

**ACADEMIC COUNCIL
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 16, 2001**

Members Present: Rev. Edward Malloy, C.S.C., Nathan Hatch, Rev. Timothy Scully, C.S.C., Rev. John Jenkins, C.S.C., Jeffrey Kantor, Carol Mooney, Rev. Mark Poorman, C.S.C., Frank Incropera, Eilleen Kolman, Mark Roche, Carolyn Woo, Jennifer Younger, Jean Porter, Susan Roberts, Thomas Blantz, Rev. Patrick Gaffney, C.S.C., Naomi Meara, Sonia Gernes, Lionel Jensen, Joan Aldous, Hilary Radner, Teresa Ghilarducci, Umesh Garg, Joseph Powers, Panos Antsaklis, Rick Mendenhall, Jay Tidmarsh, Alan Krieger, Kenneth DeBoer, Ava Preacher, Andrew Olejnik, Patrick Shea, Sarah Bassler

Members Absent: Edward Conlon

Members Excused: James Merz, Francis Castellino, Patricia O'Hara, W. Robert Scheidt, Ikaros Bigi, Dino Marcantonio

Observers Present: Mary Hendriksen, Dennis Brown (for Dennis Moore), Capt. Patrick Casey, Harold Pace

Observers Absent: Dan Saracino, Barbara Walvoord, Omar Munoz

Invited Guests: Margaret Doody, Julia Douthwaite, Robert Norton, James Powell and Barbara Turpin

Fr. Malloy called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. Fr. Jenkins offered a prayer.

1. Minutes approved. The minutes of the Academic Council meeting of November 27, 2001, were approved without amendment.

2. Introduction of New Members. Fr. Malloy introduced Profs. Lionel Jensen and Hilary Radner. They are taking the places of Profs. Nordstrom and Blanchette, who are both on leave this spring.

3. Proposal from the Graduate Council for a New Ph.D. in Literature Program. Prof. Hatch introduced the guests invited to be present for discussion of a proposal (Attachment 1) to establish a new Ph.D. program in literature: Profs. Margaret Doody, Robert Norton and Julia Douthwaite, and Graduate School Associate Deans Barbara Turpin and James Powell. Prof. Jensen was also identified as a member of the committee that had prepared the proposal.

Prof. Hatch prefaced the discussion by explaining that the decision to approve a new academic program should be kept separate from any decision as to the exact

budget necessary to actually launch the program. In approving a program, no approval of the program's administrative budget is implied nor of the number of faculty lines the program might require. The issue before the Council today is solely the academic integrity and viability of a Ph.D. in Literature program.

Prof. Doody began her presentation by stating that Notre Dame is a place associated with excellence in the humanities. The College of Arts & Letters has a great reputation for undergraduate teaching. It has ambitions – comparing itself with institutions such as Vanderbilt and Princeton. Every one of the universities with which it likes to be compared, however, has graduate level study in modern languages (French, Italian, Spanish, etc.) and classical literatures (both Latin and Greek). Notre Dame's graduate programs are saliently lacking in such areas. Looking at the University from the outside is like looking at a great castle with one wall down – ragged stones and space where something ought to be.

Prof. Doody said the committee on which she has served proposes to mend this gap by the creation of a Ph.D. in Literature program. Creation of the program is made all the more important by Notre Dame's position as a major Catholic university. A major Catholic university without a multicultural study of literature and modern and ancient languages is truly anomalous. After all, until recently, Latin was the language of the liturgy. And from the Middle Ages on, throughout all of Europe, the study of the classics has been intimately bound up with the life of Catholic intellectual institutions of great repute. Moreover, Notre Dame was founded by a French order. Today, it exists in a world and a hemisphere where knowledge of the Spanish language and of Spanish culture, both Iberian and Latin American, will be essential in all Americans' cultural and business lives in the 21st century.

In light of Notre Dame's origins and character, Prof. Doody continued, it seems odder and odder that the University does *not* offer programs at the doctoral level in Spanish, Italian, French, German, and Irish studies. Having acted recently as an external reviewer for the English Department, she believes the absence of such doctoral programs affects Notre Dame's reputation adversely in the outside world. Yet, Prof. Doody said, when one looks at Notre Dame closely, as she has had the opportunity to do since she began to consider joining the faculty, one can see the makings of what could be a highly-regarded and original program of study in languages and literature. In addition to the distinguished faculty already present at the University, institutes and centers have been established over the past years that would seem to invite, as well as support, graduate-level work in these areas. It is not as if the University would be starting from scratch. With the Kellogg Institute for International Studies, the Medieval Institute, the Devers Program in Dante Studies, the Nanovic Institute for European Studies, the Keough Institute for Irish Studies, and the Institute for Latino Studies, much is already in place. In terms of library collections, there are literary specializations already recognized – for example, the Zahm Dante Collection, Neo-Latin texts in the Medieval Institute, and collections of Latin American materials, as well as recent efforts by Dean Roche, Profs. Vittorio Hosle, and Robert Norton to build up collections of distinction in German literature. A National Endowment for the Humanities grant has supported Irish Studies by allowing the Library to acquire northern

vernacular literature—making Irish Studies one of the fastest-growing and most interesting areas of the humanities at Notre Dame. Also, in relation to Irish Studies, Eamonn O’Ciardha, a Cambridge-trained Irish scholar, has come this year to help develop the Library’s acquisition of Irish language materials.

Prof. Doody said all these institutes, centers, and materials exist, but as a set of islands. The committee’s proposal would connect the islands by an elegant and relatively inexpensive bridge, thereby solving a number of problems at once instead of spending money on bits of problems at different times. The connecting bridge – the proposed Ph.D. in Literature program – would strengthen existing entities and programs as well. One way it will do this is by adding more graduate students to the University, which leads to a livelier intellectual life overall on campus. Graduate students are not mere inert bodies. They are a university faculty’s youngest colleagues and their very presence makes a great contribution to the formation of a thinking group of scholars. With the presence of graduate students, not only will Notre Dame continue to attract great faculties, it will also be able to retain them – which is more difficult, particularly when one is trying to retain the best and the brightest of young faculty. When graduate studies are offered, faculty can teach at their maximum capacity.

The committee also expects that the Ph.D. in Literature program would improve placement in Notre Dame’s English department. At the moment, Prof. Doody said, Notre Dame’s placement in English is suffering from a glass ceiling. She attributes this largely to the fact that current doctoral students are isolated. They are not part of a total nurturing, intellectual environment – the kind that exists at other schools where English graduate students have peers in Spanish, German, or Latin, and where there are seminars to share and broaden knowledge. Placement in English would improve once a lively Ph.D. in Literature program existed.

Undergraduates would also benefit from the creation of the program. Prof. Doody believes there is a tendency, perhaps unconscious, with undergraduate teaching to assume that the professor’s job is to supply answers. With graduate teaching, the emphasis is more on open-ended questions, and this should play back into a livelier approach by the faculty with undergraduates. Undergraduates will also benefit from the lectures, guest speakers, and other events associated with a high-level graduate program.

