

**THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE COLLEGE COUNCIL
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS
Monday, April 20, 2015
McKenna Hall Auditorium**

ATTENDANCE

Deans: *Dean:* John McGreevy; *Associate Deans:* JoAnn DellaNeva, Maura Ryan; *Assistant Deans:* Collin Meissner, Ava Preacher, Nick Russo, Joseph Stanfiel, Vicki Toumayan

Chairpersons and Directors: Thomas Anderson, Jim Collins, Richard Cross, William Evans, Steve Fallon, David Gasperetti, Richard Gray, Patrick Griffin, Elizabeth Mazurek, Peter McQuillan, Rory McVeigh, Gretchen Reydams-Schils, Peter Smith, Yongping Zhu

Elected Faculty: Cindy Bergeman, David Betson, Alessia Blad, Catherine Bolten, Noreen Deane-Moran, Denise Della Rossa, Sabrina Ferri, Robert Goulding, Encarnacion Juarez, Louis MacKenzie, Tara MacLeod, Laura Miller, Marisel Moreno, Tzvi Novick, Abby Palko, Catherine Perry, Sebastiano Rosato, Jason Ruiz, Thomas Stapleford, James Sullivan, Hannelore Weber, Shauna Williams, Michelle Wirth

Undergraduate Student Representative: Erin Portman, Emma Venter

Regularly Invited Guests, Observers, and Resource People: Margo Fassler (Program of Sacred Music), Kate Garry (Dean's Office), Essaka Joshua (College Seminar), Geraldine Meehan (Faculty Engagement/Global Gateways), Kathleen Opel (Office of International Studies), Matt Zyniewicz (Dean's Office)

Excused: Matthew Ashley, Dan Graff, Christopher Hamlin, Peter Holland, Tom Merluzzi, Brian O'Conchubhair, Hugh Page, Alison Rice, Robert Schmuhl, Mark Schurr, Julianne Turner, Henry Weinfield

Dean John McGreevy convened the meeting at 3:35 pm.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the February 10, 2015 College Council meeting were approved.

COLLEGE BUSINESS

Proposal for a German Studies Major and a German Studies Supplementary Major

J. McGreevy invited David Gasperetti and Denise Della Rossa to the front of the room to present the proposal. JoAnn DellaNeve mentioned that the Undergraduate Studies committee did review the initial proposal and made some suggestions for change and then suggested that the proposal come to the full Council. D. Gasperetti and D. Della Rossa explained the rationale for the proposal.

D. Gasperetti stated that in 2002 and again in 2013 external review committees suggested that the Department look into a German Studies major. The German section of the Department met for at least three sessions to debate the possibility of having a German Studies major, and developed the proposal that was considered. The Department did not think the new major will attract many students, perhaps even the number of majors will be below ten. But the courses will attract many more students than the students in the major.

Another reason to develop a new German Studies major has to do with enrollments. The German section teaches almost all of its courses in the language, making it difficult to reach out to more students across the University. The plan is to teach two 40000-level courses, one will be taught in German and one in English.

Rory McVeigh (Chairperson, Department of Sociology) asked what the enrollment is like in German Studies at other universities. D. Della Rossa explained that the Department did some comparisons with other universities and found that the number of majors in German Studies depended on the emphasis that the respective departments placed on German Studies. For example, one department teaches only German Studies.

Catherine Perry (Department of Romance Languages) wondered how the courses for the German Studies major will be numbered. D. Della Rossa mentioned that the new German Studies courses will not affect the numbering system already in place in terms of which courses will go into the German language major and which courses will go into the German Studies major.

Margot Fassler (Sacred Music and Department of Theology) stated that two things come to mind. First, in order to go onto graduate studies, particularly in Theology and Music, students really need to understand German in order to understand the literature. Students should understand how important German is for graduate studies. Second, Medieval Studies might also be helpful with regard to faculty with expertise in German literature. D. Gasperetti confirmed that the Medieval Institute faculty have proposed courses for the German Studies major. J. McGreevy recalled that the recent external reviewers complemented the Department and the College on the range of scholars who do scholarship related to the German language and German Studies.

