UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON WOMEN FACULTY AND STUDENTS  
March 20, 2013  
Eck Center—Alumni Association Conference Room  
12:00-1:30 p.m.

Members present: D. Katherine Spiess, Susan Ohmer, Kevin Barry, Abigail Palko for Pamela Wojcik, Grace Xing, Paulette Curtis, Margaret Porter

Members absent and excused: Catherine Rastovski, Jade Avelis, Kathie Newman, Katie Rose, Rebecca Wingert, Jennifer Mason McAward, Aimee Buccellato, Maura Ryan, Alison Rice

Guests: Catherine Pieronek, Ann Moran, Annie Duffy, Lara Roach and Rich Brendza

1. Welcome


2. Minutes of the February 13, 2013 meeting

Members offered a few corrections, and Dr. Curtis moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Barry seconded the motion. The minutes for the February 13, 2013 meeting were unanimously approved.

Dr. Curtis noted that William Mapother, who has endowed the Mapother Luncheon for female faculty and the Provost (discussed at the February meeting), is an engaging person who might be interested in meeting with the committee.

3. Alumni relations--community engagement discussion

The committee has invited the Chicago-area ND Club of Chicago to participate in a webinar discussion of ways the committee could engage with, support and participate in activities sponsored by the Club. Lara Roach, new Manager of the ND Club of Chicago, and Rich Brendza, VP of the Club, were present via Webex connection. The members and the Alumni associates shared information on the activities and goals of each group and initiated discussion of how the two groups might interact to the benefit of each group.
Prof. Ohmer thanked Dolly Duffy for helping to set up this discussion, and she thanked Annie Duffy, on-campus alumni association staff member for participating in the campus end of the discussion. Prof. Ohmer noted that UCWFS is interested in strengthening its connection to Chicago and is looking for ways faculty can interact with alumni in intellectual opportunities in the city.

Mr. Brendza explained that the Chicago club, like other alumni clubs, has two central functions. The first, primary objective is to fundraise in support of scholarships that are given to newly enrolled ND students. The club currently supports 70 students through its scholarships. The second function is to select the scholarship recipients and make the awards. The major fundraising activities of the club are the annual Rockne dinner, the annual golf outing, and membership dues. The scholarship students are invited to attend the Rockne dinner in recognition of their award. There is also an on campus dinner (March 26, 2013) yearly to recognize the scholarship students. In addition to these major objectives, the Club engages in a series of service projects, which vary in size. They attract anywhere from 5 to 50 people, depending on the event.

The club also has several satellite committees that hold events, do some (minor) fundraising, engage in networking and sponsor speakers. The ND Women’s Connect group is an outgrowth of an on-campus initiative to engage women who are alumna or are married to alumni. The Hesburgh Committee holds a twice-yearly luncheon to which ND faculty, administrators and others (or Chicago-based higher education officials) are invited to speak. In addition to these groups, sub-groups of members do a lot of networking gatherings. Business, Architecture and Engineering alums all organize networking events as often as six times a year.

The committee focused its attention on the ND Women’s Connect group as a natural link to committee interests. Ms. Roach said the group plans Q & A type gatherings, such as the recent event that featured an ND grad that is a Chicago newsperson. The group is also working on an initiative to reach out to suburban ND alumna women with children; it is also planning a 40th anniversary of co-education event.

Mr. Brendza noted, in response to a question, that in the six years he has been associated with the Club, it has not pursued events with cultural institutions in the city.

Annie Duffy noted that the ND Club of Chicago has more contact with the campus than any of the other 270 alumni clubs (with the exception of the St. Joseph Valley club). The function of most alumni clubs is to support current students and alums that live in the area.
Prof. Abigail Palko broached the subject of mentoring opportunities. The Alumni Club does not have a formal mentoring program currently. However, Ms. Roach has just begun conversations with Anita Rees, in the Career Center, about an internship and mentoring program, modeled after one in Washington DC. The intent is to begin with a summer internship focus. Prof. Ohmer offered the assistance and support of UCWFS as this program gets developed. Mentoring is a significant concern for the committee, and it would be delighted to make use of its connections to faculty throughout the campus in support of this initiative. All agreed that this would be a particularly appropriate avenue for developing a connection that would be of benefit for the committee, the Club, and students.