Another benefit of the program is that in attracting high-level scholars to the University, the dynamism of the University Press will be bolstered and its choice of subjects increased. The effect of the proposed program on the development of the press demonstrates the interrelatedness of all these factors, for, as the Press grows and develops, placement of graduate students and the attractiveness of the University to new faculty are enhanced.

Prof. Doody said the desirability of the program is made even more clear by the changing demographics of the United States. Spanish is and will continue to be a major multimarket language. Furthermore, when one looks at job advertisements at institutions across the country, cross-disciplinary expertise is increasingly demanded.

More than ever before, the emphasis in academic programs is on interdisciplinary, intercultural, multilinguistic, and multicultural work.

Prof. Doody summarized her position by stating the proposed Ph.D. in Literature program fits well with the profile of Notre Dame, offers more scope for the faculty already on board, and will supply the University with new possibilities for the future. Looking at the combined powers of Notre Dame's faculty spread throughout various departments, it is possible to see that excellent teams exist in all sorts of subjects, including all the language areas. The program would not be limited by small department size, but only by the faculty who exist, as a whole, in the College of Arts and Letters. The expertise of the faculty in Theology, Philosophy, and languages is very great – for the latter, much greater than would be indicated by the size of individual departments.

Prof Doody said she believes the time is right to create the program. Library materials and faculty are already in place. In particular, some faculty new to the University are enthusiastic, interested, and capable of taking on the task of establishing the program. It is not always true that an institution can put off decisions and expect the same set of circumstances to present themselves again. This is the ideal time to make the change—a change that will enhance the direction the University already seems to be taking as well as connecting many exciting but different points of interest.

Dean Roche said he supports the proposal for several reasons. First, while it may seem that creating a new Ph.D. program in Literature is counter to the idea of focusing on centers of excellence and investing in areas already strong at Notre Dame, the proposed Ph.D. program *would* bolster existing strengths. As a discipline, the humanities at Notre Dame score highest in national rankings; yet, the one serious gap that exists in the humanities is in the area of foreign language and literature programs. The committee's proposal links those programs with the English department, as well as with Philosophy and Theology. It represents an effort to take the humanities' weakest area and build bridges to the strongest programs, thus advancing the humanities overall. Previously, the language and literature programs were clearly service units that were a step below the other departments in Arts and Letters; however, there have been recent hires at the senior level and four new chairpersons – all from outside the University – are now leading the four departments (German and Russian Languages and Literatures, Romance Languages and Literatures, Classics, and East Asian Languages and Literatures). In addition, the University has hired a language director who would be important in the training of graduate students in the program and has invested in some new faculty lines. Thus, as Prof. Doody has indicated, the College is already moving to a point where existing programs are ripe to flourish at the next level.

Second, Dean Roche stated that Notre Dame rightly emphasizes its internationalism, which is partly represented by the large number of students studying abroad. Yet, an institution cannot be considered an outstanding international university without strong programs in languages and literatures. The proposal addresses the effort to bolster the University's international character.

Third, Dean Roche pointed out that because of the intimate connection between literature and religion, it is very important for a Catholic university to have strong programs in literature and the arts. From the early Christian era to the early modern period, all art was created in the service of God. The sacramental vision of Catholicism, with its elevation of the idea that the transcendent becomes manifest in the finite, and the Catholic view of human creation as an effort to bring, in a certain sense, the absolute into the visible world, are very closely linked to literature and the arts. Thus, in relation to Notre Dame's Catholic character, there is a strong reason to approve the proposal.

Fourth, the field of literary studies is changing in dramatic ways. At colleges and universities across the nation, there is less and less emphasis on great literary works and increasing emphasis on literature's broader context. Dean Roche said if an undergraduate majoring in German asked him today where he or she might apply for graduate study in German with a focus on literature, it would be difficult to recommend a particular department. With a focus on literature, Notre Dame can develop a distinct identity.

Finally, there are pragmatic reasons to approve *one* literature program. The number of language and literature faculty in individual units at the University might not be sufficient to develop a full-fledged Ph.D. program in each of the individual departments. Moreover, because of concerns over placement, even the best programs in the country (e.g., the Cornell German Department) are admitting only two or three students a year. If he were a graduating senior, Dean Roche said, he would much prefer to enter a program where he would have the opportunity to take courses with Seamus Deane, Margaret Doody, and Vittorio Hosle rather than only with professors in the German department. Not only is this pragmatic, it works very nicely with the idea that literature is universal. While literature has always been universal, the study of literature has become increasingly international. Thus, Dean Roche concluded, the proposal allows the University to pool faculty resources and attract a cohort of students who can work collaboratively beyond their individual pursuits.

Prof. Jensen recalled that when he arrived at the University in August and was first introduced to the proposal, he noted a tension between what might be called the categories of distinction and despair. In a certain way, that tension is related to Notre Dame's identity as a peerless institution. Notre Dame identifies itself as the preeminent Catholic university in the world and this identity is well deserved, as he knows, even as far away as China. However, believing an institution to be peerless sometimes has unfortunate consequences, particularly when the University must compare itself to other institutions. When comparisons are made, Notre Dame is favored in some cases; in other cases, however, it is not.

Prof. Jensen said the committee is not advancing the proposal as a gesture of despair – that is, because members believe that Notre Dame has fallen short of Vanderbilt or some other school. Personally, his motivation is the cluster of extremely talented and dynamic individuals in a remarkable college, all led by a very inspired dean. The excitement this proposal has generated may be because there are *not*

Literature Ph.D. peers. Notre Dame might very well be inventing something new with this proposal. Thus, the creation of the program should be seen as a gesture of distinction motivated by enthusiasm and exuberance. The program breaks paradigms rather than serving as an effort to “catch up” to other institutions.

Prof. Porter said she participated in the Executive Committee’s discussion of the proposal and was the one member who voted against endorsing it, which she hated to do. This is the kind of proposal she would like to support. Moreover, Prof. Porter agrees strongly with Dean Roche that the University needs to build additional doctoral programs in the College of Arts and Letters. If she were convinced that the proposed Ph.D. in Literature program would be a good, viable program she would be very happy to sign off on committing resources to it; however, she has many concerns about the program.

Prof. Porter stated her major concern is that, if the proposal is approved, the University would be creating a doctoral program which, on the showing of the proposal itself, has no clear constituency and will train students without any real confidence in the faculty’s ability to place them. Most programs that teach literature do so in departments centered around a traditional national literature – French, German, Spanish, etc. That says to her that when institutions hire in these departments, they will be looking for people who have the competency not only to teach the language, but who have the doctoral-level training that prepares them to teach the literature of that language. That is not something Notre Dame has the resources to offer.

