

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
December 9, 2013
McKenna Auditorium
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Members present: John Affleck-Graves, Cindy Bergeman, James Brockmole, Maxwell Brown, Thomas Burish, Matthew Capdevielle, Laura Carlson, Donald Crafton, Greg Crawford, Michael Desch, Margaret Doody, Dennis Doordan, Michael Ferdig, John Gaski, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Erin Hoffmann Harding, Roger Huang, Rev. John Jenkins, C.S.C., Jeff Kantor, Peter Kilpatrick, Catherine Kromkowski, Marya Lieberman, Jose Limon, Michael Lykoudis, Chris Maziar, Paul McGinn, John McGreevy, Elizabeth Moore, Dan Myers, Robert Norton, Hugh Page, Cathy Pieronek, Thomas Pratt, Ava Preacher, Antonio Schreier, Jeff Schorey, Casey Skevington, Cheri Smith, Alain Toumayan, Diane Parr Walker

Members absent: Kathryn Boehlefeld, Nick Entrikin, Matthew Kernan, John Polhamus, Ramachandran Ramanan, Joshua ShROUT

Members and Observers excused: Panos Antsaklis, Robert Bernhard, Kevin Dreyer, Nell Newton, Maria Olivera-Williams, Carter Snead

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

Guests: Scott Appleby, Jim Morrison, Jeffrey Bergstrand, David Hartvigsen, Richard Mendenhall, Katherine Spiess, Tracey Thomas--recorder

1. Welcome and opening prayer:

Fr. Jenkins opened the meeting at 3:30 p.m., welcoming members, and invited Prof. Jeff Kantor to offer the opening prayer.

2. Approval of minutes:

The minutes of the October 30, 2013 meeting were unanimously approved.

3. Discussion and vote on an in-principle proposal to establish a new School of Global Affairs

Prof. Scott Appleby, Director of Academic Planning, Proposed School of Global Affairs, began the question-and-answer session by thanking all who have assisted in the development of the in-principle proposal to establish a new School of Global Affairs. He noted that the goal of the proposal is to provide the Council with as much detail as is responsibly possible at this stage in the development process. He noted that the name of the school is a placeholder at this stage; it will be finalized further into the process. Future stages of the proposal will continue to fill in details of the curricular programs for the Council.

Prof. Appleby noted that the word “transformative” was used in the proposal with conscious intent to emphasize the potential for transformation both internally at Notre Dame and externally for the larger world of institutional global and international programs. In the latter sense, Notre Dame brings to that world unique qualities:

- an ethical orientation to the world of human development and the related worlds of research, scholarship and practice;
- a persistent ethical focus, based in Notre Dame’s values as a Catholic university;
- a clear vision of the concept of ‘human development.’

Prof. Appleby emphasized that Notre Dame will work toward these transformational achievements while also providing, as do competitors, the standard features of exemplary higher education programs:

- high-quality education, including education in policy and the necessary technical skills required to be a leader in these fields;
- sufficient language training;
- cultural immersion;
- internships.

Notre Dame will meet the benchmarks of existing schools’ programs while also bringing our University’s unique character to the field.

The internal transformation will deepen Notre Dame’s development into a more fully international and global leading research university in the world. Prof. Appleby emphasized the ambitious scope of the idea and the school. On the one hand, it will be a professional school. That part of the proposal was informed by a reading of the report on Professional Masters’ Degree Programs, which was submitted to then Dean Greg Sterling by Profs. Ed Maginn, Don Howard, Dave Severson, and Christina Wolbrecht. The report admirably laid out the necessary requirements for a professional degree program and augmented Professor Appleby’s understanding of this kind of degree. The ambitious expectation for this new professional degree program is to meet all the benchmarks established by peers.

On the other hand, Prof. Appleby stated, the proposed school aspires to be a leader in global research and public education in the United States and beyond. In this regard, the school aspires to be a catalyst, convener, and coordinator of new kinds of research programs and public presences or services that, together with Notre Dame International (NDI), will truly internationalize the campus. The international institutes make this dual ambition plausible. They would bring to the proposed school not only the professional training (in the Kroc Institute’s graduate degree programs) but also a record of global outreach and engagement.

