ACADEMIC COUNCIL  
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME  
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 17, 2001


Members Excused:  Rev. John Jenkins, C.S.C., Francis Castellino, Joseph Powers (in London Fall semester), Kenneth DeBoer

Observers Present: Mary Hendriksen, Dennis Moore, Col. Mark Gehri, Tom Laughner

Observers Excused: Harold Pace, Dan Saracino, Julia Dayton

Fr. Malloy called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. Prof. Hatch offered a prayer.

1. Remarks of Fr. Malloy.  Fr. Malloy said that he would devote the first part of the meeting to offering some reflections on the tragic events that occurred on Tuesday, September 11, in New York City, Washington, D.C., and Pennsylvania.

Having listened to many hours of television commentary and having read endless newspaper accounts, there are still few words available to describe the experiences of that day. Just as those who were alive at the beginning of the Second World War remember where they were when news came that Pearl Harbor had been bombed, and members of a certain generation remember where they were when they learned that President Kennedy had been assassinated, surely, September 11 will have the same significance for all alive today.

Fr. Malloy said he learned that a plane had crashed into the World Trade Center after a telephone call from his secretary. Of course, at that time there was much that was unknown and much that was still unfolding. He had a meeting scheduled at 9:30 that morning with some of the people who report to him, and it was decided to expand the meeting to include members of the Officers’ Group and others who might have some special expertise to offer as the University began to chart its course of action.
The group made the decision to cancel classes at the University and to declare September 11 a Day of Prayer. It was also decided to make the main University event of the day a Mass, to be held on the South Quad. Much hard work and committed spirit went into that event. For him and all those who attended the Mass, Fr. Malloy said it will stand as one of the moments in Notre Dame’s history that will always be remembered – not simply because so many gathered on the Quad, but because of the spirit of those present and the cross-section of the community they represented.

Expecting a fairly large loss of life of parents of students, as well as of recent graduates, Fr. Malloy and the Officers’ Group immediately put into place support systems to help students and others in the University community who might face a personal loss. While nearly everyone was affected by the tragedy in some way, in the mysteries of Divine Providence, there were relatively few students or faculty who experienced losses in their immediate families.

In the days following September 11, Fr. Malloy said he knew that many faculty incorporated in some way or another their reflections about the tragedy and attempted to respond to the needs of individual students. He and his Sunday evening seminar students spent the first half of class talking about the terrorist attacks and their aftermath. Most students said that other classes provided a similar opportunity. There were larger scale academic responses and reflections. Fr. Malloy indicated that he heard very fine reports both about their turnout and the nature of their conversations.

From the beginning, Fr. Malloy said he and the University’s officers were concerned that some students on campus might be categorized because of their appearance, background, or names. One of his students, who is of Indian birth, mentioned in class that friends at other schools had been subjected to some unfortunate experiences the week following the attacks. Fr. Malloy indicated that he did not know of any incidents of that nature at Notre Dame. Members of the administration had regular meetings with representatives of the Muslim student group. Although that group’s members shared high levels of anxiety, their reports had been positive.

Fr. Malloy said that speakers tried once again to affirm the common identity and the common sense of responsibility of all people during the Sunday evening’s prayer vigil and march from the Grotto to the reflecting pool following the Tuesday attacks. Indeed, anyone who had seen photographs of those who died in the Twin Towers, or who had heard reports of their backgrounds, knew that there were people of every continent, stage of life, and socio-economic position.

Fr. Malloy recounted that in the days immediately following September 11, another set of decisions needed to be made about athletic and extracurricular events. He was in regular communication with the University’s athletic director, Kevin White, who was in contact with his peers nationwide. Officials of the Big East Conference decided to cancel all sporting events through Sunday, September 16. This decision affected several events for Notre Dame teams.
The other looming decision had to do with the Saturday, September 15, Notre Dame-Purdue football game. The game was scheduled to be played at Purdue, which complicated the decision. While air travel was not an issue because this was a game to which players would travel by bus, Notre Dame expressed its desire to postpone the game, even though at that time the Big Ten Conference had decided to proceed with scheduled games. However, Purdue officials agreed and the game was rescheduled for December 1.