Prof. Porter said her comments are not meant to impugn the quality of individual colleagues; they are intended to descriptively address the number of faculty at Notre Dame and the overall resources available here. The University will not be able to create departments capable of training graduates for tenure-track positions simply by connecting together different people in a program of interdisciplinary literature. She knows from experience that people with interdisciplinary training are very difficult to place unless they first have clear, demonstrated training in one recognized discipline.

Finally, Prof. Porter said, while the committee makes much of the comparison between its proposed program and the Literature program at Duke, Duke’s program is actually the exception that proves the rule. While Duke does have the kind of interdisciplinary focus the committee advocates establishing at Notre Dame, it also has doctoral programs in French, German, Russian, Hispanic Literatures, and Slavic Literatures. In other words, Duke can place its graduates in tenure-track positions in established departments. She does not believe the proposal will allow Notre Dame to do the same. While the proposed Ph.D. program may serve various University aims and ideals, she does not believe it has been shown to serve potential students.

Prof. Norton agreed that the concern Prof. Porter raises about placing graduates of the program is serious. The same concern has preoccupied the members of the committee throughout the time they have been meeting. In several places in the proposal, however, the committee states that students in the program should have a “grounding” in a particular national language and literature. (see, e.g., p. 12.) This is to

ensure that graduates would be able to compete successfully at the highest levels when seeking a position in traditional language departments. Obviously, this commitment puts an enormous burden on the selection committee. The committee as a whole devoted much time to thinking about how the selection committee would be constituted and the criteria to apply to student candidates. It is true that most of the potential hiring entities are universities and colleges with language departments that are nationally based; however, as Dean Roche previously mentioned, there has been a market shift in the focus of most of these departments. For example, most of the leading German departments in the United States have renamed themselves “German Studies” departments. This is not a shift in name only; it is a shift in substance. The Literature Ph.D. proposed is, in some ways, a kind of “Literature Studies” with a solid basis in literature – on the model of the interdisciplinary programs that are taking root, or have already taken root, in traditional literature departments.

Prof. Norton continued that some may wonder why the proposal is not one for a comparative literature program. Comparative literature was a child, or offshoot, of a certain kind of new critical approach – very often quite formalist and theoretical. The Committee specifically named this proposal one for a “Ph.D. in Literature” and put the emphasis on interdisciplinarity, or multidisciplinary, as a way of signaling its interest in pulling in what is known under the rubric of cultural studies into the study of literature – again, always with a grounding in what was formerly called a national language tradition.

Prof. Porter replied that while she appreciates Prof. Norton’s point, what the proposal says is that the committee wants to be sure that it enrolls students who have a sufficient competence in a language to teach the language. That differs from a student having a sufficient competence in the study of a national literature so that doctoral-level work can be undertaken. Prof. Porter said she does not doubt that the proposed program would train students, or even accept them already trained, to be language instructors. What she is questioning is whether the students who enter the program could receive the kind of doctoral-level training in a literature that she suspects people will demand when they hire in their own departments.

Prof. Norton reiterated that the concern Prof. Porter raises was discussed thoroughly in committee. He believes part of her concern may be due to a misunderstanding of the proposal. When the committee says it would require students to be “grounded” in one foreign language discipline, it does not mean that they would be expected to be able to teach *only* beginning language classes in that discipline. Rather, the committee’s expectation is that students would enter the program with such superb language skills that not only would they be able to teach language classes, they would be fully capable of teaching advanced courses in literature. Prof. Norton said that was true of his graduate school peers and should be true today for students enrolled in the best programs in the country.

Prof. Norton commented that most graduate-level seminars in foreign language departments are taught either in the language of the literature being studied or, very often, in English, and it is important to remember that students in the proposed program

will be trained to function and operate at the highest critical level in an English-language environment. The students must develop a critical arsenal at a high English-language level in discourse, seminars, and in their written work. Of course, if a student is a native speaker of a language other than English, program administrators would expect, and certainly allow, him or her to write at least some of their work in the non-English native language. Speakers of English would write in English and conduct seminar work in English. That does not mean, however, that their language skills are any less well developed than those of students in traditional national language and literature doctoral programs.

Prof. Doody agreed that committee members discussed Prof. Porter's concern. Prof. Doody said that to address that concern it is important to have an idea of what "literature" is. It is no longer assumed by those in the field that they know what literature is and their job is to teach it. Instead, in addition to the critical theory questions of the kind that occupied academia in the 1970's, 1980's, and 1990's, the cultural studies movement laid on the table the next question: What *is* literature? Thus, it would be considered very valuable for a student who intends to teach undergraduates in any way, shape, or form touching on literature to have some understanding of the variety of literatures in the world and some critical sophistication in analyzing them.

Furthermore, Prof. Doody said, people tend to assume that the world will stay stable except for themselves and that things really are today just as they were in the late 1970's. From her own experience at other institutions – Berkeley, Princeton, and Vanderbilt – and her continuing connection with these universities, she knows that not to be true. There is a movement afoot to unite the disparate foreign language departments of institutions and create a kind of language and literature module. Thus, it should not be assumed that students who graduate after the year, say, 2010, will face a world in which departments are as they were in 1995.

Prof. Doody said the seismic shift she believes is occurring in language and literature departments has already taken place in the sciences. No longer are physics and biology, for example, two absolutely separate entities. The lines between previously delineated fields cannot be clearly drawn. Moreover, scientists do not want the lines. They are much happier being able to work together and creating new bridges between formerly separate fields. Divisions between academic areas are mere conveniences. When they are no longer convenient, they go, just as the old Medieval and Renaissance system of dividing up studies was abandoned. This does not mean that the old systems were bad or wrong or that people did not do wonderful work under them; however, certain systems became less and less useful in the 18th century and were unworkable in the 19th century.

Likewise, we exist in a time when a shift is occurring. In fact, Prof. Doody continued, she would argue the opposite of Prof. Porter. To train students *now* the way they would have been trained in 1980 – to be a specialist in French or German or another national language – will not offer a road to success by 2005. Rather, Prof. Doody believes that adhering to the old ways is a dicey path to follow. It assumes that

departments and departmental lines will stay stable. She can offer her assurances that that will *not* happen. Already, a look at Modern Languages Association advertisements shows that requirements are changing. Institutions are looking for individuals who can do several different kinds of things, some of which are quite germane to what the committee proposes to teach graduate students.

In addition, with changes in demographics and world trade, globalization is more than just a political or economic mantra. Knowledge of world literature will be demanded of young teachers. Already, experience in world literature courses is considered highly desirable. Thus, for real world, historical, and academic reasons, Prof. Doody believes instituting the proposed program would put Notre Dame ahead of the wave instead of behind it. Notre Dame even has an advantage in that there are no past structures within which the program must fit. As Prof. Jensen has said, the University could offer a new paradigm for the study of literature.

Prof. Ghilarducci said she fully supports innovation and paradigm shifts, yet she is questioning how she would feel if such an interdisciplinary program were to be announced in her department. She asked Dean Roche to represent the views of department chairs from the history, philosophy, and theology departments.

