

**College of Arts and Sciences
Dean's Council of Department Chairs
Wednesday, October 3, 201**

Attended

Steve Bayne, Chair of Philosophy
Angela Biselli, Chair of Physics
Matt Coleman, Chair of Mathematics & Computer Science
David Crawford, Chair of Sociology & Anthropology
Nancy Dallavalle, Chair of Religious Studies
Jean Daniele, CAS Assistant to the Dean
Dawn DeBiase, CAS Assistant Dean
David Gudelunas, Chair of Communication & Director of Women Gender & Sexuality Studies
Olivia Harriott, Chair of Biology
Manyul Im, CAS Associate Dean
Terry-Ann Jones, Director of International Studies
Mark LeClair, Chair of Economics
F. Casar Maldonado, S.J., Assistant Professor of Modern Language
Laura Nash, Chair of Visual & Performing Arts
Marcie Patton, Chair of Politics
Sue Peterson, CAS Assistant Dean
Elizabeth Petrino, Chair of English & Co-Director of American Studies
Judy Primavera, Chair of Psychology
James Simon, CAS Associate Dean
Kraig Steffen, Chair of Chemistry & Biochemistry
Yohuru Williams, Chair of History & Director of Black Studies

Regrets

Mary Ann Carolan, Chair of Modern Languages and Literatures and Director of Italian Studies

Approval of the Minutes

Dr. David Gudelunas moved to approve the September 12, 2012 Dean's Council minutes and Dr. Kraig Steffen seconded the motion. Ten were in favor with two abstentions.

I. Diversity & inclusion Issues for Students & Faculty

- **Review of Chairs Retreat Evaluations**
 - The new chairs response rate to Chairs' Retreat survey was close to 100% and that of continuing chairs under 50%. Overall, new Chairs found the retreat very useful. The Dean heard from several after the retreat.
 - Ratings were consistently good on all topics, with the exception of the Diversity Workshop. Responses ranged from not useful to very useful and everywhere in between. New chairs found it more useful than continuing chairs.
 - Some comments on the Diversity portion of the retreat: not enough time; critique of how it was done; critique of colleagues' questions hijacking the agenda (because

- Dr. Pliner went with the questions asked). There was not enough in-depth coverage of issues to glean enough from the workshop.
- For future retreats, most commented that they wanted about the same number of topics and about the same (or a little more) interaction among chairs.
- **Discussion follow-up from Susan Pliner workshop**
 - There were several components to the interaction relative to Dr. Pliner's workshop.
 - Dinner with several faculty of color, so she would be able to include reflections from their conversation back to the group during the Retreat.
 - Workshop meeting with the Dean, discussing institutional issues—faculty recruitment, retention, and Rank & Tenure issues in relationship to diverse faculty.
 - ½-day workshop with department chairs.
 - The Dean and Associate Dean Manyul Im had a follow up conference call, where they all shared their reflections.
 - Dr. Laura Nash asked the Dean to share some of the feedback received from the conference call she had with Dr. Pliner. Dr. Pliner mentioned that people are in different places, resulting in a challenge at these types of workshops. All of her comments, whether about faculty of color experience at Fairfield, her encounter with the group, her reflections on the Dean's leadership, etc. were that we are not so different as an institution than other institutions, though we have a lot of work to do.
 - Dr. Im mentioned that the biggest issue is how to keep momentum going in terms of becoming agents of diversity. Most of us are fans of diversity, but we need to become agents of diversity.
 - Dr. Crawford mentioned that there were a few points of data collection that the Dean wanted to look into and that might have been the place to begin during the workshop. Discussion relative to our situation at Fairfield would have been more useful. Fairfield is aware of the larger picture in terms of higher education not being very diverse. It might have been more useful to talk about where Fairfield was and discuss how to get to the next step.
 - Dean mentioned that one point we did learn was that the data Fairfield reports is not necessarily reported in a way that is useful internally – we report through IPEDS and through all the required channels. But analysis of data, reflection on data, communicating data, and acting upon data within the University are not steps taken by HR or IR (both of which now report to the VP for Administration, Mark Reed).
 - Dr. Coleman mentioned that the department received a lot of international applicants and the only applicants of diversity that they receive. At Fairfield language becomes a huge problem, so the Math/CS Department is not sure how to handle barrier. Dr. LeClair added that the Economics Department is faced with the same issue. The Dean shared that this challenge was discussed between some of our international faculty and Dr. Pliner. All of our International faculty have excellent English but students may still perceive accents as unintelligible. Students tend to be biased, which is created by lack of familiarity listening to non-native speakers of English, and this creates an anxiety barrier (as opposed to the actual accent being the communication barrier).
 - Another point learned is that international faculty talk about the extra work needed to prepare their classes. They attempt to overcome student difficulties and biases through extensive use of PowerPoint and repetition, as they are concerned