Through the University’s Counseling Center and Campus Ministry, the administration provided various kinds of support services for those who might be grieving or anxious. The reports Fr. Malloy received were that while there were not large numbers of students experiencing distress because of deaths in their immediate families, there had been many conversations about the events of September 11. Fr. Malloy said that the terrorist attacks and the political situation in general will produce different levels of anxiety in students. Just the Sunday before the tragedy, his seminar class had read and discussed Nevil Shute’s novel, *On the Beach*, which was written in the 1950s. The novel’s basic theme is the misreading of evidence in a highly armed world, the resulting nuclear war and that war’s aftermath. One of the students in Fr. Malloy’s class who had been a bit reluctant to join the discussion relayed that one of his fears on September 11 was that the events of the novel would be replicated in real life.

While loss of life in the immediate University community was less than initially feared, many connected to Notre Dame have been profoundly affected. Philip Purcell, a University trustee, heads the firm, Morgan Stanley Dean Witter & Co., in which a number of employees were killed. Patrick Ryan, the husband of Shirley Ryan who is on the Board of Trustees and the father of a current Notre Dame student, heads a firm, AON, that employed the largest number of people in the World Trade Center buildings. Many of that firm’s employees were also killed. This is another aspect of events that affects the University community.

Fr. Malloy reported that the terrorist attacks had affected operations at Notre Dame as well. As the University prepared for the home football game against Michigan State on September 22, the administration sought out the very best advice for security preparations aware that travel to and from the campus for academic and sporting events would most likely be affected.

Some at the University were acquainted with a few of those involved in making decisions for the country. Condoleezza Rice, the President’s National Security Adviser, is a Notre Dame graduate. Fr. Malloy said he knows many join him in hoping and praying that those entrusted with grave responsibilities discern the right course of action for the country.

In conclusion, Fr. Malloy thanked the many people who worked together during the past very difficult week. It had been extremely troubling to witness the enormous amount of human pain and suffering caused by the terrorist attacks. Fr. Malloy
acknowledged an e-mail he received from Prof. Bigi urging the administration do all it can to ensure that every member of the University community was treated well. He assured members of the Academic Council that he will continue to do all he can to create an inclusive environment on campus.

Fr. Malloy asked Fr. Mark Poorman, Vice President for Student Affairs, to comment on the student dimension of the tragedy. Fr. Poorman said the goal of his office was to make sure that as news came through on September 11 and the days following, the safety net in place for students, as a matter of course, was strengthened. The University is very fortunate in that its undergraduates, and even its graduate students, were able to turn to many people on campus for support and guidance. In particular, the rectors and assistant rectors were invaluable the week following the tragedy. Staff members of the Counseling Center were available extra hours, including late-night hours, for students. Campus Ministry also played a key role, not only by providing additional support in its offices in the Coleman-Morse Center, but by helping to plan the Mass of September 11 and the candlelight vigil of September 16.

Prof. Brogan shared with the Council one very interesting response she had was from a former student, a senior, who said to her that the tragic events of September 11 had made her change her mind about being at Notre Dame. The student told Prof. Brogan that she had “always hated” it here, saying “I don’t know why I came, and do not know why I stayed.” Yet, the student said the response of the University to the tragedy and the conversations she has had on campus after it made her realize that she “would not want to be a student anywhere else now.”

Prof. Brogan said her students happened to be reading Flannery O’Connor’s *A Good Man is Hard to Find* during the week the terrorist attacks occurred. The thesis of the book is that horrendous and unexplainable violence can sometimes lead to a moment of grace. Before September 11, she had asked the students to write a one-page paper examining their own lives to find a moment that would confirm that thesis. By the time of Thursday’s class, a few days after the attacks, the students were able to hold a serious, thoughtful discussion on what possible good could come from the tragedy. The class also discussed the possibilities of prejudiced reactions to those from the Middle East or of Middle Eastern ancestry and the concern that the terrorist attacks could produce a backlash of violence in the United States, in addition to possible feelings of vulnerability by other minority groups as well.

Prof. Brogan asked two questions: First, while the University has a good support system in place for students seeking counseling or help in dealing with anxieties, what services are provided for faculty? Second, during the Gulf War the University trained faculty in the process of helping students determine whether they might seek conscientious objector status. Has there been any thought to beginning that training again?

