

**MINUTES OF THE 311TH GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME
SEPTEMBER 26, 2007**

Members present: Peter Holland (chair), Robert Bernhard, Joseph Marino, James Merz, Mark Roche, Carolyn Woo, Panos Antsaklis, Philip Bess, Laura Carlson, Crislyn D'Souza-Schorey, Peter Garnavich, Angelina Lay, Juan Migliore, Darcia Narvaez, Kathleen Pyne, John Renaud, Scott Van Jacob, Jennifer Younger, Tam Chantem, Rebecca McCumbers

Graduate School representatives present: Terry Akai, Barbara Turpin

Guests present: Thomas Burish, Provost; Don Pope-Davis, Vice President and Associate Provost; Brandon Roach, Executive Assistant to the Provost; Kathryn Lam, Special Assistant to the Associate Provosts

Members absent: Peter Burns, Sandra Gustafson, Christine Maziar, Patricia O'Hara, John Welle, Bill Westfall

Reporter: Mary Hendriksen

Prof. Pope-Davis, now Vice President and Associate Provost but formerly Dean of the Graduate School, opened the meeting at 3:35 p.m. After Prof. Roche offered a prayer, Prof. Pope-Davis turned the meeting over to Prof. Holland, who was appointed acting dean of the Graduate School in August of 2007.

1. Election of search committee for the Dean of the Graduate School:

With the first order of business the election of the search committee for the new dean of the Graduate School, Prof. Holland invited Prof. Burish, Provost of the University, to outline the role of the search committee and the qualifications of its members.

Prof. Burish observed first that Council members are present today at an historic occasion. On August 1, 2007, Notre Dame's Graduate School was split into two divisions: the Graduate School, with oversight of graduate studies, and the Office of Research, with oversight of the research enterprise of the University. For the many years that the divisions were together as one entity, they were within the portfolio of one person: the University's Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. Now that they operate as distinct entities, the members of the search committee will be responsible for selecting the first dean of the Graduate School, the person who will be the chief architect of the effort now underway to take graduate studies to the next level.

Prof. Burish said that the position of "Dean of the Graduate School" does not yet exist in the *Academic Articles*, which the Academic Council is in the process of revising;

thus, he suggested that the procedures specified in the *Articles* for selection of college deans be used in this instance, albeit adapted to the particulars of this search. That procedure would call for the Graduate Council to elect five members of the University's tenured faculty to a search committee. Only elected members of the Council would be eligible to vote; observers and faculty present today representing an elected member may not vote. The Provost chairs the search committee and, "in order to ensure that [it represents] a broad range of views and perspectives," has the prerogative of appointing to it up to two additional members of the faculty. The Council elects one student to the search committee as well. After its work is completed, the search committee gives its recommendation for the dean to the provost. He, in turn, makes a recommendation to the president, who has ultimate decision-making authority for the position. [See Article II, Sec. 4]

As for the qualifications of the new dean, Prof. Burish reiterated that the new dean must, of course, embrace the effort now underway to take graduate studies at Notre Dame to a higher level. The Graduate School dean does not oversee faculty directly; thus, he or she must be ambitious for the Graduate School but able to work collaboratively with others. His or her collaborators will be other deans, the University's faculty, and the directors of graduate studies. A key collaborator will be Prof. Robert Bernhard, who began at Notre Dame this summer as vice president for research.

Also, Prof. Burish noted, the new dean must put his or her own agenda, including research, to the side. Again, the ambitions of this person must be for the Graduate School itself. While it is not impossible for the dean to engage in research, it cannot be his or her primary endeavor. Rather, the dean's primary role is to advance graduate studies at Notre Dame.

Finally, Prof. Burish emphasized that the new dean must give wholehearted support to the three-part vision President Jenkins has articulated so clearly for the University: that Notre Dame be recognized as a preeminent research university, while maintaining both its distinctive Catholic character and its unsurpassed commitment to undergraduate education. Candidates for dean need not be Catholic, but they must embrace and advance Notre Dame's Catholic mission.