Steve Fallon (Chairperson, Department of English) asked if the reflective paper/rationale required in the junior year or fall of the senior year is too early in the students' college careers. D. Della Rossa stated that the reflective paper/rationale is intended to provide the students with some structure or rationale for what they are doing with the major and why they are pursuing such a course of study. Most students in the German and Russian Department do not declare their major until junior year anyway, so it would be difficult to ask for the reflection paper/rationale earlier in their careers here. The Department would like to ask for the paper at some point, and the end of the junior year seemed like the most appropriate and feasible time.

J. McGreevy called for a vote to approve the proposed German Studies major and supplementary major. **All voting members voted to approve the major and supplementary major with one abstention.**

Climate Survey

Associate Dean Maura Ryan provided an update on behalf of the subcommittee on faculty affairs charged with formulating a response to the to the recent major faculty experience climate survey of faculty across the University. M. Ryan recalled that the Provost convened a blue-ribbon committee to look into ways to respond to the survey. That committee submitted a report that can be found on the Provost's website. Following that report, Dean Laura Carlson conducted more than 50 one-on-one interviews with faculty, some graduate students and postdoctoral fellows. The Dean's committee of Women Faculty and the subcommittee on faculty affairs met with L. Carlson to receive a preliminary breakdown of the results of those interviews. Taken together the results of those interviews and the faculty experience climate survey, most of the issues concerned the perception by women and men that the University and College climate is not as conducive to women's flourishing as scholars and as leaders as we would like it to be, that we are not providing the kind of leadership opportunities for women, nor are we preparing women well for leadership opportunities that might arise. We also have a long way to go in terms of diversity and inclusion, of race, gender, and religious pluralism.

The University Committee on Women Faculty and Students (a University-wide elected committee that includes faculty, graduate students and undergraduate students) will work with the Provost's Office and L. Carlson to formulate a set of recommendations on the University level. Further, the College Council's subcommittee on faculty affairs will explore how the College can participate in the University-level initiatives. There will probably be a call for mentoring resources for faculty on diversity and inclusion training, including such topics as unconscious bias in classrooms and in departmental interactions. The subcommittee will also consider family-friendly policies. L. Carlson and other colleagues are working on developing a proposal for an institutional grant from the National Science Foundation aimed at climate issues in the STEM disciplines.

The College will also attempt to provide resources for professional and personal networking, and doing a better job at building cohorts and introducing people to University services, especially at the associate professor level across the University.

J. McGreevy mentioned that the College will also recommit to hiring practices aimed at diversity and inclusion. Provost Tom Burish has asked each college to analyze their respective hiring patterns and what we might be able to do better and differently. The College has done pretty well at meeting its goal of hiring at least 40% women each year for the past several years, some years well above 50%. The College has also done well in hiring a number of Latino/a faculty over the past three or four years, more success than many of Notre Dame's AAU peer institutions. The College, however, has done disastrously in hiring African American faculty over the past few years. While the University has grown in faculty over the past twelve years or so, the University has the same number of African American faculty.

J. McGreevy presented a draft proposal to the Deans and Chairpersons of the College, and plans to have a fuller proposal—about a three-year plan that attempts to increase the number of African American faculty by 50%—for the College Council to consider in the fall 2015.

Darcia Narvaez (Department of Psychology) mentioned a recent article in the student newspaper about women at the University in leadership positions. Could the College apply more pressure from grassroots efforts to try to diversify the institution's administration, including the appointment of more women in

leadership positions? Further, can Notre Dame become friendlier to female administrators, in effect, become more family-friendly? J. McGreevy noted that such concerns were also in the climate survey. Notre Dame did better than peer institutions on about 90% of the questions. However, Notre Dame did not do as well as peer institutions on questions regarding women in leadership roles. M. Ryan pointed out that L. Carlson is also trying to develop an all-women ND LEAD program in the near future that will attempt to address some of the issues regarding female leadership opportunities. D. Narvaez stated that the article pointed out that an all-male administration fosters a male lifestyle on campus. Notre Dame really has to look at the broad issues related to supporting women and children. J. McGreevy recalled that over the seven years that he's served as dean, there have never been more than four women who were chairs. There are fewer full professor women to serve as leaders than there are full professor men. Further, not many women have suggested that they would consider serving as a chairperson.