Prof. Hatch answered the first question and said while the Counseling Center is
primarily for students, faculty seeking help should do so by following procedures in the health plan to which they subscribe.

Fr. Malloy answered Prof. Brogan’s second question by stating that there are many different ways the situation with the military may affect Notre Dame students. Obviously, while the ROTC students would be most immediately affected by a call for military action, the University has always tried to provide support to all of its students.

Prof. Preacher asked if there is a University policy to handle students who are reservists called to active duty. Prof. Hatch said he would look into the matter.

Prof. Bigi clarified the content of his e-mail message to Fr. Malloy. In the message, he asked for a call for continuing tolerance and acceptance of people of different backgrounds and said he was quite impressed by some of the words spoken during the Mass on the Quad on September 11, particularly the statement that the voice of Notre Dame should be a voice for society at large.

Fr. Malloy said he observed that across the nation many of the religious services held the week following September 11 were very deliberately interfaith in nature. Likewise, at Notre Dame, tolerance and acceptance continues to be a theme of activities. At a Mass Fr. Malloy celebrated on the evening of September 16 in Lewis Hall, some of the students passed out small pieces of white cloth with a prose message attached. The message urged not only acceptance, understanding, and tolerance but stated that the differences among people should be savored. That kind of initiative is only one that has flowed out of students grappling with the events of September 11.

Col. Gehri said that he has been impressed by the actions of Notre Dame’s Air Force Cadets in the wake of the tragedy. The contracts they signed only a short time ago now mean something very different. He had expected that some students, perhaps drawn to the ROTC program primarily because of the tuition benefits it provides, would find their way to his office and attempt to extricate themselves from the program. That has not occurred; in fact, students have approached him to say that they are happy to belong to the ROTC.

Col. Gehri continued that Fr. Dendinger (Major General, Retired), Chief of Air Force Chaplains, spoke to the Notre Dame cadets on September 15 to help them sort through some of the tough questions they now face. The University is doing much in that effort as well. No matter what various members of the University community may think about the presence of the ROTC on campus, Col. Gehri said, he feels it is important to remind everyone that there is no group more aware of the decisions that must be made or who relishes the possibility of the use of force less than those who might be asked to wield that force.

Ms. Schmid asked if the University administration had given any thought to the future of its programs abroad or whether students now studying throughout the world
would be called home. Several students have expressed to her their concerns on this matter.

Prof. Hatch replied that he has asked each program in International Studies to have plans in place for sending students home if the political situation becomes more serious. At this point, however, he does not feel that any Notre Dame students are in danger and there are no plans to call them back to campus. Of course, no Notre Dame students are now in Israel, but that is due to events there in prior years.

Prof. Brogan asked Fr. Malloy whether he might discuss the events of September 11 or the political situation in general with President Bush or his advisors as they consider the consequences of United States military action. Might there be an opportunity for his voice?

Fr. Malloy replied that he had spoken to Condoleezza Rice on Friday, September 4, who returned a telephone call to him placed before the terrorist attacks, but did not discuss any specifics of the events of September 11 or the present political situation. He did express to her that many in the University community were concerned for her safety and were offering prayers for her in connection with the role she plays in the nation’s future. Only time will tell whether, as they plan the nation’s course of action, Ms. Rice or others in the President’s administration will seek his counsel or that of various members of the University community.

Fr. Malloy then began discussion of the strategic planning process that will be used at the University in preparation for the next institutional accreditation process and the next development campaign. First, the steering committee, for which Fr. Malloy serves as chair, has been selected. Members include three members of the faculty elected from the Provost’s Advisory Committee: Profs. Robert Bretz, Alex Hahn, and Jay Tidmarsh. In addition, he has appointed four faculty members – Profs. Scott Appleby, Joan Brennecke, Fran Hagopian, and Naomi Meara, and six administrators – Prof. Nathan Hatch, Fr. Tim Scully, Fr. Mark Poorman, Prof. John Affleck-Graves and Mr. Scott Malpass.

