

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 3:30 p.m.
B001 Jenkins Nanovic Halls, University of Notre Dame

MINUTES

Members present: Scott Appleby, Ann Astell, Kasey Buckles, Tom Burish, Laura Carlson, Patricia Champion, Patricia Clark, Marcus Cole, Martijn Cremers, Shannon Cullinan, Michael Desch, Patrick Flynn, Mary Galvin, Patrick Griffin, Ben Heller, Michael Hildreth, John Jenkins CSC, Lionel Jensen, Christopher Kolda, Parker Ladwig, Khachatur Manukyan, Chris Maziar, Paul McGinn, Connie Mick, Connor Mullen, Sarah Mustillo, Glen Niebur, Hugh Page, Michael Pippenger, Maura Ryan, Maria Salerno, Mark Schurr, Jason Springs, Thomas Stober, Elliott Visconsi, Diane Parr Walker, Molly Walsh

Members excused or absent: James Bathon, Bob Bernhard, Colleen Cross, Thomas Fuja, Anne Garcia-Romero, Dan Groody CSC, Michel Hockx, Erin Hoffmann Harding, Dan Johnson, Michael Lykoudis, Margaret Meserve, Nancy Michael, Clive Neal, Ramachandran Ramanan, Bryan Ritchie, Carter Snead, Joe Urbany, Katherine Wallace, Shawn Wu, Samir Younes

Observers present: Earl Carter, Sara Ermeti, Brian Flaherty, Chuck Hurley, Matt Lahey, Jim Leady, Ryan Willerton

1. **Opening Prayer** – Fr. Jenkins invited Hugh Page to offer the opening prayer.
2. **Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of December 11, 2019** - Fr. Jenkins invited a motion to approve the minutes of August 29, which were sent via email.

Parker Ladwig requested a change to the minutes pertaining to a clarification made during the discussion of the Guidelines and Policies for University Centers and Institutes related to Academic Support Units. The amendment was approved by a unanimous voice vote. The amended minutes were then approved by a unanimous voice vote.

3. **Discuss and vote on the proposed new PhD in Interdisciplinary Materials Science and Engineering degree program** – Fr. Jenkins invited Mark Schurr to introduce the proposal on behalf of the Advanced Studies Committee. Schurr introduced the proposal, and then invited Alan Seabaugh to present the proposal.

Seabaugh introduced Professors Ken Kuno and Derek Lake, who were also at the meeting to support the proposal. Seabaugh presented the rationale for the degree program. The program will not reside in a department or create a new department. It will be administered by a committee appointed by the deans.

When asked why the team chose this approach, and not the creation of a new department, Seabaugh shared that infrastructure is the primary driver. There was previously a department, which has been disbanded. This approach allows the university to utilize existing resources and establish a presence in the discipline without creating a new department.

Chris Maziar asked where the degrees would be attributed, for the purposes of federal reporting. Seabaugh confirmed that the degrees would be attributed to the home departments. An advantage of this structure is that graduates interested in academic careers could pursue options in the home department, or in a materials science department.

At the conclusion of the discussion, Fr. Jenkins invited a motion to approve the proposal. The proposal was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

4. **Discuss and vote on the proposed changes to the Policy for Postdoctoral Fellows Appointments** – Fr. Jenkins invited Mark Schurr to introduce the proposal on behalf of the Advanced Studies Committee. Schurr introduced the proposal, and then invited Demetra Schoenig to present the proposal.

Schoenig provided some historical background on the policy for the Council, and outlined the four substantive points in the proposed changes: the addition of an annual review 90 days before the end of the appointment, the addition of a minimum salary requirement, the addition of a short description of the university's policies on discrimination and sexual harassment and a complaint process, and an update to the separation policy.

A point was raised related to the annual review language. In the prior version it was written in terms that seemed to apply to multi-year appointments, while the new language would apply to all appointments. Schoenig confirmed that the annual review was intended for all appointees, and is appropriate for a 1-year appt. The form of the review is not mandated, but a conversation with a postdoc at the end of the year would be beneficial to that individual.

A friendly amendment was offered, and accepted, to clarify that the minimum salary is prorated for terms that are less than 12 months. In practice, the salary is evaluated on a per pay period basis.

There was a discussion regarding the circumstances and approval process for extensions beyond the maximum allowable limit of 5 or 6 years in paragraph C. The Academic Council agreed in principle that Postdocs should have the opportunity to extend the total duration in extraordinary circumstances, and remanded the paragraph to the Office for Postdoctoral Scholars and the Office of General Counsel to update. The Executive Committee will approve the final language.

A discussion was held regarding the use of the term "Fellow" across all postdocs. It was noted that in many areas this term is associated with competitive awards and recognition. Schoenig and Schurr shared that the policy did use the term "Scholar," but it was changed to "Fellow" in consultation with Advanced Studies in an attempt to make it more discipline inclusive. Members from various disciplines indicated that they felt the term "Scholar" applied in their discipline. A motion was made to change back to "Scholar." The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

Schoenig confirmed that this policy document does not apply to Teaching Scholar appointments, or to the other appointment categories administered by the Office for Postdoctoral Scholars.

A friendly amendment was offered, and accepted, to update the research policies referenced to include the applicable references from ND Research. Schoenig agreed to work with the Office of General Counsel to ensure the appropriate policies are referenced. Any changes in that paragraph will be approved by the Executive Committee.

At the conclusion of the discussion, Fr. Jenkins invited a motion to approve the proposal. The proposal was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

5. **Discuss and vote on the proposed changes to the *Undergraduate Honor Code*** – Fr. Jenkins invited Chris Kolda to introduce the proposal on behalf of the Undergraduate Studies Committee. Kolda introduced the proposal and then invited Hugh Page and Ardea Russo to present the proposal.

Page outlined the rationale for the changes. These changes are the result of a year of operation under the Honor Code in its current structure. Clarification of some terms and processes were recommended, and have been incorporated in the proposal.

After allowing for discussion, Fr. Jenkins invited a motion to approve the proposal. The proposal was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

6. **Adjournment** – With no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:15.