As for the qualifications of members of the search committee, Prof. Burish explained that they should represent the breadth of thinking and intellectual approaches of Notre Dame's graduate programs. An ideal composition of the membership would be at least one person from engineering, the sciences, the social sciences, and the arts and humanities. (For purposes of the search committee, Prof. Burish noted, he is combining architecture with engineering.) While these general areas should be represented in the committee's membership, search committee members must put their own disciplines aside and focus on the candidates. Prof. Burish reminded Council members that the primary role of the search committee is to *recruit* the best candidates for the position, not merely to evaluate a slate of candidates who themselves demonstrate an interest in the position. Most likely, he said, the University will hire a consultant to help with the search process; still, there must be exciting, stellar people present in the pool. Identifying

those people is the job of the search committee, a job they fulfill by “selling” Notre Dame to potential candidates.

Prof. Holland then explained the procedures to be used at today’s meeting for election of the search committee. [See Appendix A] The two-stage process they set forth is based on the Academic Council’s procedures for electing its executive committee. It is intended to produce a diverse committee with a wide representation of disciplines. Prof. Holland suggested that, as a safeguard, the Council elect two alternates to the committee. Then, if one or more faculty members elected to the committee cannot serve, the Council need not reconvene. He said that Brandon Roach, executive assistant to the Provost, will act as voting supervisor.

Members reviewed both the procedures for election of the search committee and a packet containing short profiles of the 18 faculty members nominated in advance of the meeting. Then, in multiple stages, the Council elected one student, five faculty members, and two alternates to the search committee for the dean of the Graduate School:

Student:

Michael Lundin (Chemical Engineering), GSU president for the 2006-07 academic year

Faculty members:

Laura Carlson (Psychology)
Marya Lieberman (Chemistry and Biochemistry)
James McAdams (Political Science)
John Renaud (Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering)
Julia Douthwaite (Romance Languages and Literatures).

Alternates:

Brad Gregory (History)
Sunny Boyd (Biological Sciences)

[Editor’s note: Prof. Burish later appointed Profs. Brad Gregory (History) and Sharon Hu (Computer Science and Engineering) to the search committee.]

2. Approval of the minutes of the Graduate Council meeting of April 11, 2007:

Prof. Holland called for approval of the minutes of the Graduate Council meeting of April 11, 2007. They were approved unanimously, with no amendments.

3. Election of the executive committee of the Graduate Council:

Prof. Holland presented a proposal for an executive committee for the Graduate Council. [Appendix B] He explained that, while the Council has operated with an

executive committee for the last two years, the composition of the committee set forth in this proposal reflects the new administrative structure of the Graduate School.

After Prof. Holland identified Prof. Antsaklis as the Graduate Council's liaison to the Academic Council, members elected the following three faculty members and one student to the executive committee: Laura Carlson (Psychology), Joseph Marino (Dean of the College of Science), John Renaud (Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering), and Tam Chantem (Computer Science and Engineering; co-vice president of the GSU).

4. *Bulletin* revisions remanded at the April 2007 meeting:

At the last meeting of the Graduate Council, two subcommittees proposed several revisions to the Graduate School's *Bulletin*. While Council members approved several revisions outright, two of the revisions were approved in principle but remanded for further clarification. The revised versions of these provisions were presented on September 26th for a vote.

(a) Registration and Courses/Grades

Occasionally, a student takes an "incomplete" for a course grade and then has one semester to complete the work for that course. Currently, an incomplete grade for a course in which the work is never completed is factored into a student's grade point average as if it were an *F*, but an *I* rather than an *F* remains on the transcript. The *Bulletin* revision committee recommended that while exceptions can always be made for special circumstances, as a matter of policy, an *F* should appear on a student's transcript in such instances rather than an *I*.

At the meeting of September 26, Dr. Turpin proposed new language for the provision in question. After Prof. Narvaez proposed an amendment clarifying the time faculty are given to submit a grade change, members gave their unanimous approval to the following provision:

The University temporarily computes this grade as the equivalent of an F in calculating the G.P.A. When the student fulfills the above requirements, the I is replaced by the new grade. Faculty will be given 30 days from the last day of classes of the following semester to turn in the grade change form to the Graduate School. Should the student not complete the course work as required, the I will convert to an F on the transcript.

(b) Requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree/Candidacy Examination

Also at the April 2007 meeting, the oral examination subcommittee headed by Prof. Garg proposed including language in the *Bulletin* clarifying the consequences of a student failing to gain approval of his or her dissertation topic and passing the candidacy examination within eight semesters of enrollment.

While Dr. Turpin stated then that the eight-semester time frame involves *funding* and not student *status* and that in some instances—for example, sickness, other disability, loss of research data—she can give a student an extension of the deadline, this provision was remanded as well for more precise crafting of the language.