The purpose of the Steering Committee is to frame the planning process, provide the context for planning, and identify and charge the various planning units. Committee members will seek input from a variety of sources, including the Provost’s Advisory Committee, the Academic Council, and the Faculty Senate. It will try to complete the initial phase of its work by the end of this semester. The most comprehensive and significant planning activities will occur this next spring and fall at the level of the various colleges and schools.

For its task of framing the planning process, the Steering Committee has established three subcommittees: Finance and Fund Raising (chaired by Scott Malpass), Research Challenges and Opportunities (chaired by Prof. Jeff Kantor), and the Future of Higher Education (chaired by Dean Carolyn Woo). These three
committees will assist the Steering Committee by helping to establish the content within which University planning will take place. They will issue preliminary reports by the end of November. Final reports are scheduled to be disseminated by mid-March 2002.

Separate from these three committees is a committee formed to undertake a substantive review of the University’s curriculum. The type of careful review with which it is charged takes such a long period of time that the Steering Committee has given the process a head start by constituting it early in the entire strategic planning process. Eventually, the Curriculum Committee, chaired by Fr. John Jenkins, will report back to the Academic Council.

Fr. Malloy explained that once the planning units have completed their work the Steering Committee will prioritize and narrow their recommendations in one final report. His goal is to have the final report ready for presentation to the Board of Trustees by May 2003.

Fr. Malloy reiterated that the strategic planning process will call for a wide cross-section of contribution and that much of the intense labor about particular details will take place at the college level. It will be the responsibility of the deans to oversee that process and to frame it by academic unit. Of course, there will be other entities, academic and non-academic, that will participate in the strategic planning process as it unfolds.

Prof. Antsaklis asked how the planning process just described compares to that used ten years ago.

Prof. Hatch said that the major difference is that this plan focuses on the colleges and other strategic units. The last plan had one large committee for academic matters, which then went to the colleges. This plan will be more finely grained at the college level.

Fr. Malloy explained that previously he appointed all the members of the committee and it was divided generally by officer area. The units, intended to represent a cross-section of the University, reported back to an executive committee which issued the final report. The important difference between the processes is that now the Steering Committee and its subcommittees have a role in naming the strategic units for planning and in setting the parameters in which they will work. Thus, connections can be drawn immediately between needs of various units and the cost and complexity of fulfilling those needs.

A good example of why those connections should be made is the goal set during the last strategic planning process to hire 150 new faculty members. When that goal was made, no dollar figures were connected to the new faculty except the cost of their salaries. Benefits, office space, capitalization costs, library costs – none of these additional costs were considered. Thus, the process was better at identifying focused
needs throughout the University than at drawing connections between fulfilling the needs and the full array of their cost. With the new strategic planning process, the connections should surface from the very beginning.

Concerning the University’s budget and new capital campaign, Fr. Malloy said that there is much sobering news in the economic outlook. Even before the tragedy in New York, the economy was not strong. There is a whole new layer of concerns now. How many people have been laid off who are trying to pay a Notre Dame tuition? How many people in the airline and hotel industries will be entering difficult times financially? These are all questions the Steering Committee must consider as it looks at the goals the University’s various units set.

Fr. Malloy concluded his presentation by stating that he believes the strategic planning process will serve the University well. It will take intensive activity, but it should be a good process with a good result.

2. Remarks of Prof. Hatch. The Academic Articles require a formal review of the Provost every five years. Prof. Hatch thanked the members of the committee that completed his review last spring: Profs. Naomi Meara (chair), Ikaros Bigi, Ed Conlon, Teresa Ghilarducci, and Joe Powers. Prof. Hatch said that while it is always bracing to have one’s own performance put under the microscope, he thinks the review was carried out in very good will. The committee’s report was substantive, frank, and constructive, and he appreciates the forthright suggestions for improvement it contained. As a result of the review, he has identified three areas on which to focus:

   (1) Enhancing the service and efficiency of the Provost’s Office. The University has grown tremendously in its scale of complexity. It is a complexity that, at times, outstrips the kinds of systems in place. In the coming months, Prof. Hatch’s office will examine its financial system, and other systems as well, to see what improvements should be made. The new associate provost, John Affleck-Graves, will head up this effort, and he will most likely hire a new professional to assist in the task.