Dean Roche said he believes that, as the proposal developed, the committee met with the chairs of the relevant departments, as well as with other professors who had particular interests in such subjects as religion and literature or philosophy and literature.

Prof. Doody confirmed that meetings had occurred with relevant department chairs. Furthermore, she said, as the proposal states, the program's administrative board would include the chairs of the participating language and literature departments. Nothing could proceed without the chairs' permission and they would be thoroughly cognizant of all developments. The departments represented on the board are the departments that would be truly affected by the launching of the program. The English department is already represented in that its representatives are built in – Irish Studies faculty tend to have appointments partly in English; comparativists like Prof. Joseph Buttigieg also have appointments in English; and Prof. Doody has an appointment in English. The other departments need only accept students into their seminars, which she thinks they would be delighted to do. Certainly, no departments have registered any complaints about having more students in their graduate seminars. As the proposal states, the committee has chosen certain already-existing seminars that would be ideal for the program—for example, Theology 548, "Religion and Science," and Theology 661, "Philosophical Theology." The committee has discussed with members of the theology and philosophy departments which courses already being offered would be well suited to the program. Existing departments need not take any more hand in the program than they want. A few members of the faculty have registered interest in teaching a class, although that decision would be up to the individual professor with the consent of the department. Departments can cross-list courses which should not disadvantage them in any way. Rather, cross-listing should lead to an influx of bright students into existing courses.

Prof. Ghilarducci asked if the departments not represented on the Administrative Board would agree that they would suffer no indirect costs.

Dean Roche replied that other than the language and literature departments, English, Philosophy and Theology also would be involved in the program. He discussed the proposal with the chair of the English Department, Prof. Chris Vanden Bossche, who is very supportive. Prof. Vanden Bossche believes, as does Prof. Doody, that the program will enhance the placement of English graduate students. Moreover, three professors who hold endowed chairs in English – Margaret Doody, Joseph Buttigieg, and Seamus Deane – were driving forces in putting the proposal together. Prof. Vanden Bossche has an interest in developing a program in the literature of the Americas, and he sees a great deal of interest in the overlap of English and Hispanic literature. In addition, two of the foci of the English department are Medieval Studies and Irish Studies, each of which intersect very strongly with the Ph.D. in Literature proposal.

As to the Philosophy Department, Dean Roche said many of the analytic philosophers would probably not be enthusiastic about the proposed program, although they might be indifferent to it. Philosophy has recently hired Fred Rush, who has expertise in aesthetics, and he is certain that Prof. Rush would be very interested in the program. Prof. Stephen Watson, chair of the Philosophy department, has an interest in philosophy and literature, so he too is supportive. Also, Prof. Karl Ameriks, whose speciality is the history of German philosophy and continental philosophy, has been involved in some of the discussions of the proposal.

Dean Roche continued that in Theology there are a number of faculty members with strong interests in literature. For example, Prof. Cyril O'Regan, one of the department's recent hires, has discussed offering a course in literature and religion. The chair of the department, Prof. John Cavadini, was involved in some early discussions of the proposal and did have some cautionary reflections on the proposal – one of which is the desirability of investing in a new program when those teaching in existing programs would like to receive more resources. Beyond that, Dean Roche said Prof. Cavadini was, in principle, supportive of the idea of a Ph.D. program in literature. Prof. Cavadini did want to be certain that the program would make sense for a Catholic university – that is, he would not want it to develop in ways that would more closely resemble what might be called the majority view in literary and cultural studies today.

Upon a request from Fr. Scully to elaborate on his last point, Dean Roche said there is a tendency in literary studies today to abandon the study of literature. For example, when reviewing applications for a position in German, there might be more candidates with dissertations on such topics as "Fashion in the Weimar Republic" than "The Study of Evil in Faust." That is a trend in the profession. This proposal, in contrast, places literature at the forefront of literary studies.

In addition, Dean Roche said, there is a tendency in literature departments, perhaps more so in German than in French or Italian, and certainly even more so in comparative literature departments, to place a tremendous focus on what is called

“theory.” That tendency usually involves contemporary thinkers who may be less interested in traditional thought on literature beginning with Aristotle. In the committee’s proposal, the focus is not on theory, but on having courses in literature and philosophy and literature and religion that would offer a different paradigm—one much more at home in a Catholic university. Notre Dame would be attracting students who would not find the same set of questions addressed here as at other universities. Given the importance at the University of the Medieval Institute and the Keough Institute of Irish Studies, a focus already exists here on two cultures with a literature very closely connected to questions of religion and philosophy.

Prof. Roche concluded by saying his goal for the Ph.D. in Literature program is for it to be ahead of its time in the bringing together of different national literary traditions, yet so traditional in its focus on literature as to be revolutionary again. Of course, a traditional focus does not mean that participants would ignore the existence of a production and reception context for literature, but they would place that in a secondary position to literature itself. If the program develops in that way, it will have an identity very much linked to Notre Dame’s Catholic identity.

Fr. Jenkins asked committee members to respond to Prof. Roche’s last point. Looking forward, are there distinguished people the University could hire who would put into practice the kind of program that has been described? While he is comfortable with the theoretical description of the proposed Ph.D. in Literature program, it does seem that the focus of some institutions’ literature programs is quite different.

Prof. Doody responded that she wants to emphasize that the committee’s paradigm is based on Notre Dame, and, thus, on its Catholicity. As the proposal reads, it would be mandatory for each student to take one course in philosophy and one course in theology. Because most students would very likely fulfill this requirement in the first year, many may become very interested in the connection between literature and philosophy or literature and theology and want to build a program that takes that interest into account. While there are already faculty members at the University with expertise in areas of study included in the proposed program, certainly it would be possible and exciting to hire additional faculty. Whether the proposal is approved or not, Prof. Doody would emphasize that Notre Dame must shore up its offerings in the classics, without which the University cannot continue with a sparkling and solidly-based humanities program. There must be people at Notre Dame who can actually read Aristotle in the original Greek and teach students how to do so.

Fr. Jenkins rephrased his question: As the University looks to the future, would this program attract people as teachers who would flourish in it rather than in programs with a more theoretical interest?

Prof. Doody replied that there are a variety of approaches in the study of literature. Notre Dame would not be in the same mode as existing programs because the committee is not trying to replicate programs such as Duke’s. While she admires Stanley Fish (now Dean of Arts and Sciences at the University of Illinois at Chicago), this program would be much different than Duke’s. That program is typical of the third

quarter of the 20th century, when theory flourished, reaching its zenith around 1980. Notre Dame's program would have a different emphasis. Looking to the future, the University could hire people with quite a spectrum of beliefs and theoretical positions – all of whom would be very interested in the type of questions that would be pursued here. After all, research is only as good as its questions. Notre Dame's program would produce an atmosphere in which certain kinds of questions can be asked honestly and with subtlety, and with wide but not sloppy connections. This will be deeply fascinating to many people. In a way, the world has been ready for Notre Dame to offer the program so that people can come here rather than go elsewhere to meet their interests.