Mr. Brendza mentioned that the committee can refer to the Club’s website for additional information on the topics discussed today at http://ndchicago.org/. Prof. Ohmer thanked the visitors for their willingness to talk with the committee in this initial effort to strengthen connections between the campus and the Chicago group.

After the conclusion of the webinar, Annie Duffy noted that this had been a good first effort at building a partnership between the campus and alumni groups. There is potential for a strong connection between the committee and the ND Women Connect committee. She mentioned that Ms. Roach is the only full time director of an alumni club, which means she is accessible for further conversation.

Members talked about co-hosting a cultural event with the Club at a city cultural institution as an annual event that will establish a relationship that can be built upon. Ms. Duffy agreed, noting that she is ‘very confident’ that there is a large group within the Club that would be interested in attending such an event. Members talked about the historic nature of the Chicago Club, which is working to develop relationships with new categories of alums, such as younger members and female members. The committee noted that the Club has clearly stated objectives, so it will need to be sensitive to the limits of the Club’s external outreach. In planning a co-hosted event, for instance, it may be best to rely on university resources rather than expect this all-volunteer organization to commit its resources. The discussion turned to the Santa Fe building that the university has purchased in Chicago, which is going to serve as one of the new ‘global gateways.’ It was suggested that intellectual/academic events might more appropriately be planned through the global gateway than through the alumni Club.

Ms. Duffy suggested that among the many member sub groups, there would be people interested in getting involved in the kinds of events and activities the committee has been discussing. Some names mentioned included Shelia O’Brien, Judge Williams, and Ms. Palmer.
Prof. Palko returned to the mentor opportunities, which her students, in Gender Studies, are ‘thirsting for’; they are seeking role models on the work/life balance. While departments like Gender Studies can and do offer mentoring opportunities, not all students are interested in academia as a career; teaming up with an alumni club to offer mentoring and internship opportunities would enable UCWFS to support ‘real world’ connections for students.

Members discussed some on-campus ways for the committee to make connections with this same cohort of female undergraduate students. Mr. Barry proposed an on-campus dinner for alumni club female scholarship winners, including invited campus female representatives. This kind of scenario might initiate mentoring opportunities between the two groups. It was noted that there are a growing number of programs on campus, such as Building Bridges, which offer resources and support to first generation college students and minority students, so UCWFS might consider working with some of these programs rather than adding to the structure already in place. With that in mind, however, there was agreement that UCWFS could do more outreach to undergraduate female students who very likely have no idea that the committee exists to support female students on campus. The committee would benefit from an expanded ‘brand’ on campus, even as the students might be informed of this additional resource.

Members agreed that working through existing organizations and programs is a good place to begin. The Career Center’s efforts to increase mentoring and internship options for students, and the Chicago alumni club, appears to be a good starting place for the committee’s efforts. Dr. Curtis noted that the discussion thus far has focused on undergraduate students; she stressed that the decision to meet with the Chicago alumni club was motivated by an awareness that faculty, staff and all students could benefit from a stronger connection with the resources of the city as well as with alumni who live there.

Prof. Ohmer thanked Ms. Duffy for meeting with the committee today and sharing her perspective and connections with the committee. All agreed to continue working on developing the connections begun with today’s meeting. After Ms. Duffy departed the meeting, members agreed that a connection with the alumni club is a clear opportunity to further the goals of the committee to support women in leadership positions and to develop a supportive network. Outreach to the Chicago group and developing a connection with the campus Career Center are two viable ideas to emerge from today’s discussion.
4. Member Items

A. Faculty Introduction protocols

Mr. Barry reported to the committee on a discussion he had with a female colleague who had attended a Junior Parents Weekend session featuring faculty talking about their research. At this session, it was notable that married faculty pairs were introduced as Dr. Male faculty and his wife, First Last Name (e.g.: Dr. Greg Crawford, and his wife Renata Crawford). This method of introduction neglected to name the wife’s credentials and faculty status. Mr. Barry inquired into this situation and learned that there is an official communication protocol, developed in the Office of Special Events about 20 years ago, which has established this order of information in introductions at campus events. He reports this situation to the committee with the suggestion that the committee inquire further about official communication protocols used on campus in a variety of contexts, with the intention of proposing a redrafting of outdated protocols. He referred to recent research that indicates that seemingly minor actions such as these kind of hierarchical introductions can have a ‘micro-aggressive’ impact on the psyche of both the individuals being introduced and those witnessing it. In this case, female students who observe this protocol of introductions are being ‘taught’ a version of their ‘role’ in the academy.