   (2) Communicating with the faculty more effectively and in a timely fashion. As one way of meeting this goal, he is considering publishing a newsletter out of the Provost’s Office that would inform faculty of new directions, policies, and events across the University that often seem to come late to their attention.

   (3). Efforts to fulfill this goal can be incorporated into the strategic planning process now in progress. In addition, this fall, Prof. Hatch is holding a series of nine or ten dinners with endowed chairs at the University to brainstorm about Notre Dame’s future.

Apart from activities undertaken in response to the review, Prof. Hatch said that some of his main priorities this year are:
(1) **Completion of two senior searches:** The University must appoint a new dean of the College of Science and a new chair of the School of Architecture. The search for the dean is well underway; he hopes to have that appointment made by Thanksgiving. The search for the chair of the School of Architecture will begin shortly.

(2) **The issue of faculty governance:** Given the recommendation of last year’s Faculty Senate to dissolve itself, the Provost’s Office, working with the Academic Council, will make the issue of faculty governance a priority this year. The Executive Committee of the Academic Council has remanded the issue of faculty governance to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

(3) **The budget:** Even before the events of September 11, Prof. Hatch said the coming academic year would have been a year of limited budget growth. There has been tremendous growth in the budget over the past five years. In the past three years, there has been more new academic money than ever before. In 2000-01, for example, there was $11 million of new add-ons to the budget at the same time that Notre Dame’s tuition increase was the lowest it has been in a decade. The Board of Trustees wants the administration to keep tuition increases less than 5%.

Over the last six years, Prof. Hatch continued, the academic and general budget has increased from $200 million to $300 million. A third of that increase had to do with new kinds of sources, such as endowments (not based on tuition). The University has now taken nearly all of this sort of financial income into the budget. With forecasts for markets in the future less than strong and a plan to hold tuition increases to less than 5%, there will be a much more limited context for growth at the University.

Dean Woo commented that, in response to Prof. Hatch’s remarks on enhanced service and efficiency in the Provost’s Office, she wants to point out many of the issues that concern faculty in this regard are University-wide. The systems in the Office of the Provost merely flow into larger systems. Thus, all the systems at the University – not just those in Prof. Hatch’s office – need examination and streamlining. Furthermore, beyond changes to systems, a change of attitude on the part of both faculty and administrators would go a long way to allay concerns here. Faculty members are frustrated at times by what they perceive to be layers and layers of rules and procedures – some of which they can remember, some of which they never knew, and some of which seem to be in place only to make life difficult. Administrators may at times feel as if the faculty is trying to circumvent the rules they have put in place to avoid chaos. Faculty developing a greater appreciation of why certain procedures must be followed, and administrators showing more clearly that the goal of their work is to support the faculty so they can succeed in their work, would do much to resolve this issue.

Prof. Hatch thanked Dean Woo for her comments and agreed that the University’s computer systems do need a great deal of work. There are several computing systems at the University in addition to the academic computing system; e.g., Human Resources, the financial system, the Development system, and the whole
student system. Most likely, all will need to be rebuilt in the next five years. That will be a major cost, but the University is large enough and complex enough that it must have strong underlying platforms.

3. Clarification of the Implementation of the New Dean’s Honor List Requirements.

Prof. Bigi reported that he had received several calls and e-mails from students objecting to the application to sophomores, juniors, and seniors of the new Dean’s Honor List requirements passed at the Academic Council meeting of February 16, 2001. [A resolution was passed at that meeting to amend Section 21.1 of the Academic Code to restrict Dean’s Honor List awards to students who carry at least 12 graded credit hours and have a grade point average (GPA) set so that the list includes approximately 30% of the students in the college or school. The requirement before the amendment was a minimum of 12 graded credit hours and at least a 3.400 grade point average.] The students who contacted him had received a letter from the Registrar’s Office informing them of the change. Prof. Bigi asked what he should tell the students. Is there an appeal process they could begin?

