

**THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE COLLEGE COUNCIL  
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS  
February 14, 2011  
3:30 pm  
McKenna Hall Auditorium**

**ATTENDANCE**

Deans:

*Dean:* John McGreevy; *Associate Deans:* JoAnn DellaNeva, Dan Myers, Maura Ryan, *Assistant Deans:* Paulette Curtis, Ava Preacher, Nicholas Russo, Joseph Stanfiel, Vicki Toumayan

Chairpersons and Directors: Matt Ashley, Charlie Barber, Theodore Cachey, Jr., Donald Crafton, Richard Cross, Joshua Diehl, Richard Donnelly, John Duffy, Louis MacKenzie, Peter McQuillan, Rory McVeigh, Thomas Noble, Robert Norton, Mark Schurr, John Sitter

Elected Faculty: Laura Carlson, Noreen Deane-Moran, Richard Donnelly, Margot Fassler, Robert Fishman, Mary Frandsen, Liangyan Ge, Patrick Griffin, Sean Kelly, Nelson Mark, Jessica Payne, Eleanor Pettus, Malcolm Phelan, Michael Pries, Alison Rice, David Thomas, Kristin Valentino, John Welle, Shauna Williams

Graduate Student Representative: Brandon Bruning

Undergraduate Student Representative: Bridget Mullins

Regularly Invited Guests, Observers, and Resource People: Robert Becht (Office of the Dean), Marie Blakey (Office of the Dean), Richard Gray (Center for Creative Computing), Timothy Matovina (Cushwa Center), Kathleen Opel (Office of International Studies), Matt Zyniewicz (Office of the Dean)

Excused: Olivia Remie Constable, Erika Doss, Sandra Gustafson, Peter Holland, Michael Pries, Dayle Seidenspinner-Núñez, Hannelore Weber

Dean John McGreevy called the meeting to order at 3:33 pm.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes from the September 29, 2010 College Council meeting were approved without corrections.

**COLLEGE BUSINESS**

**Report on College space and future plans**

J. McGreevy stated that the Dean's Office has struggled with space issues over the past three or four years, and such issues have become increasingly complex. Arts and Letters faculty and staff are in sixteen different buildings across campus and the city of South Bend. Arts and Letters is a fairly complex enterprise with over 500 faculty and at least 100 staff. As part of thinking through how to manage space processes better, we have pursued a number of different actions, one of which was to bring in Scott Kachmarik from the University's Rotation Program.

S. Kachmarik was charged with analyzing all of the dimensions of the College's space issues. One of S. Kachmarik's recommendations which the College adopted was to hire a new facilities manager. The

facilities manager, Matthew Fulcher, will be the point person in the College for all space issues, and will help the College think through strategic planning.

S. Kachmarik spoke about what he has learned through surveys, meetings with chairpersons, faculty, and deans. He began by noting that the College has been systematically addressing space issues as far back as 1992, and had made some progress. S. Kachmarik hopes the current project will push the College forward at an even greater speed. He viewed his mission as developing a strategic plan to assess and evaluate the current and future space needs of the College. The strategic plan was to establish the goals and objectives that will meet the space needs. He also was to help the College improve procedures, processes and communication related to the transitioning of office/lab space between outgoing and incoming faculty, including departmental renovations. To accomplish this mission, he reviewed operational information, pursued a survey of faculty, met with various staff in the College, met with the College chairpersons, and met with other campus stakeholders (e.g., Architect's Office, Procurement Services, etc.). In short, in various ways he has been able to see different spaces and hear different perspectives about space over the past six months. This took some time, as the College encompasses over 600,000 square feet (teaching space, office space, lab space).

S. Kachmarik summarized the various rankings of the survey items according to the top favorable assessments, least favorable assessments, and items of top importance and of least importance. He also briefly discussed the themes of the written comments from the survey based on his discussions with department chairpersons and from the campus stakeholder meetings. The survey questions covered: (1) what faculty/staff liked best about their space; (2) what they liked least; (3) what they would change if they could. Most of the respondents to the survey were Teaching and Research faculty (134 responses), followed by Special Professional Faculty (26), visiting faculty (4), adjunct faculty (4), emeriti (4). He also heard from 39 different staff members, and 2 undergraduate students.

In the end, he recommended that the College should: (1) determine the appropriate organizational structures to advocate, prioritize, facilitate, manage and communicate the College's space management and facilities issues; (2) engage the Architect's Office to develop a facilities plan based on the College's strategic plan; (3) examine, evaluate and implement policies, procedures and processes that impact space issues and contribute to effective management and faculty/staff involvement and understanding; (4) develop appropriate structures and vehicles to facilitate communication, involvement and satisfaction in space management issues, planning and projects while maintaining dialogue between and among all faculty, staff and stakeholders that support the College.