Dr. Turpin explained at the meeting of September 26th that inserting the word “normally” into the provision would provide her with the necessary flexibility to respond to a variety of extenuating circumstances. Council members then approved the following provision:

Normally, the candidacy examination is passed, and the dissertation topic approved, by no later than the student's eighth semester of enrollment. Failure to meet this deadline may lead to discontinuation of Graduate School funding.

(c) Items for information:

Dr. Turpin also discussed three attachments distributed in advance of the meeting:

Outside chair instructions
Form for Reporting Results of Oral Candidacy Exams and
Dissertation Defenses
Graduate School Policies and Procedures Concerning Candidacy
And Defense Exams

Prof. Antsaklis suggested that the Graduate School post these forms on its Web site and inform chairs how to access them. He further suggested that posting the reporting form in PDF format will allow chairs to complete it electronically.

5. Certificate programs:

[At the Graduate Council meeting of April 11, 2007, members were informed that, during the summer months, the Graduate School would investigate the general area of certificate programs both at Notre Dame and at peer institutions.]

Prof. Holland began the discussion by explaining that at least two certificate programs currently exist at the University, with a proposal for a new certificate program waiting in the wings having gained approval by the College Council of Arts and Letters in the spring of 2007; yet no formal mechanism exists at the University for dealing with certificate programs. Moreover, it appears that no body has addressed the question of whether Notre Dame *should* award certificates to students. Thus, he posed the questions: Is it appropriate for certificate programs to exist at Notre Dame? If so, under whose aegis should they operate?

Dr. Turpin explained that the attachment distributed to members in advance of the meeting collected information from a Web sampling of several institutions belonging to the Association of American Universities. The table indicates whether each institution offers certificate programs and, if so, their target audience, approving unit, and administrative unit. As the table demonstrates, Dr. Turpin said, there are many certificate programs in existence at peer institutions. Generally, they fall into one of two categories: *professional* certificates, as in a specific area of expertise of information technology, or *academic* certificates, as in medieval studies or gender studies.

Complementing her Web survey, Dr. Turpin said, is an article in a newsletter published by the Council of Graduate Schools. It reports on survey findings that, nationwide, nearly 20,000 graduate certificates were awarded in the 2003-2004 academic year, with the most prevalent fields of study education (52%), the health sciences (10%), and the social sciences (8%). [See http://www.cgsnet.org/portals/0/pdf/comm_2005_12.pdf] The survey also reports: “More graduate certificates are awarded by Master’s-Focused institutions than either Research I or Doctorate-Granting institutions. The large number of education certificates is the main reason for this difference; nearly 70% of certificates awarded by Master’s-Focused institutions are in education.”

Prof. Roche spoke in favor of recognizing certificate programs at Notre Dame. In addition to the fact that several of Notre Dame’s peers award a variety of certificates, he said, there is value to these programs in terms of their breadth and interdisciplinarity. They are an aid in developing not only academics but also intellectuals who have some curiosity about broader questions. He added that certificates help students with placement by demonstrating the ability of a potential faculty member to teach a range of courses. Finally, Prof. Roche noted, certificate programs give faculty members not in PhD-granting departments an opportunity to engage with graduate students.

Prof. Roche then advocated that the Graduate Council develop criteria for any new certificate programs at the University and have responsibility for approving them. As for existing programs, he believed that they should be required to conform to the same standards and to undergo rigorous evaluation, with the proviso that students currently in the process of earning any certificates be grandfathered in for a certain number of years.

Prof. Woo said that she supported certificate programs in general but questioned the distinction made at times between “graduate” and “undergraduate” certificates. This nomenclature adds a layer of credentialing that is not appropriate. The value of certificate programs is their usefulness in offering a compact curriculum that then provides students with a way of demonstrating their efforts to broaden mastery of a subject area or skill. She noted that the question before the Council should not be what the *University* gains from granting certificates but what our *students* gain from earning them.

Prof. Merz said that his experience with certificates is with the engineering department at a state institution. In many cases, it was neither graduate students nor

undergraduate students who earned the certificates offered but engineers working in industry who wanted to gain a certain expertise, for example, in computational aeronautics. Certificates of this type are often a means of generating revenue for a department or college, and he believes that they should be overseen by a college council rather than by the Graduate Council.

