CCRC did not think that the University would offer very many courses. To have them count for the core would encourage more faculty to develop such courses. Further, the CCRC did not think of CAD and the second philosophy as the same thing. They saw the sequence of two Theology and two Philosophy courses as a way to emphasize the Catholic intellectual tradition. The CCRC also thought that a sequence of two Theology,

one Philosophy and one CAD as equally appealing. The former sequence only engages faculty from two departments. The latter sequence potentially engages faculty from many different departments. The two courses are not intellectually the same thing, but the CCRC thought that there was an advantage to the second sequence, and so included it as an option. P. Holland indicated that the CCRC received many faculty letters about offering an integration course in the core curriculum. Such interest was a major reason why the CCRC thought that such a course should be a part of the core curriculum. K. Buckles indicated that she has been sympathetic to pilot courses, and had considered already existing courses across the University that might fulfill a CAD or Integration requirement. She had noted many different examples of such courses, and they typically have been very successful and popular. J. McGreevy observed that students navigate toward integration courses, even at other institutions. Undergraduates flock to such courses.

Brian Krostenko (*Chairperson, Department of Classics*) asked how the CCRC envisions the core curriculum changes to be ready by fall 2018. Should not fall 2019 be more realistic? J. McGreevy responded that the proposed University Committee should play this as it goes. The CCRC did not quite know how much time would be needed for the transition; hopefully it should be pretty routine. The first year of the University Committee and subcommittees will be challenging. K. Buckles noted that the CCRC talked about having a transition team, as the proposed University Committee gets organized. P. Holland intuited that the transition could be done in a reasonable amount of time if the Academic Council quickly passed the proposal. The proposed transition team or University Committee should have the curriculum set in the fall 2017, and then all the affected departments, programs, and offices would be ready for fall 2018.

Jeffrey Speaks (*Chairperson, Department of Philosophy*) underscored that CAD courses are not going to be the same as second philosophy courses. Philosophy courses challenge students to confront their theological and world views; they do this extremely well as part of the core curriculum. CAD, as well, should have some component that challenges students' theological and world views, not simply discuss what others think about their own world views. If the CAD courses neglect to challenge students in this way, then the proposed core curriculum structure would be incoherent.

Dan Graff (*Department of History and Director, Higgins Labor Studies Program*) asked if the CCRC had looked at enrollment numbers to anticipate how students will self-select in terms of taking a history course or a social science course, for example. J. McGreevy reported that the CCRC did look at what students take as one course in a given area. By far the engineers will take one course in a given area and spread around the remaining elective credits, and that's maybe 23% of the student body. If the College of Engineering enables their students to take three more elective courses, perhaps there might be more students who will take courses in the College of Arts and Letters. Beyond that most students took more than one course in a given area, for example they took a history course and a social science course. K. Buckles noted that the advanced language and culture requirement might attract a smaller number of students because fewer students will qualify for such courses, and integration courses—at least initially—would be limited by the faculty's ability to develop them. So there will probably be many students who take arts, literature, social science, and history courses. J. McGreevy added that if a student takes a social science in the Liberal Arts category 5, then the student will most likely take a history course for Liberal Arts category 6.

Jim Collins (*Chairperson, Department of Film, Television and Theatre*) indicated that he and his colleagues were delighted by the final report; in his opinion the CCRC did a superb job, and the CCRC provided a more balanced final report in terms of the requirements. Increased flexibility would work if

balance remains respected. He was incredibly impressed by how the committee listened to faculty concerns and how they responded.

M. Brownstein asked how the CCRC defined what makes courses writing-intensive. K. Buckles replied that the committee anticipated using a working definition of 25 pages of written material, with one opportunity to review and revise papers.

Ann-Marie Conrado (*Department of Art, Art History, and Design*) also mentioned that she was very pleased with modifications in the final report. She was inspired by the idea of integration and CAD courses. She wondered if CAD courses might be team taught, to help teach the moral and ethical implications of what one produces. Could be in major if part of core? If integration is defined by a course that would be team taught, could there be a course potentially that could be modeling collaboration by two disciplines, for example, students from science and students from anthropology? Build a course together so that they learn how the other solves or tackles a problem, that way collaboration becomes more than modeling by the two faculty members but how students can be resources for each other. P. Holland thought that the idea of collaboration among students would be crucial. The reason for team teaching would be to have integrity to the representation of the multiple disciplines, and the risk without it is precisely because someone in the College of Arts and Letters asserts that he or she understands science but not in the way that a scientist understands science. If faculty are going to succeed in representing the various disciplines, faculty must be assured of their abilities to do that effectively. CAD courses can be team-taught, and we have models for approval for team-taught courses.