Prof. Porter reiterated that despite the assurances committee members have offered, she continues to have concerns with placement of the program's graduates. A second concern she has was also raised in the Executive Committee meeting and that is understanding the initiating committee's intent concerning which faculty members would teach in the program. The proposal states that the program would be run by a director and an Administrative Board. They would decide who among the Teaching-and-Research faculty in the relevant departments could teach in the program and who could not. In other words, the University would be setting up a situation in which some Teaching-and-Research faculty would be told, in effect, that they could not have access to the graduate students in the program. If that is the intent of the committee, she thinks it would set a very unfortunate precedent.

Prof. Doody said she wanted to make clear that the Advisory Board named in the proposal differs from the Administrative Board. The first is the "ginger" group. It will supply ideas and be consulted on major policy matters such as curricular innovations and degree requirements. The second is the executive body of the program. It will decide both on which applicants to accept into the program and which faculty members will teach in it.

Prof. Porter said, given that definition, the Administrative Board would decide on the focus of the program.

Prof. Doody replied that doing so would not be unusual in programs of any kind.

Prof. Porter said it would be unusual in her department.

Prof. Doody said not every professor in a department teaches graduate students. Faculty members do not have a right to teach a particular graduate course, to teach it in any particular year, or even to teach graduate students at all.

Prof. Porter replied that while at some universities people are hired into graduate faculties, the committee's proposal is a little bit different. The University would be saying to professors who are members of the Teaching-and-Research faculty—faculty who are already teaching in master's degree programs—that they might not be good enough to teach in the proposed new doctoral program. The program would draw lines between faculty who are already at the University and who are already teaching graduate students. Prof. Porter does not think the University wants to proceed in that

direction.

Prof. Douthwaite commented that the point Prof. Porter raises is important and was discussed in committee. She pointed out that the proposal before the Academic Council today was approved by the Graduate Council by a vote of 22 to 2. The Graduate Council encouraged the committee to hold a public forum with the entire faculty of the College of Arts and Letters. That forum was held on January 16 and was very well attended. The major issue arising there was the language abilities of prospective students. As to that question, as committee members have stated today, the program's administrators are committed to ensuring that prospective students are thoroughly grounded in a particular national language and literature.

Prof. Douthwaite said she found it rather poignant that the other issue that arose at the forum was how faculty members could become a part of the proposed Ph.D. in Literature program. As she sees it, this will be somewhat self-selecting because teaching in the program will be extremely demanding. To be part of the program, faculty will need to publish frequently and have a very high-profile professional career so that they are able to make the contacts that will facilitate the hiring of their students. Perhaps some faculty are not willing to do that. Some faculty who teach in a master's degree program may not have been required to do that.

Prof. Douthwaite said she believes the program could shake things up a bit in a positive way. It will open things up for the junior, up-and-coming faculty and would also create ways of thinking about one's field in terms of cohorts across the college and across different disciplines. Faculty will work together in different fields and mentor students together.

Prof. Meara said she believes Prof. Porter's point raises a question of policy. When a person is hired into Notre Dame's Teaching-and-Research faculty as an assistant professor, he or she has graduate faculty status. In fact, Prof. Meara said, when she came to Notre Dame, she was surprised by this policy. When a department's Committee on Appointments and Promotions (CAP) recommends a candidate to the dean, provost, and president for hiring, and the hiring occurs, that person receives graduate faculty status. Now, the committee's Administrative Board could effectively change that rule. In addition, the program has no entity equivalent to a department, with its own CAP, to make decisions on whether a faculty member is assigned to teach graduate students.

Prof. Douthwaite said the Administrative Board would be that body.

Prof. Meara replied that the problem is that the Administrative Board is comprised of faculty from various departments. She does not believe it should decide who is on the graduate faculty.

Prof. Hatch questioned whether the situation would be similar to the Medieval Institute, which is an interdisciplinary doctoral program. There are many medievalists at

the University who cannot teach in that program as much as they would like. The director of the program and faculty colleagues decide what courses need to be offered and then the director negotiates with departments to see who can be freed up to teach them. One could say that the Institute is “discriminating” against some faculty members, but even in departments with a large number of doctoral students, a new faculty member does not have a *right* to teach a graduate seminar. In any given department, decisions on teaching graduate students are worked out in terms of where the students are, their interests, and who teaches graduate students well. While the procedures for selecting faculty for the proposed Ph.D. in Literature program would be a bit more complicated because of its interdisciplinary nature, it is analogous to situations elsewhere at the University.

Prof. Meara asked if the chair of a department would have the authority to refuse a request of the Administrative Board for a certain faculty member to teach a course.

Profs. Hatch and Doody answered that the chair would have the authority. Such matters are negotiated.

Prof. Meara asked what might occur if a faculty member wanted to teach a course in the proposed program, his or her chair authorized it, but the Administrative Board said, although it wanted the course, a different faculty member would teach it?

Prof. Porter said she believes it is important to note that the steering committee in the Medieval Institute is *elected* from its constituency. In the case of the Ph.D. in Literature program, a decision would be made by an appointed committee. She agreed with Prof. Hatch that larger departments such as Philosophy do not automatically assign junior faculty to teach graduate seminars and that some restrictions exist on whether junior faculty can direct dissertations, but it is never said to a regular Teaching-and-Research faculty member, “You cannot work with graduate students.” There is some self-selection that occurs, as well as some natural selection in terms of the faculty members with whom students prefer to work, but it is never said that certain faculty members cannot teach graduate students.

Fr. Gaffney said he favored the program and suggested that better clarification of the director’s role in administering the program might clear up the question that has arisen over assigning faculty to courses.

Prof. Doody answered that the Administrative Board should be characterized largely as a committee of departmental chairs. Nothing could be done without negotiation among them. What is being described are the nuts and bolts questions present in any program that exists outside of standard departmental boundaries. Because of the kind of strenuous conversation and negotiation that the proposed program would require, when the deans reviewed the proposal they suggested that the program should have an associate director to perform some of the daily work. The current committee, which will morph into the Administrative Board, did include wherever possible the directors of graduate studies from the relevant departments. They are the administrators who know what courses have been given in the past or have been

suggested for the future. Thus, if it is desirable for these directors to be part of the program's administrative structure, they can be. Alternatively, the chairs could consult with them.

Prof. Norton said that the committee had not thought of external criteria which would exclude any faculty members from participating in the program. The Administrative Board would be very interested in looking at all proposals submitted and, through a process of negotiation, would either solicit or select proposals for courses. The interest is in having a vibrant and intellectually sound program, with courses taught by faculty from any of the ranks. He agrees with Prof. Douthwaite that committee members would be delighted if the proposal resulted in a program the faculty viewed as competitive and highly desirable.