R. McVeigh asked that while Notre Dame does have to compare itself with other institutions, why not bump up the 40% women goal for hiring? The pools of graduate students to choose from are changing, where departments might be able to hire more than 50% women. J. McGreevy also observed that the availability of female candidates varies greatly by discipline.

To underscore D. Narvaez's point, M. Ryan commented that Notre Dame also needs to do a better job with policies that allow all faculty, staff and students to flourish.

Parking Proposal

J. McGreevy invited some members of the Council's faculty affairs subcommittee—Robert Goulding (Program of Liberal Studies), Tzvi Novick (Department of Theology), Gretchen Reydams-Schils (Chairperson, Program of Liberal Studies), and Tom Stapleford (Program of Liberal Studies)—to introduce the Parking Report that they authored for the Council's consideration. M. Ryan provided some context for the discussion by stating that many concerns have been expressed to her about the recent parking situation, including the recent university offer to faculty and staff to reserve parking spaces in certain locations across campus. M. Ryan then encouraged faculty to write a report that the faculty affairs subcommittee could consider. J. McGreevy stated that the Council could: (1) vote to approve the report, (2) send it forward to Executive Vice President Affleck Graves, and/or (3) send it to the faculty senate.

T. Stapleford noted that while there are eight recommendations in the report, there is one overriding recommendation, namely, to freeze the plan to provide more reserved parking spaces and have a broader, University-wide discussion about parking, what the goals are and why reserved parking was brought forward. There are four broad areas of concern. First, the distribution of parking and optimization of space. Why could not faculty and staff share parking spaces? Second, lack of accessible parking. Many accessible parking spaces are not near where faculty or staff work. Third, short term parking has been drastically reduced. Fourth, equity. Staff will often have to be on campus from 8:00 am 5:00 pm and they are the persons who will least afford to retain reserved parking. This opportunity to retain reserved parking cuts against the grain of Catholic Social Teaching. Finally there did not appear that policy makers did not pay much attention to the working habits of faculty, particularly College of Arts and Letters faculty and how the parking changes will affect their working habits. How are the parking options affecting the community life of faculty who increasingly do not wish to come to campus on days when they do not teach and/or have office hours? The parking options present a disincentive for faculty to come to campus.

Louis MacKenzie (Department of Romance Languages) observed that his reserved parking space as Department Chair was often taken by another vehicle, defying the reserved space and tow-zone sign. The reserved parking spaces will be abused by people who are running late to class or to an appointment. The new policy, according to L. MacKenzie, is a bad idea.

Encarnacion Juarez (Department of Romance Languages and Literatures) stated that the current parking options do not work for her because, after she parks, she takes a bus, but the bus does not go to O'Shaughnessy Hall.

Peter Smith (Chairperson, Department of Music) asked if there has been any discussion about building a multi-level parking garage. J. McGreevy suggested that the authors of the parking report meet with J. Affleck-Graves to hear his understanding and vision for parking at Notre Dame. J. Affleck-Graves would probably note that parking is not a new topic but the limited number of parking spaces is a relatively recent concern. He may also mention that Notre Dame is the only elite private university that does not charge for parking. Other institutions fund the building and maintenance of parking structures through high parking fees. In the end, it is difficult to figure out how to pay for a parking garage.

Noreen Deane-Moran (Department of English) commented that there are only three handicap parking spots for Flanner Hall, spaces which the cooks at North Dining Hall take up by 6:30 am. At one point, N. Deane-Moran received a parking ticket twice a week for \$50 each because she parked over an hour in her handicap parking spot close to where she taught. She now pays someone to go park her car after dropping her off at Flanner where she teaches. Further, working trucks often take up the parking spots near Flanner, especially on weekends. Those trucks do not get tickets for parking in no-parking zones, while faculty do receive parking tickets for parking in no-parking zones.