- about receiving positive teaching evaluations. The extra prep work is often not understood, known, or valued by their colleagues.
- Dr. Pliner discussed the ways students' bias is recorded on evaluations. Their comments may be coded: that is, their comments reference lack of expertise or incompetence with international or faculty of color. We tend to take students' comments at face value, rather than interrogating their views on competence and expertise as potentially having racial, gendered, and other biases.
 - Dr. Im commented that there is an issue on how we count international faculty within our diversity statistics. On the one hand, we aspire for diversity, but on the other hand there are particular U.S. groups that are historically marginalized. The Dean mentioned that Affirmative Action (and the diversity statistics we are required to keep) are because some groups are systematically and historically disadvantaged and/or under-represented. Better representation among those groups in higher education will help students from those groups, as well as all students to move beyond historical inequities. Diversity is a social justice issue. That said, international faculty bring another kind of diversity, and it is also important.
 - The Dean mentioned that the numbers she had shared during the retreat workshop relative to sex and US minority groups (that do not include international students) were College numbers based on a review of recent hires, R&T decisions, and departures from the University. They were not official stats; rather, she counted individual faculty bodies who are faculty of color but she did not know whether they were international faculty or how they would be coded on a census form. The Dean does not necessarily know a person's residency or citizenship status at the time of hire or thereafter.

II. Dean's follow-ups since diversity workshop—Review of Data on Faculty Recruitment & Retention

- Wrote to Office of Institutional Research reflecting critique of campus climate survey in terms of not having disaggregated data analyses, so the campus climate data responses from the small number of minority students and faculty represented in the survey disappear into the larger body of members. You cannot get at the climate from different perspectives. They need to disaggregate the data into various subgroups. The Dean copied the President's Institutional Diversity Council since this is their concern. They all seemed to be open to her suggestions.
- Requested faculty Affirmative Action data and analysis from HR, copying the President's Institutional Diversity Council, as well as the SVPAA and VP Administration. She requested reports on our faculty recruitment data. The Dean framed her request by stating that this data needs to be analyzed, reported, and reflected upon. Data is reported as annual snapshots, but not with any kind of trend analysis.
- HR Director Mark Guglielmoni was responsive to the Dean's request, sharing a pile of reports; however, these reports were not very useful. The Dean was able to take the data from these reports and reorganize the format into data she could analyze in a different way. This was not College data, rather *University* data. If our data was similar year to year, and our hiring was proactive in terms of diversity, the data should change, unless faculty are growing at a greater rate than our diversity hiring (which is not the case) or we have a retention problem. The latter seems to be the situation at hand. The Dean shared the analysis of aggregate data supplied by Human Resource Director (handout).
- Development of report template with HR Director, who seemed very interested in learning about the issues. The Dean asked HR Director to develop a report each year

with the following information: how many searches by school, how many total candidates, what proportion of the total candidates are reported as diverse, how many finalist and hires were there and what proportion of these were diverse. We could then see how we are doing in terms of developing diverse candidate pools, and how we are doing with the hiring process. If we have this data we would be in a better position to track retention. Departments have a more intimate relationship in terms of the retention question, because they know the specifics of the faculty's reasons for success (or failure), for staying (or leaving), but the institution is responsible for understanding the overall retention data and is accountable to what those stats say in terms of our climate. Chairs already send in their AA forms at the end of the search offering information on how many total applicants, how many finalist, and who was hired. HR should be compiling this data, analyzing it annually and for trends, and reporting back to the Deans and VPs so we can assess our progress.

- Dr. Harriott mentioned that job candidates do not self-report, so it is hard to determine and record this type of data. The Dean agreed stating that we cannot determine if someone is a non-resident or a US Citizen, and we cannot always know what racial group (or veteran status or other category) someone ascribes to. Human Resources is in the process of signing a contract with a service to collect this type of data automatically. Then, when a candidate applies, a card will go out to collect this data (if people choose to report it) and the data will be analyzed by a third party organization.
- Dr. Dallavalle mentioned that they are switching to on-line applications. There could be a prompt to self report before submitting the application. This would offer immediate data that could be built into the system for reporting purposes. The Dean thinks this is the kind of system HR is talking about.
- Dr. Gudelunas asked if Human Resources performed exit interviews. The Dean mentioned that student affairs personnel do exit interviews with students who voluntarily withdraw (but not with students coded financial or medical), but she does not know whether HR does exit interview with employees. She does not think they do them with faculty, though faculty usually share some reasons with their Chairs and the Dean. The President's Institutional Diversity Council advises the President and they can influence him on decisions to be made around these types of suggestions.

