

College of Arts and Sciences

Faculty Meeting Minutes

October 7, 1998

Called to order at 3:30 p.m.

The minutes from the April meeting were approved

I. President's Report

The President's report was delayed until later in the meeting, and presented after the introduction of new business.

II. Dean's Report

Changes to next year's calendar have been proposed, as well as proposed changes to the rules governing the calendar. The current rules would require having final exams on December 23 next year. Two possible models for next year's calendar, as well as the proposed rule changes, are being circulated by the Department chairs.

Hearing no objections, these issues will be both introduced and voted on at the November 4, 1998 meeting.

The Dean thanked participants who helped out with the federal judicial visit.

Questions from the floor

Marty Hart-Landsberg:

- 1) Why are tenure decisions being delayed until late spring?
- 2) Do the new tenure outcomes in recent years (1 year probation, and promotion to Associate without tenure) represent changes in policy?

At the next meeting, either the Dean or, if appropriate, a representative from the Committee on Promotion and Tenure will provide a response.

III. Committee Reports

The Committee on the Curriculum

Bill Randall: A General Studies Curriculum Task Force has been formed; it will be soliciting proposals from the faculty for alternatives to the current General Education program. An open forum will be held in November to discuss and evaluate alternative proposals which may come forward.

For more information, please contact any of the committee members: Jean Ward, Evan Williams, Jack Hart, Elliot Young, Rachel Wheeler, Jane Hunter, Ben Westervelt, and Laura John '01.

The Committee minutes are on the Governance Webpage after they are approved.

The information gathered in last year's investigation into the general education program is on record, either in the Curriculum Committee minutes, or as e-mail conversation. All of this information is available to the community.

Committee on Admissions, Awards and Academic Standing

For committee chair Kurt Fosso, Dean Atkinson announced that the committee would be considering the following:

1. Implementation of Latin Honors
2. An amendment to the academic integrity policy has been proposed by SAAB, which would require that all academic integrity cases must go to the Honors Board. This amendment will be considered by the committee.

IV. Announcements

The Environmental Affairs Symposium, organized by the inaugural class of the Environmental Studies Major, will be held the week of October 19.

V. New Business

Curt Keedy introduced a motion (with housekeeping changes incorporated below) on behalf of Academic Council. No second was necessary.

WHEREAS, the Academic Council has agreed that a reduction in the frequency of developmental reviews is advisable; now therefore be it

RESOLVED that the following changes occur in the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Review Document:

Section II, Page 3, Line 110-121 and Section III, Page 3, Line 148-151.

Developmental reviews of associate professors occur every six years. Faculty who wish to be reviewed more often than that may request a developmental review by consulting with their chair and/or divisional dean.

Developmental reviews of professors occur if they have been in rank at least six years or if at least six years have elapsed since their last developmental review and if:

1. the faculty member requests a review;
2. the faculty member's divisional dean requests a review; or
3. the faculty member receives two consecutive salary reviews of low percentage salary increases or less.
4. The chair of the reviewee's department (or surrogate) for all developmental reviews will serve as an in-department member of the developmental review committee.

Three rationales for the proposed change were offered:

1. It lightens the reviewing burden for faculty.
2. For Associates, the 4 year review cycle doesn't fit with the 6 year promotion cycle.
3. For full Professors, salary review will signal the need for a developmental review.

Hearing no objections, debate on the motion was suspended until the next meeting.

President's Report

The President began by stating his desire to build some context for the parking and transportation debate. This is a longstanding issue; many people involved with the initial round of Master Planning in 1991-92 are no longer at the college.

A Board of Trustees retreat was held two weeks ago. Capital campaigns exhaust trustees; we have a large number of younger members who must be cultivated. (Trustees have been our main financial supporters: 57% of campaign funds came from trustees, which is an unusually high number) The Trustees agreed to frame the next campaign as a Lewis & Clark Bicentennial, ending in 2005. Four principles will guide the campaign:

1. At all three schools we will continue to emphasize selectivity, and the arts and skills of communication.
2. Consistent with our mission as a residential undergraduate institution, we shall create new accommodations designed to serve 3/4 of our students.
3. Two new academic facilities are proposed: expansion of the Law School; and a new social sciences building.
4. We will seek to utilize the campus on a year round basis.