Prof. Garg said that he, too, has begun to receive complaints from students. He believed that the amendment to the Dean’s Honor List provisions was meant to apply only to students entering the University in 2001 and subsequent years. The most complaints have been from seniors who suddenly find that they must reach a 3.7 GPA in the College of Science and a 3.77 in the College of Arts and Letters before earning a place on the Dean’s List. Part of the problem is the way the students were informed. It is a question of communication and conversation.

Dean Roche said that the Council made two changes in the honors system last year. The first involved Latin honors. Dean Roche clearly recalls that decision was to go into effect for students entering the University in 2001. Although he does not recall the exact date the amendment to the Dean’s List requirements was to be applied, the question can be resolved by checking the minutes of the meeting. If the minutes do say that the amendment affects only First Year students, the Council should ask Dr. Pace to retract the changes. If the minutes say otherwise, then the students should be sent a copy of the minutes to demonstrate that there was a reflective process in which many issues were raised, students had an opportunity to address certain concerns, and votes were taken.

Dean Kolman said that she was always under the impression that the University would implement the new Dean’s List requirements on a rolling basis, beginning with the students who entered the University in 2001. She was surprised when Dr. Pace said the amended requirements would apply to all students, but he checked the minutes and they do not say one way or another when the change is to be implemented. It would be much easier if the amendment does apply only to First Year students. The newsletter her office released in August explained that the Dean’s Honor List will include the top 30% of First Year students, which should be somewhere between a 3.5 and 3.6 GPA. Dean Kolman said she never recalls the vote being “and we’ll put this into effect in the
fall for every single student."

Prof. Hatch said he shared Dean Kolman’s assumption that the amendment was to apply in this academic year only to First Year students.

Prof. Preacher commented that she, too, was under that impression and if it is otherwise, then she has misinformed students.

Prof. Garg said that the resolution as passed did not specify when it was to go into effect. What is distressing to students is that the change came as a total surprise.

Fr. Malloy indicated that he will consult during the committee meetings and make a recommendation before the end of the meeting. The matter may need to be remanded to the Executive Committee.

Prof. Blanchette asked whether a brief poll should be taken to see how many members here today who were also present at the meeting of February 16 recall clearly that the amendment was meant to be applied this year only to First Year students. If that is the sense of members, then perhaps the thing to do is to apply it only to First Year students.

Fr. Malloy said he will review the minutes while the committees meet.

Ms. Rauch, who works in the Registrar’s Office, reported that Dr. Pace told her that the reason it was decided to make the new requirements apply across the board is that students from all years have classes together, and it does not make sense to have a different bar for students according to their class year.

Dean Roche said that as Fr. Malloy researches the matter, the minutes will certainly be one source to consult. When motions are introduced, the committee often distributes to members a one-page print-out along with its presentation. That document may state the committee’s intentions about how the requirements were to be implemented.

4. Committee Structure of the Academic Council. Dean Roche said while the Academic Council’s Undergraduate Studies Committee tends to be busy each year, and the Faculty Affairs Committee has already received a few requests for consideration of particular issues – including the very complex question of the Faculty Senate and its role in University governance – the third committee, the Graduate Studies Committee, has a somewhat unusual status. The Council made the decision a few years ago to no longer send items that were approved by the Graduate Council to the Graduate Studies Committee. Thus, at last year’s final Academic Council meeting Prof. Garg, the committee’s chair, explained that the Graduate Studies Committee functions primarily as an advisory committee for the Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research.
Dean Roche said he thinks it may be the appropriate time to think about the role of the Graduate Studies Committee in relation to the Council as a whole. He does not know whether the current committee structure exists because of provisions in the Academic Articles or through convention. If the committee does not have a full agenda this year, he would recommend an examination by the committee itself of its role and the consideration of its replacement by a different committee. It may be a good idea to take a look at other universities to see how their councils subdivide into committees. A change may involve deciding that the Council’s third committee should deal with issues now considered part of the Undergraduate Affairs Committee, or it may be decided to have it consider issues of residential life, transform itself into a rules committee, or take on some other form altogether. Thus, he would ask that the Graduate Studies Committee help the Council think through the relationships between the three committees and the relationship between each committee and the Council itself.