III. Another question that came up in the retreat workshop was: How are students introduced to diverse faculty? Are they encountering diverse faculty in their core courses?

- We could obtain data relative to this research question if we find this to be important.
- The US & World Diversity subcommittees of UCC are to perform an analysis of the requirement. Is it working; do we have an adequate number of courses; how do folks feel about teaching these classes, etc.
- Dr. Crawford mentioned that when dealing with diversity within the core, we can not just look at course taught by full-time faculty. It would be more useful to look at part-time faculty. Dr. Bayne asked if part-time faculty data was available. The application should have information that would be useful.
 - A question came up regarding diversity pedagogy. Faculty express that they are not necessarily trained to facilitate difficult dialogues within the classroom among majority students let alone groups of mixed students. There are also different dynamics when there is a majority or minority faculty member trying

to facilitate these conversations. We could partner with CAE and Office of Diversity Initiative to spearhead some opportunities to promote more conversation about diversity pedagogy.

- Dr. Im mentioned that this could go only so far. One of our faculty of color had a difficult time with her class because of the hostility she received. Their perception was that she identified favoritism towards students of color. The Dean commented that this is a common experience for students when they are not accustomed to perspectives other than majority views being expressed. It's one of the ways bias unfolds in the classroom (and may show up on evals for the faculty member, with majority students questioning her credibility or effectiveness rather than questioning their own biases).
- Based on this picture, the Dean asked department chairs what they might be interested in as a project to take up that the Dean and Associate Deans could prioritize? Faculty are shepherds of the academic programs of the institution, as well as advocates and leaders. We could take on some of this with goals, projects, etc.
- Dr. Petrino mentioned that one of her concerns is that the IDEA form reflects certain biases from students relative to ethnic faculty, particularly ethnic women. Dr. Harriott commented that in some situations if the numbers are not too large in some incidences data is not recorded.
- Dr. Crawford asked how the status of the diversity of faculty determined. The Dean mentioned that we might have this information from other sources. At our November Dean's Council meeting there will be focus on IDEA forms. We will look at aggregate reports and look to chairs to share how they use IDEA to standardize evaluation of courses. We will discuss what we could learn from the IDEA form. This form generates an array of data.
- Dr. Crawford shared that, in terms of US Diversity and World Diversity, it was explained that when the requirement was first initiated it was difficult because there were not many courses, so the standards were looser. But over time, the standards became much tighter, more reflective of contemporary thought on these issues. The original courses were never removed from the list of diversity requirements, so it is not clear how much integrity there is for the choices listed. This sends an interesting message about diversity when there are two courses that have different amounts of content and different approaches to content related to diversity issues.
- Dr. Jones commented that we are sending an odd message to students. Students studying in Tanzania are still required to fill their diversity requirement. The Dean agreed with Dr. Jones. She has long advocated for a study-abroad semester in a non-Western country should count for the world diversity requirement due to the value and depth of the immersion experience.
- The Dean consulted with Dr. Bayne as to the appropriate way to move this conversation forward to address curricular questions around requirements. Bayne mentioned that this should go to UCC.
- The Dean asked the opinion of the chairs whether there should be US and World diversity requirement.
- Dr. Dallavalle mentioned that it is up to the department to reflect on the core to see if diversity is a component within their courses. The Dean will reflect on this with UCC and work with them to develop a questionnaire. Crawford shared that when he was Chair of World Diversity there was a paragraph describing what courses should include in terms of meeting the requirements.

- Dr. Im suggested that the College seek guidance from the U.S. and World Diversity sub-committees, since they worked hard to make requirements robust.
- Dr. Harriott commented that it is difficult to incorporate diverse requirements into the natural sciences. How could they get this to be more inclusive of the sciences rather than just humanities or social sciences?
- Dr. Nash mentioned that it is difficult to add a diverse unit if faculty lack expertise in a particular culture. It's not helpful to do a superficial job.
- The Dean shared that when she engaged in the diversity workshop, she found the experience a bit demoralizing. These are issues she cares about and at Fairfield, they are not moving in the direction or at the rate that feels like real progress. The issues are important, and we must keep working together.