As part of achieving a better learning environment, we must address the parking issue. Ease of transportation is critical. Recently, a Trustee could not find a parking place with an elderly visitor. Action needs to be taken.

In 1990-91, 200 members of the college community were involved in a 30-year master planning process. No master plan existed, beyond a minimal plan from the 1950's, based on an eastern university quadrangle model. In the 1970's the aesthetics changed to "dropping buildings into the woods". No consideration at all was given to parking.

The 1990-91 the planning process involved 9 focus groups, and was headed up by a steering committee which produced 3 iterations of plans shown to both the community and neighbors (the neighbors have been ignored in the past; as a consequence, bad relations have continued to plague the College).

The principles behind the master plan were (1) to eliminate parking sprawl, and (2) to confine parking on the edge of campus.

Three lots were proposed:

1. Structure behind Pamplin Center 800-900 cars
2. Structure under Law Library 200 cars
3. Residential lot 200 cars

For physical and environmental reasons, the Law parking structure now does not look feasible. A surface lot (170 cars) along the softball field has been advanced as a possible substitute. The City liked it, viewing it as environmentally sensitive. The Law students do not. We are trying to avoid having to build it.

The State of Oregon, and Oregon cities are pushing for transportation management and greater residential density. The College Housing Program is also looking in this direction. At the same time, however, the neighbors are concerned about high density housing, for example on Houston ball fields.

Conversations with TriMet have not proven fruitful. Since 1991, the city's focus has been on light rail; this has led to a squeeze on bus service. We will continue to work with TriMet, in spite of the catch-22 that we are not yet dense enough to justify bus service.

In terms of transport alternatives, the college has introduced the Pioneer Express at a cost of \$58,000/year for initial service. Bus fares are currently subsidized at 20%, and the Executive Council has proposed an increase to 50%.

The Signature Project was the first major project of the 30-year master plan. One achievement of the Signature Project has been to create an auto free zone in the middle of campus.

Why the focus on Transportation and Parking now? Approval of the master plan by the city requires:

1. Half street improvements in front of the campus (curbs, bike lanes, etc.)
2. Intersection improvements at Terwilliger; we bargained to receive some credit against future development fees for doing this.
3. Parking fees.

Why don't Reed College and the University of Portland have to pay for parking? They got in there two years before we did. During the next round of approvals they will probably face fees. However, the college did not fight the city requirement; fees have been under consideration here for quite a while. The TAG group also recommended

parking fees. We as a community desire to accept responsibility for the costs of parking.

The parking issue must be addressed. Parking costs the college directly, in terms of maintenance, policing, and socially via its impact on the disruption of college life.

Why not build the parking structure out of higher tuition? This is not fair to non-drivers. However, not all of the structure will be paid for from parking fees; this would require a fee of \$160 per month.

What have we done since 1990-1991? We have had ongoing conversations with neighbors, TriMet, etc. The neighbors and the city want us to build a parking structure.

The Transportation Advisory Group (TAG) was asked to come up with alternative transportation methods. The group made 17 recommendations, including the need for a parking fee. Of these, 11 have been implemented, others are still being considered.

The Executive Council disagreed with TAG on two issues. How high should the fee be? The TAG fee proposal is too low to serve as an incentive to discourage parking. Should the fee be uniform? There is no way that a modulated fee will have the same effect on people. What about the regressive impact-- can it be addressed? The Executive Council is looking at this issue closely.

This discussion is the beginning of a process, not an end. (even if this was not made clear in the President's memo). In particular the Executive Council is thinking about the following issues:

1. If people are going to pay a \$40/ month fee there should be some visible improvement in the parking situation. We have enough spots, but people can't find them.
2. Car pooling is an important alternative; a reduction in fees as a car-pooling incentive is under consideration.
3. Fees impose different burdens on different people. How can we address this?
4. Should the fee be phased in to reflect improvements?

All parking fees will be used to fund alternative transportation and parking. A significant amount will be spent on improving parking, though there are no immediate plans for a structure. The Trustees want it in the next 7 years.

In summary, the Executive Council is not insensitive to the concerns raised by the community, but we need to begin making changes.