Fr. Malloy said that the committee structure of the Council is designed to energize it by subdividing responsibility and providing a vehicle to bring matters forward. The Council could have five committees if it so chose. He knows that Prof. Kantor has a proposal regarding the relationship among the Council’s three committees. It may be that discussion of his proposal will lead to a decision either to enhance the role of the Graduate Studies Committee or to reconfigure the committee structure altogether.

Prof. Garg said it is true that the committee’s agenda may not have been as full as that of the Undergraduate Studies Committee. There were, however, many issues that were considered and discussed – for example, the application of the Latin honors and dean’s list requirements to the Law School and the Business School. In addition, and very importantly, in the dialogue committee members began last year with graduate students, they learned there are many issues the officers of the Graduate Student Union want the committee to address. Members have begun examining some of these issues, with much work occurring over the summer. While it is true that the committee’s role has changed since the decision not to have it review every resolution of the Graduate Council, the general idea is that the Academic Council will give to the committee any issue involving graduate students it wants examined.

5. **Election of an Additional Member of the Executive Committee.** Prof. Hatch explained that Prof. Ghilarducci, elected to the Executive Committee at the last meeting, felt she could not serve on the committee this year due to family issues. Thus, the Council must elect another member to take her place. A vote was taken and Prof. Gernes was elected to the Executive Committee.

6. **Minutes of the Academic Council Meeting of April 23, 2001.** The minutes of the Academic Council meeting of April 23, 2001, were approved without amendment.

7. **Announcement by Dean Kolman of Richard Light’s Visit to the University.** Dean Kolman announced that Richard Light, a professor at Harvard in both the School of
Education and the School of Government and the author of a book released last spring, *Making the Most of College: Students Speak Their Minds*, will be on campus October 29 and 30 to give a major address and to meet with smaller groups of faculty and students. Prof. Light has spent the last ten years talking to students to find out what makes the difference between a good undergraduate experience and one that is not as fulfilling. At orientation this year, each of the First Year students received a reprint of a review of the book that highlighted the author’s ten main points. In connection with its sponsorship of Prof. Light’s visit, the Provost’s Office is making his book available to faculty. Dean Kolman offered copies of the book and review to all members of the Academic Council. She said the book contains many good, simple strategies for making teaching more effective and students’ experiences more rewarding. She also said that each of the colleges has been represented on the steering committee that is working to get discussions going among faculty to implement Prof. Light’s ideas on campus.

8. Status of the Faculty Senate. Prof. Brogan reported that despite the confusion produced by a vote last year to dissolve the Faculty Senate in a very complicated discussion and vote, the newly elected senators voted by a majority to maintain the Senate. This summer, faculty formed an *ad hoc* committee to discuss organizational reform in the Senate. Members met with Fr. Malloy, Prof. Hatch, deans, and other faculty, and a great deal of energy was generated with commitment from both sides. The *ad hoc* committee will meet on September 18 and present its recommendations to the Academic Council’s Executive Committee.

9. Committee Reports. Members of the Academic Council divided into the three standing committees of the Council to determine their agendas for the year. When the groups returned to give their reports, Fr. Malloy announced that he would remand the issue of the timing of implementation of the new Dean’s Honors List requirements to the Executive Committee, which will discuss the matter with Dr. Pace. Executive Committee members will decide whether they want to decide the issue themselves or bring it back to the full Council.

(a) Graduate Studies: Prof. Garg said the committee would take up some issues of organization, but members feel that the committee has an important role to play in issues before the Council. The Law School and other professional schools are represented on the Graduate Studies Committee. Also, it serves as a voice for graduate students. If the committee is disbanded, members feel that it would send the wrong signal to graduate students. The committee will study a proposal by Prof. Kantor to examine how the committee can work with the Graduate Council.

(b) Faculty Affairs: Prof. Delaney reported that the committee had agreed on seven agenda items, including the status of the Faculty Senate.

(c) Undergraduate Studies: Dean Roche stated that the committee has established three subcommittees. The issues they will take up include scheduling, the
Honor Code, whether to establish a mechanism to require students enrolled at the University for five to six years to graduate, increased opportunities for experiential learning, academic advising, equity in tutoring practices (some colleges have more extensive tutoring programs than others), and study abroad.

There being no further business, Fr. Malloy adjourned the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John Affleck-Graves
Secretary