IV. **Sexual Misconduct/Sexual Harassment/Summary of Policy As It Exists**

- Assistant Dean Dawn DeBiase reviewed Fairfield University's revised Sexual Misconduct Policy, sharing a handout summarizing the current policy.
- On September 19, 2012 the Vice President of Student Affairs, Dr. Tom Pellegrino, communicated the revised harassment policy, known as the "Sexual Misconduct Policy." **This policy can be found** on page 45 in the 2012-2013 Student Handbook. http://www.fairfield.edu/document/student/sl_s handbook.pdf.
- The most significant piece is that any employee, who has reasonable cause to believe sexual misconduct has occurred should comply with the University's Sexual Misconduct Policy, regardless of the age of the student.
- Any employee, with the exception of those legally bound by confidentiality, which would most likely not be relative to faculty, must report an incident of sexual misconduct to the Department of Public Safety a.s.a.p.
- Incidents that occur to students under the age of 18 are viewed as child abuse. Folks should follow the same reporting process, reaching out to the Department of Public Safety.
- The Department of Public Safety is directed to follow a certain protocol, reaching out the appropriate authorities.
 - Contact the Fairfield Police Department—This does not require the victim to pursue a criminal investigation.
 - Notify the University's Title IX Compliance Coordinator, Dr. Terry Quell, Assistant Dean, SON, and the Title IX Compliance Investigator, William Johnson, Associate Dean of Students.
 - Appointed University personnel will contact the victim, explaining their options, services, available resources, and assist the victim with filing a formal Title IX Sexual Misconduct Complaint. The victim does have a choice whether they want to file the complaint. The individual has a lot of options following the situation.
- Dr. Dallavalle asked for clarification. If she is sitting with a student in her office and they say something that falls under these categories, should she interrupt the student and explain that it is mandated that this type of information be shared with the authorities at Fairfield. The faculty member could tell the student that if they continue the conversation, they are required by law to report the incident. While the student has many options, confidentiality is not one of them. Students will be made aware of this policy, so if they choose to reach out to faculty, staff, etc... they are aware of the responsibility and protocol that needs to be followed.

- Assistant Dean DeBiase offered dialogue to use when encountering this type of experience. A script was highlighted on the handout shared with department chairs. The recommended script shared was for situations relevant to a student victim, as well as a victim who is a fellow employee. Once faculty contact Public Safety their legal responsibility is completed.
- Dr. Primavera commented that there should be an identified person for comfort of the student, rather than directing them to Public Safety. This would reduce their level of fear and intimidation. Ms. DeBiase offered to share this suggestion with Dr. Pellegrino.
- Dr. Petrino asked how this policy was being disseminated among faculty. This information was posted on University Announcements, as well as a workshop offered. The Dean sent out an email that each department have a representative at the workshop.
- The Dean mentioned that if there is any follow up folks could reach out to Ms. DeBiase; she is the point person in the CAS Dean's Office and a licensed social worker with experience with this type of situation. She is available to attend a department meeting if further discussion is needed.

IV. Chair Progress Reports/Discussion

- Department By-Laws—The Dean asked how many department had department by-laws. It was determined that English, International Studies, Women and Gender Studies, and Latin American and Caribbean Studies has by-laws. The Dean asked that copies be shared with her. She recommended chairs find someone in the department that is governance oriented. In some departments, by-laws may be developed sooner than others due to past management practices about which folks are unhappy, but by-laws really should be about transparency. Situations as simple as junior faculty knowing how courses in the curriculum are shared across faculty. There is no timeline or deadline to create by-laws; this is not a mandate but a request by the Dean that would serve departments and support the success and satisfaction of faculty. These policies should not supersede the College Governance Document; it is about local operations and organization, things unique to the department.
- Chair Succession Planning—Drs. LeClair, Coleman, and Crawford are ending their term as chair this year. The Dean would like elections before fall course schedules are due (early February). It is helpful to have elections during the last department meeting of fall semester, however, so there can be a one semester of mentoring.
- Assessment—The Dean mentioned that the Associate Deans, as well as Christine Siegel are available to help work on refining assessment plans and procedures, analyzing and interpreting data, etc. The Dean offered to fund participation in assessment conferences. We like to send teams to national assessment meetings, so the group can share what they learned.

VI. Announcements and Routine Issues

- Still working out FY '13 budget kinks. Information pertaining to FY'14 has not been shared with the Dean's Office. The Dean commented that chairs be as streamlined as possible in terms of how much work we put into the FY '14 submission process based on what we experienced this year.
- Final Exam Policy—UCC sub-committee is working on change of policy to bring to Academic Council. Dean wanted to make faculty aware that these changes are unfolding. More info may be available on this before next DC meeting.

- CAS Planning Committee is forming a sub-committee within the College to look at R&T guidelines. The handbook states schools shall define “appropriate faculty” for the purposes of appointment and tenure. We have not done this, and there are a few ambiguities that should be clarified and codified.
- The Grievance process is being reviewed to make sure that the chair’s role and the time frame are clearly delineated.
- AC subcommittee on part-time faculty concerns. Dean would like chairs to be aware of this.
- The Dean’s Council November meeting will focus on IDEA, Assessment, and NEASC
- Dean’s Council December will include chairs and directors. Stephanie Frost and Noel Appel will join the group for a discussion relative to Faculty, Advancement, and the Campaign.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.