S. Kachmarik also suggested some operational strategies: (1) develop transition checklists; (2) consider offsite locations for future development to provide easy access for research participants; (3) consider alternate arrangements for gather and retail spaces; (4) determine the purpose of the Great Hall and renovate appropriately; (5) consider utilization strategies to support growing demand for academic conference and intellectual engagement support services.

J. McGreevy asked for questions.

Louis MacKenzie (Chairperson of Music) asked if the Crowley building is on the renovation list or the "not-to-renovate list"? J. McGreevy stated that on the one hand, both Crowley and Riley have been termed "tear-down buildings" on the Architect's list. On the other hand, the College's top building priority is the social science building, and the College is raising money for that building. Crowley and Riley would be next in line in the next capital campaign. So, it makes sense to try to repair and renovate those facilities at this time.

The Council members showed their appreciation to S. Kachmarik for his work over the past several months.

### **Summer session undergraduate courses**

J. McGreevy next invited Associate Dean JoAnn DellaNeva to talk about summer session. J. DellaNeva in turn invited Assistant Dean Ava Preacher to present the issue. A. Preacher stated that the summer session courses over the past two years have changed, in that oversight of the Summer Session Office went from the Provost's Office to the Registrar's Office. In the past, the two-credit courses and the three-credit courses over the span of three to five weeks during the summer were not previously available for the regular Notre Dame faculty to teach. Such courses were typically developed by programs that came to campus through outside groups who used our space and rented our facilities. With the turnover to the Registrar's Office, this sort of schedule of courses was published and regular faculty began to offer two- to three-credit undergraduate courses in the time frame of three to five weeks during the summer months. This is problematic for students, because students then are not able to take more than one class. Such courses must meet for several hours during the day. The students also try to work during the day, and this sort of schedule prevents them from being able to devote appropriate time to their studies. This is what the Office of Undergraduate Studies is hearing from the students.

Further, the College had adopted a policy that the University would not accept transfer credits for a summer course outside of Notre Dame that met for less than four weeks. If a course was less than four weeks, the course had to show a very strong rationale for such a short time frame. Rationales came from mostly language programs and/or live-in programs where students attend class all day and do nothing but speak the new language.

A. Preacher asked the Council if the College needs to have a standard policy about how long undergraduate courses must be? She proposed that no summer session undergraduate course should be scheduled for fewer than four weeks.

Tim Matovina (Director, Cushwa Center) asked if this new policy would apply to graduate courses. A. Preacher confirmed that the new policy would be applied only to undergraduate courses. T. Matovina further asked how the policy might affect registration and enrollment? Some non-Notre Dame students take our courses in the summer and this policy might affect their decisions to come here. Are most of the students in these courses our own undergraduate students? A. Preacher stated that most of the students in these classes are our own students who stay on campus; we do not have many non-Notre Dame students enrolling in these classes.

Associate Dean Dan Myers asked if we have investigated what would be eliminated or prevented by this policy? He would not like for the new policy to be a cause for concern for some of our key courses for our curricula. The Department of Anthropology, for example, has a summer program for field work. Further, D. Myers suggested that the proposal also show that the policy does not affect graduate courses so that it is clear to others in the future. A. Preacher agreed that any final proposal should make that clear.

J. McGreevy asked if we know how long the anthropology field sessions are. Mark Schurr (Chairperson, Department of Anthropology) replied that the typical minimum time frame for such courses is three weeks, one credit hour per week. The students usually meet forty hours per week, which might meet the appropriate rationale requirement to qualify for an exception to the policy. A. Preacher confirmed that the field courses would qualify as an immersion course, similar to the immersion language courses.

D. Myers asked if there are any other courses that we might not be thinking about at this time that may be adversely affected by this policy? A. Preacher replied that there are summer service learning courses, but those courses do not typically take place on campus. This policy would not apply to those courses because students typically spend about six weeks engaging such courses. Also, internships for credit can be pursued at a variable credit. Students, for example, could get three credits for their month-long internship if they are working forty-hour weeks.

Matt Ashley (Chairperson, Department of Theology) stated that there is academic credit connected to the service learning program, the credit typically occurs during the academic year in conjunction with the summer learning experience. So, the service learning courses most likely would not be affected by this policy.

J. McGreevy stated that in his conversations with the assistant deans it was clear that the policy is proposed in the best interests for the students. There was some concern faculty who taught the seven-week summer courses would want to reduce their seven-week course to a three-, or four- or five-week course. That would allow them to teach the course and pursue more research during the summer months. But it is a pedagogical concern about the reduced time frame for the undergraduate courses.