Ms. McCumbers advocated developing different criteria for the two kinds of certificates discussed. She said that the value of certificates lies in making students more marketable and providing them with an opportunity for professional development. She emphasized that professional development is a pressing concern for graduate students. The various teaching certificates offered by the Kaneb Center are examples of how graduate students can develop marketable skills.

Prof. Pyne, the former director of the University's program in gender studies, said that she was part of the research team that developed the proposal for the gender studies certificate approved last March by the College Council of Arts and Letters. She noted that most of the certificate programs in gender studies are offered by institutions with *programs* in this field rather than departments. For example, Emory has a women's studies department and thus offers a PhD rather than a certificate in gender studies; Princeton, on the other hand, with a program in women's studies, is developing a certificate in gender studies, as is Yale. She emphasized to Council members that certificates are "absolutely the wave of the future" in gender studies.

As for certificates in general, Prof. Pyne said that certificates in an academic area are not meant to stand alone. Because they are awarded in conjunction with a masters or PhD degree, they demonstrate a concentration in an area of interest. Prof. Pyne added that in her own experience with graduate students at Notre Dame, certificates are a great help to students on the job market. Finally, as Prof. Roche noted, they are invaluable in that they allow faculty not in PhD-granting departments to have a graduate student community and to conduct research at a high level.

Prof. Holland thanked Council members for their comments and said that the Graduate School will develop a proposal for certificate programs based on the discussion.

Prof. Holland noted that a copy of the Graduate School's *QuickFacts* brochure was at each member's place, along with a report on last year's graduate student survey. It is essential that the Council consider the survey results. He plans to do so at the next meeting.

There being no further business, Prof. Holland adjourned the meeting at 5:10 p.m.

Procedure for election of the search committee for the Dean of the Graduate School:

Composition:

The search committee for the Dean of the Graduate School is composed of five members of the tenured faculty and one student enrolled in the Graduate School. The Provost chairs the committee. After today's election, he may appoint up to two additional members from the regular faculty to the committee in order to ensure that it represents a broad range of views and perspectives.

Election Procedure:

Note: During each round of voting, the number of votes cast by each Council member will be equivalent to the number of vacancies available. A Council member may not cast more than one vote for a candidate during any given round of voting. There will be no absentee ballots.

(1) Student member:

The first student to receive the vote of a majority of Council members present is elected to the search committee.

(2) Faculty members:

To encourage diversity on many levels, the election of the search committee's five tenured faculty members occurs in two stages. Three members will be elected in the first stage, and two members elected in the second stage.

First stage: Electing the first, second, and third search committee members

A slate of nominees will be presented. Further nominations may be received from Council members present, with the expectation that the nominee will have indicated his/her willingness to serve. Council members may nominate themselves.

Voting: A nominee is elected to the search committee upon receiving the vote of a majority of Council members present.

(To facilitate counting the votes, members should use separate pieces of paper for each name.)

Votes will be conducted in successive rounds until all vacancies are filled.

If, during any round of voting, more nominees receive the vote of a majority of the Council members present than there are vacancies remaining, a run-off of those nominees

will occur. During the first stage of voting, any nominee receiving three or fewer votes during any round will be eliminated from the process; however, nominees eliminated during the first stage may stand for election again during the second stage of voting.

Second stage: Electing the fourth and fifth search committee members

We will return to the original slate of nominees (excluding those nominees already elected to the search committee during the first stage). Council members may nominate additional tenured faculty, including themselves, to stand for election. Again, it is assumed that nominees will have expressed a willingness to serve.

As during the first round, the nominees receiving the vote of a majority of Council members present will be elected to the search committee, with the same provisos applying.

Executive Committee of the Graduate Council

The Graduate Council has an executive committee composed of the dean of the Graduate School, the associate deans, a liaison from the Academic Council (the one member of the group defined in Article IV, Sec. 3 (d)(3) who is on the Academic Council's executive committee), three faculty members elected by and from the Graduate Council (no more than one of whom can be *ex officio*, as defined in Article IV(3)(d)(1)), and one graduate student representative elected by and from the Graduate Council. The dean of the Graduate School serves as chair. Executive committee meetings are called by the chair or when requested by a majority of executive committee members. The functions of the executive committee are to: (1) develop the agenda for Graduate Council meetings; (2) advise the dean of the Graduate School, and (3) recommend the formation of subcommittees that would address areas of concern and report to the dean or to the Council as a whole.