In the discussion that followed, Elliott Young agreed that car use needs to be reduced, and stated his support for a parking fee. However, he said that the President's memo rejected the TAG proposal of a graduated fee. The Faculty needs to express their opinion in the form of a resolution to the Executive Council.

He therefore introduced the following motion:

Whereas the Executive Council recommendation of a flat \$40 per month fee is regressive and will unfairly and severely impact the poorest members of our community;

Whereas the TAG committee's recommendations, though not perfect, provide practical disincentives for car use and incentives for using alternative means of transportation, as well as outlining a reasonable means to distribute the fee burden fairly;

Whereas the Executive Council's decision to ignore and override the hard work and thoughtful recommendations of the TAG committee diminishes faith in the democratic governance at Lewis & Clark College.

Whereas the overwhelming response to the Executive Council's parking plan has been negative;

Whereas Lewis & Clark College cares about the well-being of the most vulnerable members of its community and promotes the principle of fairness;

We, the faculty of the College of Arts & Sciences, resolve to urge the Executive Council and President Mooney to reconsider its parking proposal and support the recommendations of the TAG committee.

We further resolve to recommend to the Board of Trustees that they adopt the TAG committee's proposal rather than the one issued by the Executive Council.

The motion was seconded, and was open for debate.

A series of informational questions followed. How much is still open for discussion? What about evening visitors? What is the timetable? The President responded that the memo was intended to promote dialogue. The Executive Council has a broader task

than TAG-- which was asked to look only at alternative transport, and not the parking problem. Bill Curtain is heading up a committee addressing implementation, including evening visitors. Dean Atkinson reported that Academic Council is looking at division and department specific issues. In terms of timetable, the master plan approved by the city called for a parking fee by September 1. The College has obtained an extension, until Jan. 1. In terms of what is closed, the Executive Council supports a flat fee for single occupancy vehicles, but is looking for some way to alleviate regressivity. The Council believes that the TAG program would not change behavior.

In light of this information, Curtis Johnson asked Elliot Young if the motion was still required. Professor Young replied that as the process was still open, it was appropriate for the faculty to express its opinion by means a resolution. Since the clear majority opinion expressed in e-mail conversation was in favor of the TAG approach to graduated fees, and the President remained opposed to this idea, the resolution was still needed.

Evan Williams then moved a substitute motion.

"We the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences, resolve to urge the Executive Council and President Mooney to reconsider its parking and transportation proposal."

The motion was seconded.

Discussion ensued about both the substitute and original motions; in addition, further questions were addressed to the President. What are the systematic ways of addressing regressivity? What happens to people who come on a short term basis? Will we charge for memorial services and weddings? Won't the high fee serve as a disincentive for faculty to come to campus? What about folks in the middle: 2 or 3 day a week workers? Will they have incentives or disincentives to drive? The unintended effects of the high fixed fee may be to discourage the kind of community we want. It was also suggested that fees might vary by distance from campus. Several faculty expressed concern over the impact of high fees on low income students.

In response to the issue of regressivity, the President said that he couldn't provide specifics because they involved union negotiations. But he implied that there might be wage compensation for unionized staff. Dean Atkinson said that the other issues were noted and under consideration by the Executive Council.

With regard to discussion of the motions, it was argued that the substitute motion lacked content; in response, Curtis Johnson offered as friendly amendment the following:

"We the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences, resolve to urge the Executive Council and President Mooney to reconsider its parking and transportation proposal in light of community response on e-mail and other communications."

Evan Williams accepted the amendment as friendly.

Three people spoke in support of the tenor of the original motion. The original motion, in the "Whereas" clauses, provided a "sense of the house" to guide the deliberation of the Executive Council. These included strong community support for a graduated fee schedule, as well as concern that faculty committees were not being heard by the Executive Council.

Two people spoke against the original motion. The term "ignored" was viewed as inaccurate. In addition, the mandate of the TAG committee was transport only, and TAG had not been asked to nor had they developed a more comprehensive parking proposal.

Rich Peck moved to adjourn; the motion was seconded but failed on a voice vote.

The question was called and seconded. The faculty voted to close debate by a voice vote.

The substitute motion passed by a voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30.

Created by: eban@lclark.edu
12-02-98