Dean Roche commented that Prof. Meara was essentially asking two questions. First, how will the program include the faculty members who must negotiate with their chairpersons to teach a course in the program? He does not see this presenting a problem. The Administrative Board includes the chairs, and it is not as if they must fill spots in two competing graduate programs. Graduate seminars would be offered both to departmental graduate students and to Literature Ph.D. students. Thus, each seminar would constitute one graduate activity for the faculty member.

Dean Roche said that Prof. Meara's second question, initially raised by Prof. Porter, is more complex. On the one hand, it raises concerns about inclusion and democratic participation in an intellectual endeavor; on the other, it points up concerns over placement and ensuring that graduate students have appropriate mentors. He thinks the committee has chosen a reasonable path by giving the Director and the Advisory and Administrative Boards certain authority to choose which courses to offer and selecting faculty members for those courses so that proper mentoring will be addressed. Mentoring and placement concerns were raised by Prof. Merz, Vice President of Graduate Studies and Research, when the proposal was first discussed with him. Addressing these concerns requires choosing very carefully who will offer a small number of graduate courses. Again, he thinks the committee has found a reasonable path between making the program so inclusive that it is almost as if one teaches by some arbitrary lottery mechanism and so exclusive that certain faculty members are denied permission to teach. The board will use its judgment to bring in faculty who can most prominently mentor the graduate students admitted to the program.

Prof. Jensen asked Prof. Porter what, specifically, would convince her that the program is viable and likely to succeed.

Prof. Porter named three ways to alleviate her concerns. First, some kind of statement from reviewers outside the University as to the viability of the program, whether they would recommend the program to students, and whether they would hire a graduate of the program. Second, a clearer statement of the rationale of the program and a clearer indication of the course of study. She becomes very uneasy when she sees a doctoral program that can be structured in a multitude of ways in accordance

with a student's particular interests. While it is important to leave some flexibility, she perceives the program to be almost totally open ended. Third, a more structured account of the core of the program – that is, what every graduate of the program should have and be able to do, no matter what else they have and do, when the course of study is completed?

Prof. Jensen commented that, while the proposal could be vetted by people outside the University and their opinions on its viability received, the problem is that if the program truly is paradigm-breaking, it may be unable to be evaluated effectively by others.

Prof. Porter asked if others are unable to evaluate the program, how will they accept graduates of it?

Prof. Jensen answered that he would address that concern by an example. Last spring, Stanford graduate students called a conference for graduate students in national literature programs across the country for the purpose of beginning to forge a new paradigm for the teaching of literature at the doctoral level. The students claimed they could no longer bear the way that they were trained in traditional language programs that prevented them from actually being able to converse with colleagues studying other literatures and other disciplines. They spent an entire weekend trying to find a way to talk about their dilemma and to read history, philosophy, and literature – not only in the original language, but also in translation. That kind of struggle for a new paradigm may well be what Notre Dame is in front of with the committee's proposal.

Second, Prof. Jensen said, while the committee may not be able to say how or where graduates could be placed tomorrow, if one looks at the Modern Languages Association's interview schedule, it is apparent that institutions are hiring individuals whose studies are broader and more far-reaching than in the past. He knows that to be true in Asian Studies. In his field, there are more and more people with Ph.D.s who do research in Chinese or Japanese *and* in Greek or Latin. Inevitably, this is to overcome the limitations of a purely national focus. One cannot understand a certain nation's history or literature without understanding its intercourse with the rest of the world.

Prof. Preacher moved to call the question. Ms. Roberts seconded her motion. The Council's vote was evenly split –14 to 14 – on whether to curtail discussion.

Fr. Malloy asked whether the Executive Committee intended Council members to vote on the proposal today or only to discuss it.

Prof. Hatch said he believed a vote was intended. He then asked committee members whether, leaving budget and implementation issues aside, it is possible to have a program in which extraordinarily high standards will be set for incoming students even in the initial years. How would the program work if, in the first year, the Board adhered to a very high bar and, failing to garner applications from five outstanding students, it admitted only two?

Prof. Woo asked whether any bodies other than the Graduate Council had reviewed or approved the proposal.

Dean Roche replied that graduate proposals that come out of the College of Arts and Letters are not vetted in the College Council but go straight to the Graduate Council. When the proposal was voted on by the Graduate Council, there were only two negative votes. After the College held an open forum in January to address various issues, the committee met again. The italicized language in the attachment (see, e.g., page 8) represents very modest changes resulting from the open forum. The proposal then went to the Executive Committee of the Academic Council and passed by a vote of 5-1-1.

Prof. Mooney pointed out that, by agreement, the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Council does not review new graduate programs presented to the Council. Members have decided that that kind of review is not an appropriate function of the committee.

Prof. Garg qualified Prof. Mooney's comment by saying the committee will review proposals when specifically asked to do so by the Council.

Prof. DeBoer asked for clarification. Page 13 of the proposal states: "The Director . . . is also the director of Graduate Studies"; yet, page 14 states: "The Program's Director of Graduate Studies will be selected from the Admissions Committee."

Dean Roche said that the statement on page 14 should be deleted.

Prof. Meara said that even when a program is paradigm-breaking, it is possible to ask for outside reviews of its proposal. No one had ever undertaken a program like the Alliance for Catholic Education (ACE), but she encouraged outside reviews of that program when it was at the proposal stage and those reviews were made. There are legitimate questions to ask of this proposal: Would you send your undergraduates to this program? Would you hire its graduates? Would you encourage your Ph.D. students to strive for a position in such a program? What should be the core elements of the program's curriculum?

Prof. Porter moved that the Council refer the proposal to the Graduate Studies Committee with the understanding that it consult with the committee members who developed the proposal to work on ways of soliciting external reviews. Prof. Meara seconded the motion.

Prof. Doody said that selecting the external reviewers would be problematic. How many French, Italian, or Spanish departments would be asked to review the proposal? Where does the committee find other Irish Studies programs? How many Classics departments should be asked to review the proposal? Does the committee solicit opinions from many departments all over the United States, or does it go to some representative departments and some departments of comparative literature?

Fr. Malloy said he presumed those questions would be worked out by the committee.

Fr. Scully commented that in his experience of external reviews, results depend very much on whose opinions are asked. While he appreciates Prof. Porter's concerns, an external review *can* be an exercise of limited usefulness. He supports the proposal on the basis of the quality of the faculty in the College of Arts and Letters who are putting it forward.

Prof. Porter replied that, first, she does not understand the necessity for hurrying. Second, an external review should not be considered to be problematic. Of course, the committee should think carefully about the identity of the reviewers, but a logical starting point would be people in the departments where the committee would aspire to place the program's graduates. If the external review is of no value, it can be disregarded. If the review is satisfactory, the Graduate Studies Committee can report it back to the full Council again. To her, it seems a win-win proposition.

Prof. Jensen said, as one who has been involved in both sides of the reviewing process, he knows that responses can be all over the map. He questions the utility of the exercise. The responses will most likely not be unanimous. Will that mean the viability of the program should be questioned?

