

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
MEETING of October 30, 2013
McKenna Auditorium
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Members present: Panos Antsaklis, Cindy Bergeman, Robert Bernhard, James Brockmole, Thomas Burish, Matthew Capdevielle, Donald Crafton, Earl Carter for Greg Crawford, Michael Desch, Margaret Doody, Dennis Doordan, Kevin Dreyer, Nicholas Entrikin, Michael Ferdig, John Gaski, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Kathryn Boehlefeld, Erin Hoffmann Harding, Roger Huang, Rev. John Jenkins, C.S.C., Jeffrey Kantor, Matthew Kernan, Peter Kilpatrick, Catherine Kromkowski, Marya Lieberman, Jose Limon, Michael Lykoudis, Christine Maziar, Paul McGinn, John McGreevy, Elizabeth Moore, Daniel Myers, Nell Newton, Robert Norton, Hugh Page, Catherine Pieronek, Thomas Pratt, Ava Preacher, Antonio Schreier, Joshua Shrout, Casey Skevington, Cheri Smith, Alain Toumayan, Diane Parr Walker

Members absent: Maxwell Brown, John Polhamus, Carter Snead

Members and Observers excused: John Affleck-Graves, Donald Bishop, Laura Carlson, Stuart Greene; Maria Rosa Olivera-Williams; Ramachandran Ramanan, Jeffrey Schorey

Observers present: Kevin Barry, Marie Blakey, Chuck Hurley, Kasey Buckles, Dale Nees, Frank Rossi, Michael Ryan, Lee Svete

Guests: Scott Appleby, Jim Morrison, Tracey Thomas--recorder

1. Welcome and opening prayer:

Father Jenkins opened the meeting at 3:30 p.m., welcoming members, and invited Professor Dennis Doordan to give the opening prayer.

2. Approval of minutes:

The minutes of the September 11, 2013 meeting were unanimously approved.

3. Summary of actions taken by the Executive Committee of the Academic Council (October 11, 2013)

Dr. Burish reviewed the role of the Executive Committee to approve non-substantive changes to the Academic Code. He presented four minor changes (see below) which were approved by the Executive Committee on October 11, 2013 and invited questions and comments from members. There were no questions.

Academic Code of the Graduate School, Sec. 5.8.2

Selection of faculty for appeals committee is amended so that rather than draw them from the Graduate Council (now dissolved) they are now selected from the college councils (two from the student's college and one from outside it).

(a) **Academic Articles, Article, IV, Section 3(h) ((pages 34-35) University Committee on Internationalization**

The reference to "College Council" is amended to include the Schools of Law and Architecture.

(b) Academic Articles, Article IV, section 3(k) (pages 36-37): University Committee on Women Faculty and Students

The composition of the University Committee on Women Faculty and Students is amended to insert the University's Title IX designee in the place of the University's Sexual Assault Resource person, who no longer exists due to various reorganizations.

(c) Article IV, Section 3(m)(pages 37-38): University Committee on Appeals

The subset of former elected members of the Provost's Advisory Committee asked to serve on the University Committee on Appeals will be limited to those who have served within the last five years.

4. Committees' annual reports

Father Jenkins presented the annual reports of the Council's committees to members and invited questions. They are included in the minutes as Appendix A.

5. Consideration of a three-stage approval process for a proposed new School of Global and International Affairs:

Dr. Burish introduced the discussion of a proposed three-stage approval process for a new School of Global and International Affairs at the university. Based on the discussions Scott Appleby has had with the faculty this fall, and the comments he has heard personally from the deans and several faculty, Dr. Burish anticipates that a recommendation to create a new School will be brought forward to the Council in the near future. Overall, there seems to be broad support for the proposed new School.

There has not been a new school created by the university for many years, and there are no records of a clearly established protocol for this process. Dr. Burish and Professor Appleby presented to members a proposed three-stage process for recommending and voting on the creation of the new School.

The three stages are as follows:

Discussion and vote on process (October 30)

Discussion and vote on an in-principle proposal to create a new school (December 9)

Discussion and vote on individual elements, i.e., the degree programs (when ready)

Dr. Burish and Professor Appleby invited questions and comments from members on this proposed process, stage one of which is today's discussion. If members approve the new School 'in concept,' then the positions of dean and faculty can be populated, and administrators can work together to create the new School, including its degree programs.

Professor Doody asked for a definition of 'global' in relation to the new School; she expressed concern that the new School will become 'a branch of the business School.' Dr. Burish assured members the new School will focus on the understanding of culture, religion and languages, and other traditional humanities disciplines in addition to financial and economic topics. The specifics of the course of study will be determined by the administrators and faculty, once they have been appointed.

In response to a question, Dr. Burish and Professor Nicholas Entrikin, chair of one of the task forces, noted that a number of peer institutions have recently launched similar programs and schools; for example, Indiana University, Duke, Georgia Tech. This area is 'a bit of a growth industry.'

