

**THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE COLLEGE COUNCIL
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS
Tuesday, April 23 2019
McKenna Hall Auditorium**

ATTENDANCE

Deans: *Dean:* Sarah Mustillo; *Associate Deans:* James Brockmole, Peter Holland, Essaka Joshua, Margaret Meserve; *Assistant Deans:* Maureen Dawson, Collin Meissner, Nicholas Russo, Joseph Stanfield

Chairpersons and Directors: David Campbell, William Carbonaro, Lee Anna Clark, Jon Coleman, James Collins, William Evans, Margot Fassler, Brian Krostenko, Dianne Pinderhughes, Alison Rice, Peter Smith, Jeff Speaks, Yongping Zhu

Elected Faculty: Christopher Abram, Thomas Anderson, Carolina Arroyo, Liang Cai, Noreen Deane-Moran, Denise Della Rosa, Darren Dochuk, Kirk Doran, David Gibson, David Hernandez, Michael Kackman, Tara MacLeod, William Mattison, John O'Callaghan, Matthew Payne, Nathan Rose, Meghan Sullivan, Lijuan (Peggy) Wang, Hannelore Weber, Shauna Williams

Graduate Representatives: Jillian Snyder

Regularly Invited Guests, Observers, and Resource People: Patrick Clauss (University Writing Program), Kate Garry (Dean's Office), Michelle LaCourt (Dean's Office), Erin Lemrow (First Year Advising), Holly Martin (First Year Advising), Geraldine Meehan (Faculty Engagement/Global Gateways at NDI), Brian O'Conchubhair (CSLC), Kathleen Opel (Office of International Studies), Kasey Swanke (First Year Advising), Matthew Zyniewicz (Dean's Office)

Excused: Maria Di Pasquale, Ben Heller, Peter Holland, Diarmuid Ó Giolláin, Joshua Lund, Tim Matovina, Lyn Spillman, Tom Stapleford, Juan Vitulli, Matthew Wilkens, Weibing Ye

Dean Sarah Mustillo convened the meeting at 3:30 pm.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

S. Mustillo asked for any amendments to the March 7, 2019 College Council minutes. The Council approved the minutes without corrections.

COLLEGE BUSINESS

Advising

S. Mustillo explained that Vice President and Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs Hugh Page no longer serves as Dean of Notre Dame's First Year of Studies (FYS); Elly Brenner now serves as Assistant Provost for Academic Advising, and directs Notre Dame's Center for University Advising, providing centralized leadership for the University's various undergraduate academic advising services. Instead, First Year of Studies advisors will be embedded in the College located in 119 O'Shaughnessy. The advisors will report to E. Brenner with input from the College. E. Joshua explained that the University is transitioning to integrative four-year advising. The Office of Undergraduate Studies will connect the FYS advisors with the DUSs. Individual DUSs will discuss their programs with the advisors. There will also be a director of FYS.

Peter Smith (Chairperson, Department of Music) mentioned that it will be important for Music that there be a careful effort to link with FYS advisors with other colleges. Holly Martin said advisors will serve all the students with all their interests. S. Mustillo recalled that over half the undergraduate students at Notre Dame have a major in the College.

Advanced Placement policy

E. Joshua explained the issues we have had with advanced placement. The current AP situation is that (1) the University accepts AP for elective credit in the degree; (2) the University does not accept AP in the University Core Curriculum (starting in the fall 2018); (3) the College of Arts and Letters allows AP in: College general education requirements, some program requirements (i.e., majors/minors), and elective credit. In the spring 2017 the College Council banned AP/SAT II/IB in the College degree. In the fall 2017, the College received feedback from prospective students, parents, other colleges and admissions. That feedback showed that the College's AP policy was not consistent with other colleges, and internal transfer students from one college to another might lose credit if they switch to the College of Arts and Letters. Further, parents and students were concerned that the students could not graduate early if they had enough of the AP credits to do so. With such feedback, Dean John McGreevy postponed implementation of the new AP policy in the academic year 2018-2019 and then again for the academic year 2019-2020. In spring 2019, the Undergraduate Studies Committee of Academic Council presented a proposal that would remove the College's ability to ban AP outright. E. Joshua showed other data related to the AP matters: average use of AP by college, maximum use of AP by college, interpretation of usage of AP, benchmarking data with peers and aspirational peers, and current programs across the College of Arts and Letters who currently allow for AP credit to count.

To address the AP issues, E. Joshua and the Undergraduate Committee developed three options for the Council to consider. The College Council voted for option 2, which was: no AP credit for University requirements; no AP credit for College requirements; and allow departments to make their own decisions about AP credit. AP credit would be accepted for elective credits.

S. Mustillo called for a vote to approve Option 2. The vote was 40 in favor, 1 vote against, with 0 abstentions.

College Supplement to Academic Code

S. Mustillo reported that E. Joshua had been working on a project all year, trying to codify all the College rules that have to do with undergraduate programs. E. Joshua reported that the undergraduate academic code allows for much discretion. E. Joshua stated that she will update the College Supplement to the Academic Code every year and will make it searchable.

<https://al.nd.edu/advising/academic-policies/>

Variable teaching load

S. Mustillo explained the topic on variable teaching loads, a topic suggested by Provost Tom Burish. Should the College increase or decrease teaching loads for faculty who are no longer research active? Should the College readjust the percentages of 40% research, 40% teaching, 20% service? If the College adjusted the workload expectations, then teachers could teach a 3-3 load, and be eligible to earn merit raises. This would allow more courses and could decrease loads for faculty who are active researchers.