Prof. Ohmer asked Mr. Barry to provide her with details of the session at which this protocol was observed; she offered to take this topic to the Office of Special Events and begin a conversation about changes in the protocol. Mr. Barry suggested that she also bring the conversation to the President’s Office, noting that while there is evidence of progress over the years, still, more progress needs to be made.

B. Retention of faculty and diversity reading group

Prof. Ohmer reported on efforts made by Prof. Kathy Brickley, who was unavailable for today’s meeting, to gather information about retention of female faculty members. With the help of her assistant, she made an intensive effort to gather information about each faculty member who has left the university in the last ten years and the reasons for their departures. Unfortunately, for many people there was no information available. The result of this effort was ‘heartbreakingly inconclusive.’ Prof. Brickley gave the data collected to Institutional Research, which concluded that there was not enough information to develop statistical analysis. While the office is reportedly reluctant to make equivocal statements about data, nonetheless, it is clear that there is insufficient
information on this topic, and the committee may continue to explore ways of better understanding the situation for female faculty who leave the university.

Prof. Ohmer noted that the Faculty Affairs committee of the Academic Council is currently looking at gender and diversity on campus and that the UCWFS might want to collaborate with this group. Members identified an area that they felt merited further scrutiny, that is, that the rate of success at receiving tenure also measures faculty who actually complete the tenure consideration process, and does not include those who are counseled out or who leave the university. It is suggested in informal campus conversation that some faculty are discouraged from submitting the tenure application, and this cohort is missing from the standard data which reports retention data.

Dr. Ohmer shared with the group Kathy Brickley’s proposal that the committee organize a reading group for this summer on the topic of campus diversity. Mr. Barry reported that he has been working with a study group during this academic year on the topic of diversity training, so he offered to review materials to make a suggestion of some texts that the reading group might find informative. Prof. Ohmer said she would contact both Prof. Pope-Davis and Prof. Dan Myers to ask for some funding for this reading group. Prof. Grace Xing mentioned that Prof. Bob Bernhard was deeply involved in the start-up of a diversity group when he was at Purdue; he might be a helpful resource for a diversity reading group.

C. Female graduate student luncheons

Prof. Pieronek reported that the female graduate Science and Engineering students have held two successful luncheons at which groups of students have made research presentations. The third is scheduled for next week; members are invited to attend. Prof. Xing asked about the method of advertising the luncheons; it was not clear what methods the graduate students had used to advertise these events.

D. April 24, 2013 public forum meeting

Prof. Ohmer reported on the program planned for the next UCWFS meeting, which will be a public meeting, on Wednesday, April 24, 2013, from 3:30-5 pm, in the Eck Center Auditorium. This meeting will focus on family-related topics connected to campus benefits. Groups have been invited to make presentations; the format will be a Q&A style; the groups are eager to get feedback from community members about the success of programs and events and suggestions for improvement. Presenters will include ECDC, DPAC, Denise Murphy on wellness programs, RecSports and a representative discussing services for children with special needs.
Mr. Barry suggested that this program might be advertised as sponsored by the Provost’s office rather than the UCWFS committee. He noted that stereotypically women’s committee would sponsor a discussion of family-related issues, which masks the importance of family issues for all faculty and staff members, not limited to females. Prof. Ohmer made note of this suggestion.

Members briefly discussed the challenges of scheduling an event such as this, as some campus members are unavailable during working hours, others are unavailable after work hours because of family commitments, and others unavailable on weekend hours for a variety of reasons. It was suggested that a lunchtime meeting might be an option for the next public forum; another possibility would be multiple sessions.

Prof. Ohmer noted that the committee has broken ground on several new initiatives and ideas today; she thanked members for their dedication to the work of the committee. The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.