Professor Appleby referred to the 11-item memo he has provided to members describing the proposal he will bring to the Council at the scheduled December 9, 2013 meeting. At that meeting, he will provide the Council with sufficient information in order for members to vote ‘in principle’ on the new School.

Members discussed the idea of dual or joint degree programs that might be created with natural campus partners. The new School will also provide undergraduate offerings, including a secondary supplementary major, coming out of the College of Arts and Letters.

Professor Appleby noted that there are plans for two town hall meetings prior to the December 9 Academic Council meeting, to collect feedback in an open-ended environment. The discussion of the component parts of the new School will take place after the December 9 ‘in principle’ vote.

Professor Donald Crafton asked about the value of a stand-alone MA degree for students in terms of placement. Professor Appleby agreed that successful placement is a crucial element in determining the feasibility of the new School. Data collection is and will be undertaken on this issue; the report of the Entrikin task force has begun this discussion. Other ideas under consideration include dual MA degrees in complementary programs or a Ph.D/JD/MBA in conjunction with the MA. The School of Global and International Affairs would offer studies in other cultures which would complement these other programs, taking advantage of a Notre Dame niche. In reference to Professor Crafton’s idea of an undergraduate entering the new School in the junior year and using a fifth year to finalize the MA, Professor Appleby said that idea had not yet been considered; it might be ‘a very attractive idea.’

Professor Antsaklis asked about the role of Science and Engineering in the new School; he also asked about the long-term plans for research coming out of the new School. Professor Appleby agreed that ‘cutting edge research’ must be a central element of this new program. He also agreed that Science and Engineering are ‘quite important’ to the overall vision of the School; he has met with Dean Kilpatrick, Engineering, and Dean Crawford, Science, to discuss possible connections. The Kellogg and Kroc Institutes have been invited to suggest research projects that would be beyond the scope of individuals but could be effectively hosted by the new School. All agree there is much potential for fruitful interaction between these various units.

Professor Kevin Dreyer asked about the timing for members to receive the proposal packet prior to the December 9 meeting. He noted that it will be a large packet of information that members will want to study closely. Professor Appleby and Dr. Burish acknowledged the request for ample lead time, and assured members that the packet will address the relevant issues generally rather than in dense detail. The purpose of the December 9 discussion and vote is to provide members with sufficient information to approve only an ‘in principle’ concept of the new School; it is not ‘final approval’ of the component parts of the School.

Dr. Burish and Professor Appleby invited members to evaluate the 11 items on the list of categories to be covered in the presentation at the December 9 meeting [see Appendix B]: Do these categories address the most useful topics for members to be able to give full and informed consideration of the ‘in principle’ concept?

Some suggested categories for explication included:

- Further explication of the role that can be filled by the Colleges of Science and Engineering.
- Explication of the interaction between the Institute for Global Development (IGD) and the new School was requested by Dean Kilpatrick.

Dr. Bernhard spoke about the IGD's long-term connection with the new School; it is the intention to join together the global elements of Notre Dame's programs. The December 9 presentation can include an 'opening statement' on the close working relationship between the two units.

- Explication of the other international institutes and their roles in connection with the new School.
- Explication of the ways in which the new School will integrate with the mission of the university.
- Explication of the ways in which the new School will integrate with the commitment to 'an unsurpassed undergraduate education.'

Professor Appleby noted he has deferred a forceful statement on the undergraduate programs for the new School because he is cognizant of not encroaching prematurely on the purview of others at the university who have primary responsibility for undergraduate education. Discussions have begun, however, on this aspect of the new School. Dean McGreevy briefly commented that 'it is true the new School will thrive or fail based on the quality of its graduate programs.' In addition, however, a new school at the university must include a significant undergraduate presence. This school in particular provides an opportunity to 'internationalize' the university's curriculum in a coherent way. Dr. Appleby noted that it will take patience and careful work to determine the 'right curriculum' to achieve this.

In response to a question about the role of study abroad programs for graduate research in conjunction with the new School, Professor Appleby said that structurally, the new global gateways have upgraded and enhanced Notre Dame's international sites, with which the new School will be strongly coordinated. The IGD forms a third pillar in this area; all are addressing the complex of research options for the university. A strong working relationship between these three units will enable productive discussion of the funding issues connected with effective internship placement for graduate students.

Professor Alain Toumayan suggested that Professor Appleby might find it useful to consult a report delivered last year to the Advanced Studies Committee by Professors Ed Maginn and Don Howard on the role and place of professional programs at the university.

As there was no further discussion, Dr. Burish thanked Professor Appleby for his presentation and members for their questions.

Father Jenkins asked whether any member had an objection to proceeding with the approval of the School in the two-step process that Provost Burish had outlined. No member objected, and the procedure for approval of the proposed school was adopted by unanimous consent.

As there was no new business, the meeting was adjourned to committee meetings.