Kirk Doran (Department of Economics) asked: Who would make the decision to move a faculty member to a higher teaching load? S. Mustillo noted that it would be at the chair level, and the department could codify it as much as possible, for example, if a faculty member has not published in a certain amount of years. K. Doran responded that there is some granularity in different disciplines.

Lee Anna Clark (Chairperson, Department of Psychology) recommended that departments should foreshadow teaching loads to let teachers know that such a decision is coming and possibly help them devise a program to help get back into publishing. S. Mustillo agreed that the departments would have to give them adequate and fair warning.

Margot Fassler (Director, Sacred Music Program) thought that allowing faculty to teach more would be a great idea for many reasons. The College and departments should recognize that—in addition to publishing—invited lectures, competitive international and national meetings should also be factored in. S. Mustillo agreed, and mentioned that such scholarly activities should be reflected in the respective CAP documents.

K. Doran recommended that chairpersons handle such decisions in a mutual fashion, with conversations with faculty. He also recommended that the agreement does not need to be legalistic. S. Mustillo reiterated that departments should really codify scholarly work so that chairpersons can make the decisions. Departments must spell it out: What is a reasonable amount of time to produce scholarship? Someone who teaches a 3-3 load can help someone else teach a 2-1 load.

Tara MacLeod (Department of Irish Languages and Literatures) stated that such a policy could hurt the smaller departments.

Denise Della Rossa (Department of German and Russian Languages and Literatures) wondered if there is a model for doing such changes? S. Mustillo reported that the policy would be pursued by the central administration and they would review models from other universities, which is why S. Mustillo wanted to get sense of what the Council members thought.

David Campbell (Chairperson, Department of Political Science) wondered how the implementation of the policy would procedurally work. He asked if departments could consider the implementation by

considering the various divisions separately. S. Mustillo liked the idea because it would provide department chairpersons some background for their decisions. Bill Carbanaro (Chairperson, Department of Sociology) also liked the idea, because it would give more legitimacy to department chairs. It would help to get opinions and to help give more background and collective judgement.

Jesse Lander (Chairperson, Department of English) also liked the flexibility that divisional consideration would provide, but he also worried that the departments would use teaching as some sort of punishment. He asked, as a management policy, what exactly is the University trying to solve? S. Mustillo mentioned that the University is trying to grapple with what a 40-40-20 faculty work load should mean. J. Lander suggested that departments could first address the issue through merit compensation, and then chairpersons and the faculty involved could reconsider responsibilities.

Tom Anderson (Chairperson, Department of Romance Languages and Literatures) observed that if faculty are not good researchers, then they most likely are not productive teachers.

Bill Mattison (Department of Theology) stated that he is persuaded by the equity issue but noted that such a policy should not be punitive. He suggested that there may be some ways to learn from current changes in IEI, where administrators had to think about how teachers contribute to common mission. S. Mustillo thought that the policy could be drafted in such a way as to make it more of a choice of the faculty members to move to more of a teaching position. L. Clark opined that zero raises are not enough motivation for faculty.

P. Smith stated that if faculty are research inactive, then they should have a 4-4 teaching load. He observed, however, that there is a quandary; there may be cases where faculty are at the associate professor rank for a long time and are research active, but they are not producing. Such faculty may literally be active researchers but may not be reaching research standards of the University. Can we clarify, how much you have to be doing to be considered "research active"? K. Doran observed that some faculty are pursuing ambitious projects. What is considered a major project? S. Mustillo mentioned that faculty who are taking 10 years for major projects to come to fruition are typically publishing other items, essays, and articles etc. She clarified that the policy is directed to those who have not published at all within 10-years time. Sometimes it seems that the University values teaching too much here. The message must consistently be that faculty are expected to do both well. B. Evans observed that the University already has an incentive mechanism by giving lower salaries. Should we be more aggressive with that?

Hannelore Weber (Department of German and Russian Languages and Literatures) suggested that the College and departments decrease service loads for some faculty. There seems to be much unfairness in the service loads of faculty. S. Mustillo observed that it is much more difficult to ask folks to do extra service.

Jim Collins (Chairperson, Department of Film, Television, and Design) asked if faculty can challenge a chairperson's decision, stating that he or she is very close to having the book/production done? Would there be some way to offer zero raise for one year to get the book done, rather than apply more teaching responsibility? Would chairpersons have the ability to recalibrate? S. Mustillo shared that the Provost wants this policy to be University-wide. To have such a policy should be a University decision. If the College agrees to support it, the implementation should be up to College.

Associate Dean Margaret Meserve stated that over the years colleagues have taken advantage of this change in teaching load. There has not been a published list of faculty who have switched to a heavier teaching load. This proposal is coming forward because there have been ad hoc changes; some chairs have been hardline in making the changes. Yet, it has been only a handful of people. MOUs have not been arranged.

Associate Dean James Brockmole liked the idea of allowing faculty members to opt into the new teaching arrangement. If the faculty member does not opt into it, the University will have the option of requiring the transition. He worries, however, about writing a “standard” that would stipulate when a faculty member needs to transition. Departments typically know what the standard is. There is an equity issue.

Four new minors in MCOB

S. Mustillo discussed four new minors in the Mendoza College of Business—finance, accounting, real estate, innovation and entrepreneurship. There are some issues about this. S. Mustillo wondered how these minors might impact certain College of Arts and Letters majors. After much discussion, S. Mustillo suggested that the College monitor the impact.

ADJOURNMENT

S. Mustillo adjourned the meeting at 4:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew C. Zyniewicz
Dean’s Executive Administrator