Associate Dean James Brockmole inquired about the writing requirement. An academic weakness among Notre Dame undergraduate students upon arrival to campus generally has been their writing abilities. J. Brockmole liked the proposed changes in the writing requirement. He wondered about the students who are able to test out of the Writing and Rhetoric course. Had there been any thought about the timing of the second writing course? If students could wait until junior year, would that be too late, because many of the majors have writing intensive courses? K. Buckles acknowledged that the Core Curriculum Review Committee had thought about the timing of fulfilling the writing requirement. Currently First Year students have a writing intensive course, either the USEM or the Writing and Rhetoric course. If they take a writing-intensive course, some might take it as juniors and seniors. K. Buckles could see an advantage to taking a later writing intensive course. The Department of Economics, for example, has a writing intensive course, yet K. Buckles would like students to first learn how to think like an economist before they learn how to write like an economist. She would prefer to leave the decision to the majors to determine when students should take writing courses so that students might have a more engaging writing experience. J. McGreevy observed that if there does not appear to be appropriate writing intensive courses in a given major, then students may take more university seminars.

Margot Fassler (*Program in Sacred Music*) commented that it is important to require different levels of student prerequisites in some of the introductory courses mentioned. She underscored that such courses should be developed as soon as possible. For example, perhaps there should be two levels of introductory courses in Theology, a course for the student who has little or no background knowledge about Catholicism or religion, and one for students who have significant background in that area. Advanced introductory courses would also help faculty and administrators emphasize the value of the core curriculum while recruiting good students. The core curriculum could be more attractive to them. J. McGreevy agreed—and the CCRC agreed—that students should not be bored in the core courses; the University should give them something new and fresh in the core courses.

T. Stapleford wondered if the Integration course could count toward another core requirement rather than as a separate requirement. For example, if an Integration course was offered by a faculty member in science and a faculty member in philosophy, could it count toward a science course or philosophy course instead of an Integration course? J. McGreevy asserted that the CCRC had considered that question. The faculty from science would ask if the CCRC thinks that science and math are even more important in the twenty-first century than in the twentieth century, then why drop either a science or math from the core requirements. J. McGreevy could see an Integration course fulfilling core requirement 3, but for the proposed core curriculum CCRC thought that it should be in the General Liberal Arts requirement 6.

C. Bolten stated that some students bore themselves in courses that they have already taken in high school in order to compete with fellow students, or simply to do well and to get excellent grades. She thought the University should more explicitly push students outside their comfort zones. Accepting no AP can be one way of doing that.

M. Fassler suggested that with the proposed core curriculum the University should help students find ways to make a cohesive education in their four year experiences. Good advising can tease threads of academic themes through the curriculum, and students would enjoy the core curriculum even more than they do.

Liang Cai (*Department of History*) noted that her courses have double-counted as history and literature requirements. L. Cai wondered if all the faculty have to have their core courses reapproved. J. McGreevy indicated that they would but that he would think that L. Cai's current core courses would be approved. P. Holland stated that it would depend on how the University Committee and subcommittees discharge their work. All new courses will be approved but subcommittees would see immediately what courses would count. K. Buckles recalled that every one of the "ways of knowing" will have more explicit learning goals, so that the approval process may be somewhat automated.

Essaka Joshua (*College Seminar Program*) wondered whether or not the CCRC considered the development of oral expression as a goal. J. McGreevy indicated that the CCRC agonized over that one. At one point the CCRC considered adding oral intensity. For logistical reasons the CCRC thought it would be too much of a burden to add such a group of courses. P. Holland recalled that the College of Arts and Letters has the CSEM courses as a college requirement. J. McGreevy noted that students also are able to acquire such skills in small seminar courses.

J. McGreevy asked the College Council to show their support or not in a broad vote. Before the Council took a vote, J. McGreevy recused himself and stepped out of the room. P. Holland chaired the vote. P. Holland first asked T. Stapleford if he had a motion. T. Stapleford motioned to remove Integration from the General Liberal Arts category 6 in the proposed core curriculum. No one seconded his motion.

Next P. Holland asked if there is a motion for the College Council take a broad vote about the CCRC report under discussion. T. Tweed motioned for the College Council to take a vote to accept the recommendations in the CCRC report. B. Krostenko seconded. The motion passed with 41 in favor, 1 against, and 2 abstentions.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

P. Holland adjourned the plenary meeting at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew C. Zyniewicz  
Dean's Executive Administrator