Prof. Don Crafton complimented the proposal overall but suggested that it could be strengthened by a greater emphasis on the arts, which have long been used for teaching, expressing cultural values, and providing us with the opportunity to learn of other cultures’ values. There are already many resources available on campus. He particularly noted the number of students who use study abroad programs to study and create art in international contexts, as well as the many artists and scholars of the arts who are brought to campus every year by the international institutes. Prof. Crafton asserted that the elevation of the arts in the proposal for this new school would move the role of the arts from a parochial level, adding a distinction to the program. As a

model, he referred to the role played by the arts in the development of South Africa and the creation of global awareness of apartheid during the past three decades.

Prof. Appleby concurred with Prof. Crafton's point but noted that the revised proposal might not be the best place to develop this aspect of the new program. Due to concerns about the length of the proposal, he has had to make a number of choices of emphasis tied largely to the professional track in crafting the proposal. Where the proposal emphasizes the kinds of ideas Prof. Crafton has presented, it does so using the term "culture." He agreed that Notre Dame could develop an aggressive plan with NDI and with the proposed school's website to highlight the array of international arts opportunities for scholars and students here. The Keough-Naughton Institute for Irish Studies is an example of the kind of opportunity to be found at Notre Dame.

Dean Greg Crawford, College of Science, reported that Prof. David Lodge, Biology, shared his and his colleagues' enthusiasm about the proposal. Dean Crawford noted in particular the way that synergies could be made across faculty members' work with climate change, water, health, and basic species and land use—to name some areas—and with basic policy and ethics as they converge with international aspects of the School.

Prof. Appleby remarked on an appended proposal submitted to him by Dean Crawford and some colleagues. Prof. Patrick Regan, from Political Science and the Kroc Institute, has also consulted faculty colleagues and produced an appended proposal around the topic of climate change. The hope is that the new school can convene, collaborate, and otherwise work with other campus units to advance interdisciplinary projects such as this one.

Prof. Margaret Doody remarked that many will be excited by the prospects presented in the proposal. This initial proposal acknowledges elements which still need attention; in particular, library holdings, the number of languages in which instruction can be offered additional language faculty, and additional faculty working in the areas of Asia, Africa and the Middle East. These weaknesses, she hoped, will be addressed through a collaborative effort on the part of *all* the colleges and institutes prior to the final confirmation of the new school. This new program offers an opportune occasion for an increased interchange between the arts and the sciences; it offers an occasion to think through how and why we want to teach languages as part of an exploration of how to widen students' ideas about language, culture and expression. These kinds of inquiries could impact the campus in a significant way. Prof. Doody advocated an immediate campus-wide discussion, since the weaknesses must be addressed before any further moves can be made. The University could show its respect for other peoples and cultures in the most practical way by instituting a much more dynamic and far reaching approach to languages than hitherto seen here.

Noting that Notre Dame is currently working on expansion of many graduate programs throughout the colleges, Prof. James Brockmole asked about the wisdom of putting a substantial quantity of resources into a new school which will 'live or die' on the strength of its graduate programs—at the possible expense of existing graduate programs. He also asked about the assessment process for the new school over the long term. The proposal includes a reference to a four-year time frame for obtaining accreditation; Prof. Brockmole suggested there should be a more detailed set of criteria for evaluating, and if necessary, abandoning, the new school.

Prof. Appleby noted that the proposal document did not naturally offer itself as the location for a shut-down protocol. He pointed to the “robust” metrics presented in the report on professional masters programs (mentioned above); these metrics should be established for effective review of the progress of any degree program. Prof. Appleby asserted that a key aspect for measuring the success of the new school will be placement. Strong placement of graduates “right out of the gate” is essential for the continuance of the program.

In reference to the question on prioritizing support of existing graduate programs, Prof. Appleby noted that the “transformative trajectory” referred to earlier should centrally involve the new school but not the new school alone. Under the banner of globalization and internationalization, means should be identified to strengthen other programs, which may or may not be within the school as such—for example, programs in the arts and, languages. The principle in play is that the school will be one of an array of catalysts for deepening Notre Dame’s international and global approach on a variety of levels, not all of which would be the school’s sole responsibility. Discussions across departments on ways to think more explicitly about ways to build internationally should diminish the possibility that putting resources into a new school might weaken support of existing programs. Prof. Appleby suggested that a significant way to avoid weakening other units would be to achieve real success in the new campaign for all things international so that rather than competing for existing resources, the new school, as well as existing programs, will all draw on increased resources.