Prof. Porter replied that she, too, has been both reviewer and reviewee. Anyone who has been involved in the scholarly world knows how to handle an external review and how to evaluate it. She must wonder why there is so much resistance to the idea of an external review.

Dean Incropera said he was swayed by Prof. Porter's recommendation. An external review would be analogous to the way CAPs function during promotion and tenure reviews. Recommendations for reviewers are put forward by the candidate for promotion and also by the CAP. In this case, the proponents of the measure can certainly suggest a number of reviewers who they believe are enlightened and able to provide good, objective criticism. Another group of people might select other people or departments to participate in the review. The number of reviewers could be significant and the reviews themselves could be filtered very carefully by those asked to make a decision. He sees nothing wrong with the motion.

Prof. Hatch suggested that if a review is to occur, it should be modeled on the University's process for reviewing departments. That is, rather than sending out proposals for reading, reviewers should visit the University, talk to the principals, and interview the faculty.

Dean Incropera said that would mean that a small sample, perhaps only five people, would be involved in the review.

Prof. Hatch agreed that departments are reviewed with a small number of reviewers.

Dean Woo said she is concerned about good process and the implications of an external review at this stage. The Graduate Council gave the proposal considerable thought. Why should an external committee now be charged with examining the proposal? There was no external review of the Masters in Mechanical Engineering (MEME) proposal approved by the Academic Council in November. What would insisting on the process at this stage mean for the future?

Prof. Doody said she does not think it is customary to send out proposals for new programs absolutely cold to many people. She is against the suggestion and sees it as a delaying tactic – one which will not do the faculty at Notre Dame any good. She does think it could be worthwhile to have a serious review of the program a short time after it is up and running – in the third, fourth, or fifth year. That way, there would be an actual entity to examine and, if necessary, the program's course could be corrected.

Prof. Doody reiterated her belief that there are costs to delaying the proposal. Some faculty enthused about the proposal will become disgusted and leave. In fact, one faculty member who would have been excellent for the program has already left. Even though they might love Notre Dame, people will go where they have the opportunity to teach graduate students and where the intellectual atmosphere is lively and exciting. Delay will also cause the University's placement in English to remain at a level lower than is desirable and its negative reputation will only worsen while reviews and studies continue. She believes the Council should make a decision today.

Fr. Malloy called for a vote on the motion to command an external review of the proposal to establish a Ph.D. in Literature program. The vote was 10 in favor, 19 opposed.

Fr. Scully then moved to call the question; Fr. Gaffney seconded his motion. It passed by a voice vote.

Prof. Porter suggested that the final vote be taken by show of hands.

Fr. Malloy agreed. The vote to establish a Ph.D. in Literature program passed the Council by a vote of 23 to 7.

3. Proposed Guidelines for Faculty Concerning the Use of Alcohol. Prof. Mendenhall, chair of the Faculty Affairs Subcommittee, explained that the guidelines proposed today (Attachment 2) have their origin in a Spring 1999 Faculty Senate resolution. As did the Faculty Senate's proposed guidelines, the subcommittee's guidelines address three areas:

- a. the manner in which faculty approach the use of alcohol in their relationships with students;
- b. the manner in which faculty approach the use of alcohol at their own gatherings and social events; and
- c. the manner in which faculty relate to one another when they perceive that one of their members is involved in an abusive use of alcohol.

Prof. Mendenhall said the subcommittee's first recommendation is to add the proposed guidelines to the policy section of the *Faculty Handbook*. The University developed an Alcohol Policy in 1984, which was reviewed and modified in 1988. Because most of the provisions of the policy apply to students, its text appears only in the student handbook, *Du Lac*, even though it contains a section governing the serving of alcohol at all events hosted by the University. Adding the guidelines to the *Faculty Handbook* makes the general University policy known to and accessible by the faculty. Some provisions of the proposed guidelines clarify aspects of the University Alcohol Policy; others go beyond it and set forth expected behaviors in situations not directly addressed by the policy.

The subcommittee's second recommendation is that the University extend its contract with Michiana Employee Assistance Programs (MEAP) to cover faculty members. When a faculty member is struggling with alcohol abuse, the University has no professional resources formally available. The Counseling Center and the Office of Drug and Alcohol Education serve only students; the University's contract with MEAP covers only non-faculty staff. While six faculty members sought and received assistance through MEAP last year, those services were provided only as a courtesy.

Fr. Malloy asked Prof. Mendenhall to explain the differences between the subcommittee's proposed guidelines and those of the Faculty Senate.

Prof. Mendenhall said wording was strengthened in some places and, because of comments by the University's General Counsel, changed in another place. The only major change is to the Faculty Senate's proposal that, in situations of a faculty member engaging in an abusive use of alcohol, colleagues might express their concern by initiating an "intervention." [Faculty Senate Proposed Guidelines, Sec. 3A.] The subcommittee eliminated that language because members did not think that faculty members had the training to hold an intervention.

Fr. Poorman noted that Section 1A of the subcommittee's guidelines, dealing with faculty use of alcohol when students are present, changes the Faculty Senate's language of "avoiding" offering alcoholic beverages to underage students [Sec. 1A] to a prohibition against doing so ". . . faculty *must not* offer alcoholic beverages to underage students."

Prof. Preacher said she found the wording of the subcommittee's Section 1C confusing, particularly lines 48 through 51. When an event does not include undergraduates and a host is following the policy of providing alternative nonalcoholic beverages and a meal, why must there be an application for an exemption?

Prof. Mooney explained that Section 1C has five subparts: Alcohol must be dispensed by a licensed bartender; all participants must be of majority age; the cost of alcoholic drinks must be borne by individual consumers; a meal must be provided and the bar open only for a limited (brief) time either before or after the meal; and alternative nonalcoholic beverages must be provided. If any one of the five requirements listed in

the subparts is not met, the host must apply for an exemption. Most likely, the primary reason for applying for an exemption will be the absence of a licensed bartender. The wording of lines 48 through 51 is intended to clarify that an exemption will *never* be granted unless nonalcoholic beverages and substantial amounts of food are available at the event. Thus, three of the five requirements (Subparts 2, 4, and 5) must always be met.

Prof. Preacher asked whether it is likely an exemption will be granted if those three requirements are met.

Prof. Mooney answered that exemptions are likely, but each case is fact-specific and involves examining such matters as who is invited to the event, its purpose, and its location.

Fr. Poorman questioned what force the guidelines have. He asked what advice the University's General Counsel gave concerning the extent to which faculty members could be held accountable to the provisions of the guidelines, or, if they are made regulations, regulations.

Prof. Mooney replied that the General Counsel did not say anything about that issue.

Fr. Poorman asked whether Ms. Kasebier is concerned about it.

Prof. Mooney said no concern was expressed when the guidelines were reviewed.

Fr. Scully asked regarding the question of liability, how the University is protected from litigation resulting from a violation by a faculty member of the guidelines. In the event of a violation, would the individual faculty member or the University be liable?