G. Reydams-Schils suggested that reserved parking spots in fact compound the parking problems because the reserved spots are not the ideal optimization of space. Many of the parking spots stand empty for large amounts of time depending on people's habits. It might be more optimal to have more short-term parking spots—about two hours—which would be utilized much more frequently than reserved parking spots. R. Goulding added that the accessible parking situation is worse during the summer and fall because most of the accessible parking spots are open to the public. There should be some spots reserved for faculty and staff.

J. McGreevy reviewed each recommendation in the report. First, "If the reserved parking program is to be expanded, could it be done in a way to maximize the continuous use of the spaces—which would include allowing faculty and staff to share the use of a single space?" For instance, two faculty could buy a parking space and arrange among themselves the times that each would use the space. Laura Miller (Department of Psychology) added that such an arrangement might work especially well for some staff members who work separate shifts.

R. McVeigh suggested that the Council should take a harder stance not to have reserved parking spaces because it exacerbates a bad situation, as G. Reydams-Schils stated, with regard to the ideal optimization of space.

Elizabeth Mazurek (Department of English) asked about having a reserved "parking lot" rather than a single car space; that way spaces are utilized more frequently. J. McGreevy observed that the University basically already has such an arrangement.

William Evans (Department of Economics) wondered why a parking space at \$480 violates Catholic Social Teaching while a parking space at \$240 does not violate Catholic Social Teaching? J. McGreevy replied that in principle one could make the argument that the cost of the parking space could be scaled by income.

Cindy Bergeman (Department of Psychology) did not like the idea about splitting cost and use of parking spaces because the University would be encouraging faculty not to be on campus. Searching for a parking space is not a good use of anybody's time, but the idea of splitting the cost and use of a parking space almost creates a structure for when faculty will be on campus. One faculty member might be here on Mondays and Wednesdays, while the other faculty member might be here on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Further, she did not remember getting an email or a survey about the reserved parking spaces. Why is the University doing this? Is it for persons in the Development Office, so that they can have parking spaces? J. McGreevy did not believe that to be the case—in terms of the reserved parking spaces were really for the Development Office—but he did underscore a communications concern about communicating the reserved parking changes.

P. Smith wondered if the central administration has to struggle with finding parking spaces. If they did, they might have more sympathy with the complications that the parking situation has caused.

J. McGreevy called for a vote concerning the first recommendation: "If the reserved parking program is to be expanded, could it be done in a way to maximize the continuous use of the spaces—which would include allowing faculty and staff to share the use of a single space?" **The vote was: 7 in favor, 31 apposed, with 1 abstention.**

J. McGreevy next asked for a vote concerning the second group of recommendations: "First to increase the number of accessible parking spaces near the buildings where most faculty and staff actually work; second, to reserve most of those accessible parking spaces as only for faculty and staff; and third, to consider whether a limited number of accessible spaces could be provided only for faculty (not staff) adjacent to buildings where they actually teach (such as DeBartolo and O'Shaughnessy). These could be time-limited, providing them access to their teaching space for the period of their class (say, two hours)." **The vote was unanimously in support of the recommendation.**

The College Council voted on the third group of recommendations: "To provide more temporary parking spaces, and to consider increasing the time limit to two hours (at least on some of the spaces); to reinstate temporary spaces reserved only for the use of University employees, to at least the same number as were lost from the stadium circle; to reserve some temporary spaces for expectant mothers. It has become the norm even at most supermarkets in the area, to reserve one space adjacent to the accessible parking, for expectant mothers; surely Notre Dame could follow their example. What is more, such a move would obviously be in accord with Notre Dame's respect for life." In other words, who is in favor of increasing the number of accessible for handicapped persons and temporary parking spaces and limiting such space to faculty and staff? Who is in favor of more temporary spaces? **The votes were: 31 in favor, 5 apposed, 3 abstentions.**

The Council next considered the issue of equity that the parking program raised. J. McGreevy summarized the issue: The parking program guarantees reliable parking only to those who have \$480 to spare in their budget. The program introduces a two-tier system, of those who can afford privileged parking and those who cannot. Hannelore Weber (Department of German and Russian Languages) suggested that perhaps the administration could charge a fraction of a percent of one's salary rather

than have a set amount. Michelle Wirth (Department of Psychology) asked for the number of already-reserved parking spaces on campus. J. McGreevy replied that there are about 30-40 currently reserved spaces, and most if not all of those are paid for as well.