Thomas Burish, Provost, identified Prof. Brockmole’s question as one that arises frequently: Should the University begin something new prior to enriching existing programs or entities? Listing some examples, Dr. Burish agreed that the question is an important one to ask, given the limits to resources. He mentioned that, at times, resources are qualified in their availability—resources might be restricted to a new program or restricted to an existing program. There is widespread campus agreement that Notre Dame must become more international if it wishes to maintain its relevance in the future. If, as the proposal appears to show and Prof. Appleby has been emphasizing, this new school is “done right,” then it will strengthen many existing programs. Some new, strong programs will also be created, while simultaneously adding strength to languages, to the library, to development in programs in political science, history, economics, and other fields. The hope is that the new school will be a catalyst in addition to being a creator, he said.

Prof. Michael Desch, applauding the transformational element that will bring together several of the international institutes in affiliation, noted that the proposal does not develop a plan for a transformational governance relationship across the college units, where there are “big equity players” invested in the success of the new school. He expressed interest in a model of transformational governance across the silos of the different colleges.

Prof. Appleby responded that creating a model of governance across college silos is a radical proposal and, as such, one that has not yet received sustained attention. Attention has been given to the role of the new school in establishing networks among the campus units, and in catalyzing, coordinating, and convening among the colleges. Professor Desch reiterated that there are a number of departments in the College of Arts and Letters with large equity stakes in this new

school. Historically, governance has been managed through joint appointments, which have both worked and not worked in individual cases. Prof. Desch noted that the kind of enthusiasm being elicited by ideas such as the climate change program (mentioned above) implies a much deeper and ongoing relationship. Given these kinds of possibilities, he asked how equity partnerships might be created that maintain the positions of the various departments and colleges.

Prof. Appleby declined to enter too deeply into a discussion of structural issues. He noted that there are current structures on campus for leaders to come together; these might function as a forum in which these kinds of governance discussions might be introduced.

Dr. Burish agreed that the governance question is an important one, both within the school and with the school's relationship with faculty in other colleges and schools. Some of the consultants to the new school have said that an advantage of the school could be preventing silos from developing within the school itself, as they have within other schools. Cross disciplinary benefits can disappear when individual units seek to distinguish themselves from others. Developing processes to prevent disciplinary silos is an important goal. The enthusiasm for such an interdisciplinary, team-based approach among many faculty who plan to be active in the school should be a catalyst for maintaining a non-parochial perspective. Dr. Burish noted that Prof. Desch is asking, in part, the good question of whether there is a structural approach that can trump the natural inclination toward silos. He said there does not appear to be an answer at this time, since specific "structural" processes or entities have not yet been put in place; nor would it be appropriate to delay the development of the new school until those structures were identified and agreed upon. If the school is approved in principle, then an approach might be to charge the dean and faculty with the task of figuring out a possible structure before the school's structure is fixed. He reiterated that this is a relevant question; there will not likely be an answer in advance. However, it should be a goal of the overall development of the new school to work toward an answer.

Dean John McGreevy of the College of Arts and Letters concurred that the question and comments on governance are excellent but stated that it is not appropriate to vote on the matter at this time. He suggested that the new school will be a step forward in terms of governance in the simple sense that the international institutes, which have been superb for Notre Dame over the last ten years but have been more or less in their own orbits, will be pulled together into a single body by the creation of the new school. Therefore, vertically, there will be an increase in interaction and governance both formally and informally. More challenging will be the mechanisms for interaction between schools—for example, between the School of Global Affairs and the College of Science. That kind of governance is difficult to legislate in advance. He agreed that it would be worth considering structural mechanisms that might promote successful dialogue between those entities.

As there were no more questions, the question was moved and seconded; a vote was taken and approval was unanimous.

Father Jenkins thanked Prof. Appleby and all who have worked on the proposal thus far.

4. Discussion and vote on two new masters of science degrees from the Mendoza College of Business

Dean Roger Huang presented the visitors, all faculty in the Mendoza College of Business: Profs. Jeffrey Bergstrand, David Hartvigsen, Richard Mendenhall, and Katherine Spiess, who have been invited to attend today's meeting to answer any questions Academic Council members have about two new proposed masters of sciences degrees a Master of Science in Finance and a Master of Science in Business Analytics.

Dean Huang explained the rationale behind the new programs. The definition of a business school is "changing rapidly." While an MBA formerly defined the post-baccalaureate activity of business schools, that is no longer true. Most schools are initiating one-year specialized programs. Mendoza is working to focus on the competitive edge which the college has; for instance, the newly created MSB is now being repeated at peer institutions.

As there were no questions about the proposals, a vote was taken on each proposed masters program. Both were approved unanimously.

Fr. Jenkins thanked the invited guests and all involved in developing these new degree programs.

As there was no new business, the meeting was adjourned.