Motion: Undergraduate summer session courses should normally adhere to a seven-week schedule, and no undergraduate summer session course should be scheduled for fewer than four weeks, with the exception of immersion programs (e.g., in the languages and in Anthropology). Graduate courses are not included in this motion.

Motion passed overwhelmingly.

### **Reallocation committee**

J. McGreevy reminded the Council members that Fr. John Jenkins (President) sent a letter describing proposed reallocations across the University. J. McGreevy will serve on the committee that will consider the reallocation proposals, and wanted to ask the Council members if they had any questions.

Robert Norton (Chairperson, German and Russian Languages and Literatures) asked what reallocation means. J. McGreevy responded that there is a fine line between “reallocation” and “cut”. Fr. Jenkins, John Affleck-Graves (Executive Vice President), and to some extent, Tom Burish (Provost) are grateful to the Board of Trustees that at a moment of great economic crisis Notre Dame has not once had a 0% increase in salaries, and indeed more than that, allowed major new research projects—especially in the sciences—and major efforts at hiring, especially in Arts and Letters.

We have hired well beyond replacement hires in terms of faculty over the past three years. Putting major new dollars into the academic enterprise as a strategic decision may be the best chance in our lifetimes for Notre Dame to grow and excel even more. Many of our peer institutions are having severe budget difficulties. The Board is concerned that the University’s funds are being used as efficiently and as wisely as possible.

Don Crafton (Chairperson, Department of Film, Television and Theatre) wondered what the timetable was for the reallocation efforts. J. McGreevy said that the efforts will occur fairly quickly with recommendations to the executive team (Burish, Affleck-Graves, Jenkins) by the end of the semester. Items that will be considered: Notre Dame’s retirement benefits, parking and a whole range of issues across the University.

Theodore Cachey (Chairperson, Department of Romance Languages and Literatures) asked how the reallocation relates to the recent campaign that will conclude this summer, when the campaign is reported to have raised more than the initial goal. Will the reallocations also consider the strategic plan that informed the campaign, especially with regard to funding academic chairs? J. McGreevy said that the University would like to announce in June that the campaign reached \$2 billion, a significant amount and largest ever for a Catholic university. It is the largest ever by a school without a medical school. He does not think the campaign will have an effect on the reallocation process, because the money given to the campaign is almost all targeted. In terms of endowed chairs, seven years ago when the campaign was developed Mark Roche (former Arts and Letters Dean) said his top priority in the campaign was endowed chairs. Arts and Letters, then, has done reasonably well with regard to funding endowed chairs, getting about 60% of the funding sought. The funding for the outstanding chairs will come from the reallocation efforts if they are part of strategic academic priorities.

D. Myers stated that having us pay for parking and reducing the commitments to retirement signifies a pay cut, a compensation cut, and both are permanent; whereas, student financial aid is a temporary problem. It seems that we are addressing a temporary problem with a permanent solution. Has there been any thought to matching the solution to the actual problem? J. McGreevy reminded the Council that the committee has yet to meet, so there has not been much thought at that point. He mentioned parking and retirements because they were two topics on a list of initial items to consider for reallocation. But, we are the only major university out of the top thirty who do not pay for parking. And, while it is a compensation issue, it is a way to generate revenue for the University, and the revenue could go to undergraduate financial aid or to another priority. He does recognize that it would be a reduction in compensation.

Assistant Dean Joseph Stanfiel wondered if athletics is being considered as an entity for financial cuts. The \$20 to \$40 million amount that is targeted for reallocation is precisely the amount put into the new hockey arena. While some look forward to taking part in games in the new arena, a new arena is not really relevant to being a better university. J. McGreevy imagined that one answer could be that while the money for the arena was not on the list of top five priorities for the University, the money for the hockey arena could not be targeted for anything else. Knowing that fact, people on both sides of the issues would have good arguments. The athletic department is part of the 2% reallocation, as is every unit in the University. The non-academic units have had significant reallocations over the past five years, while the academic units have been relatively sheltered and protected.

D. Crafton noted that the new buildings also need maintenance, and the funds for such maintenance are typically not part of the gift. So those costs also come out of the bottom line. He further wondered how development officers try to negotiate the would-be donors. Do they try to steer them to our priorities? J. McGreevy does think that, based on his past three years as dean, the executive team (Burish, Affleck-Graves, Jenkins) and development vigorously guide donors to our academic priorities. Recall that very few—almost none—Division I athletic programs return funds to the academic enterprise each year.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew C. Zyniewicz  
Executive Assistant to the Dean