T. Stapleford asked if the Council should vote on the expansion of the reserved parking in general. J. McGreevy asked for a vote. Who opposes the \$480 reserved, single parking spaces scheme? Assistant Dean Ava Preacher wondered whether security enforced the current parking areas. There are often cars in inappropriate parking areas.

W. Evans suggested a scenario: A faculty member has to leave to pick up her children from pre-school in the morning, but has to park in the Bulla parking lot upon her return to campus. That activity takes about 20 minutes a day, and with a typical 250-day work year, that would be about 5,000 hours a year to walk back-and-forth for parking. He asked why is it bad for her to spend \$480 to park in a reserved parking spot near Flanner Hall? T. Stapleford responded that the issue has to do with who has the income to afford the parking space fee. W. Evans observed that the two people in his department who will pay the fee are staff. W. Evans asked why is not time an efficient way to allocate things rather than money. The people who pay the fees are demonstrating that they value the spaces at a higher rate. Why is that bad? G. Reydams-Schils responded that the spaces will remain empty when the faculty or staff are not on campus.

Associate Dean Peter Holland stated that the real scandal in the parking issue is the fake consultation. Nobody knows anybody who has been consulted on the parking issue. The faculty recall that the administration had to remove the statement on the move from TIAA-CREF to Fidelity some time back when it became obvious that the decision had already been made, and hence no consultation. The failure of the administration in various segments to consult properly is deeply shocking. P. Holland had discussed with J. Affleck-Graves the effect on parking that the new buildings will have near the DeBartolo Performing Arts Center [DPAC], only to discover that nobody discussed the impact with the Executive Director of DPAC. It is ludicrous to consider that consultation on the parking matter took place and no one noticed. W. Evan's point may be valid, but the University cannot evaluate the possibilities until we have consultation. P. Holland suggests that the Council request that the administration suspend the parking decision, undertake a consultation, report, discuss, and then see where the University goes from there. G. Reydams-Schils said that the Council is not only voting on the parking decision but also for much broader consultation. H. Weber noted that the quality of life for faculty and staff has gone down as a result of the parking situation. P. Smith suggested that the University hire a firm with expertise in space management to analyze the parking situation on campus. N. Deane-Moran observed that there are shuttle buses to cart people to and from their offices, but not for staff on the third shift. M. Ryan suggested that the administration slowdown, have a genuine consultation on parking with the appropriate governing bodies on campus. The parking proposal should be put on hold until a full parking plan has been developed. The faculty senate should be consulted. G. Reydams-Schils stated that there should be a full plan, not a plan that is implemented piecemeal, and the plan should be discussed at College Council and Faculty Senate. D. Gasperetti mentioned that as a member of Faculty Senate he has observed that the administration has not consulted the Senate on a number of issues. He thought that his colleagues on the Senate would like to consider a full parking plan. S. Fallon stated that the College Councils across campus should consider a full parking plan, not only the Senate. Catherine Bolten (Department of Anthropology) urged that when an outside consultant comes to campus to review the parking situation, the bottom line (or the maximization of profit for the University) should not be the primary consideration.

J. McGreevy called for a vote on the proposal: Does the Council favor asking the administration to stop activity with the new parking proposal until proper consultation (e.g., meetings, surveys, town hall meetings) with all those affected by future parking plans. **Votes: 41 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstentions.**

ADJOURNMENT

J. McGreevy adjourned the plenary meeting at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew C. Zyniewicz
Dean's Executive Administrator