Prof. Mooney replied that the answer would depend, in part, on who was hosting the event. If a faculty member is hosting an event in his or her own home with personal funds, she cannot imagine the University would be liable. Part of the reason for the change in language from the subcommittee's first draft of faculty "should not" serve alcohol to underage students when inviting students to their homes to "must not" [Sec. 1A] was exactly that concern. General Counsel would not approve the guidelines with the "should not" language. A policy is not clear if it says, essentially, that a behavior is not a good idea.

Fr. Scully asked whether the General Counsel is satisfied at this point that the proposed guidelines do not expose the University to legal jeopardy.

Prof. Mooney replied that because of the subcommittee's concerns on this issue it asked the General Counsel to review the guidelines twice.

Prof. Mendenhall commented that he did not believe the guidelines would

increase the University's liability.

Prof. Mooney agreed.

Fr. Poorman said if the University did not have a policy and a department or college hosted an event resulting in a lawsuit, it would seem to him that the University would open itself up to greater liability than if a policy existed but was broken.

Prof. Mooney said that situation could go both ways.

Fr. Poorman asked if one person in the Provost's Office will handle requests for exemptions.

Prof. Mooney answered, "Yes."

Fr. Malloy said he has spent countless hours attending meetings at which the subject of alcohol on college and university campuses has been discussed. The study he co-chaired at the National Institutes of Health will most likely be released this summer. It addresses the subject of alcohol abuse not only by dealing with student drinking directly, but in the broader arena of how other participants in the University community conduct themselves and the models they establish, as well as concern about the neighborhoods around a campus. While it is difficult to formulate these sort of guidelines to everyone's satisfaction, he thinks the subcommittee has done an excellent job and he appreciates their hard work.

Fr. Malloy called for a vote on the proposed "Guidelines For Notre Dame Faculty Concerning the Use of Alcohol." They were unanimously approved.

4. Proposed Resolution from the Undergraduate Study Committee on Dean's List Requirements. Dean Roche explained that the proposed resolution would amend Section 21.1 of the *Academic Code* to restrict Dean's Honor List awards to undergraduates who carry at least 12 graded credit hours and have a grade point average (GPA) in the top 30% of the college or school. The GPA would be determined at the beginning of each Fall term by using the GPAs earned by students in the college for the previous two semesters and calculating the 30% cutoff figure. (Attachment 3). The proposal is an extension of the decision at the last Academic Council meeting to restrict Latin honors to the top 30% of each graduating class.

The rationale for the proposal is the same as that for the decision. When more students receive honors than not, an honors designation becomes meaningless. Currently, the percentages of students receiving Dean's List honors are relatively high. In Fall 2000, 55% of the students in the School of Architecture, 57% of the students in the College of Arts and Letters, 48% of the students in the College of Business, 37% of the students in the College of Engineering, and 50% of the students in the College of Science were placed on the dean's list (Attachment 3, fn. 1).

Dean Roche said the proposal takes into account concerns raised by student members at the November 2000 Academic Council meeting about the desirability of an absolute scale for honors. Thus, although the committee proposes to tighten the requirements for dean's list honors by restricting them to approximately 30% of students in each college or school, the precise GPA needed to achieve dean's list honors is calculated every summer by reviewing records of the previous two semesters and determining what GPA would establish a 30% cutoff. The requisite GPA for the dean's list for each college would then be announced at the beginning of the fall semester. Dean Roche said that an absolute scale can be integrated into dean's list honors because they are different than the University-wide Latin honors. He also pointed out that the grade point average will vary by college, but will be linked in each college to its own 30% cutoff figure.

Prof. Hatch asked how dean's list honors would be calculated for students in the First Year of Studies. Would the 30% figure be calculated on the basis of the grade point averages of students in the previous year?

Dean Kolman replied that discussion in committee was that students' first year would be treated as a unit. It has occurred to her, however, that there is a real distinction between GPAs in the first semester of the first year and those of the second semester. Because of that, the college has different probation requirements for each semester. In the first semester, a student need only receive a 1.7 GPA to be in good standing; in the second semester that figure is 1.85 (as compared to a 2.0 GPA in all subsequent semesters).

In light of the evidence that GPAs differ rather radically in the first year from first to second semester, Dean Kolman said she would like the freedom in the First Year of Studies to set a different grade point average each semester for dean's list honors. She proposed undertaking some historical research to see what the precise change in GPAs is from first to second semester, expecting to confirm her belief that a different cutoff in each semester would be appropriate.

Dean Roche pointed out that, as written, the committee's proposal would already allow her that freedom. The amendment states that the 30% cutoff would be made so that "by best estimates 30% of the students in the college or school will receive dean's honor list in a *given semester*." Thus, if Dean Kolman's review of past years suggests that the 30% cutoff will deviate between Fall and Spring semesters, she would be authorized to set a different GPA for each term.

Fr. Malloy commented that he spoke recently at the honors convocation for the First Year of Studies and had visual evidence that the number of students receiving dean's list honors had grown.

Prof. Tidmarsh questioned the impact on the Law School of the proposed

amendment's last sentence: "For graduate and professional students in programs which choose to award dean's list honors, the dean's honor list includes those students who carry at least 12 graded credit hours in the previous semester and who achieve at least a 3.400 average in that semester." The Law School has its own system of honors, different than that proposed.

Prof. Powers, a member of the Undergraduate Studies Committee, said the wording of the proposed change would not change the status quo in the Law School or any professional school. In fact, the wording of the proposal is identical to that in the current Academic Code of Honor and would have no effect on the Law School.

Fr. Malloy called for a vote to amend the *Academic Code*, Section 21.1, as proposed by the Undergraduate Studies Committee, so that approximately 30% of undergraduates in each college or school receive dean's list honors in a semester. The proposal passed unanimously.

5. Committee reports.

(a) Faculty Affairs Committee: Prof. Mendenhall said his committee's work on the faculty alcohol policy had been discussed and voted on today.

(b) Graduate Studies Committee: Prof. Garg reported that his committee continues work on Latin honors for the graduate program. The committee awaits information from the Law School and College of Business. While the Law School has collected the requested information, the Law School faculty itself wants to discuss the issue before releasing it.

(c) Undergraduate Studies Committee: Dean Roche said, having already dealt with Latin honors and dean's list honors, the subcommittee headed by Prof. Powers is taking up the subject of contextual reporting of grades on transcripts. The same subcommittee continues work on the number of Friday classes at the University and has discussed several models for resolving the problem. It will present a proposal on that subject in the near future. A subcommittee headed by Fr. Jenkins is working on revisions to the University's honor code. Although he had hoped to present revisions to the full Council this spring, the subject is very complex. University counsel is now reviewing the subcommittee's work.

Dean Roche said a third subcommittee is studying aspects of the University's curriculum as a precursor to a broader study in the future.

There being no further business, Fr. Malloy adjourned the meeting of the Academic Council at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Ann Mooney
Secretary