

College of Arts and Sciences
Dean's Council of Department Chairs and Interdisciplinary Program Directors
Wednesday, December 12, 2012
Approved Minutes

Noel Appel, Director of Foundation Relations
Peter Bayers, Director of American Studies
Steve Bayne, Chair of Philosophy
Angela Biselli, Chair of Physics
Mary Ann Carolan, Chair of Modern Languages and Literatures and Director of Italian Studies
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 Downie, Director of Program on the Environment
Ben Fine, Director of MS in Mathematics
Stepanie Frost, Vice President of Advancement
David Gudelunas, Chair of Communication & Director of Women Gender & Sexuality Studies
Olivia Harriott, Chair of Biology
Terry-Ann Jones, Director of International Studies
Marti LoMonaco, Director of American Studies Graduate Program
Mark LeClair, Chair of Economics
David McFadden, Director of Russian E. European Studies
Laura Nash, Chair of Visual & Performing Arts
Sue Peterson, CAS Assistant Dean
Elizabeth Petrino, Chair of English & Co-Director of American Studies
Judy Primavera, Chair of Psychology
Gavriel Rosenfeld, Director of Judaic Studies
Kurt Schlichting, Interim Chair of Sociology & Anthropology
Kris Sealey, Director of Peace & Justice
James Simon, CAS Associate Dean
Kraig Steffen, Chair of Chemistry & Biochemistry
William Vasquez, Co-Director of Latin American & Caribbean Studies
Michael White, Director of MFA Creative Writing
Yohuru Williams, Chair of History & Director of Black Studies
Maggie Wills, Director of Professional Studies
Qin Zhang, Director of Asian Studies

Regrets

Michael Pagano, Director of Communication
Marcie Patton, Chair of Politics
Vin Rosivach, Director of Classical Studies

Approval of the Minutes

Dr. Nancy Dallavalle moved to approve the November 7, 2012 Dean's Council minutes and Dr. Kraig Steffen seconded the motion. All were in favor of the minutes with a few abstentions.

Discussion of University Advancement and the Comprehensive Campaign – VP Stephanie Frost, Noel Appel, and Rob Cottle

This discussion was an opportunity for CAS Chairs and Directors to be briefed on the University's Comprehensive Campaign and to discuss general roles of faculty in fundraising.

Stephanie Frost, Vice President for Advancement

Ms. Stephanie Frost opened the conversation, sharing the relevancy of Advancement in relations to CAS faculty. She explained that the discussion was designed to share ways Advancement could be supportive with faculty initiatives and how faculty could find ways to intersect with Advancement work. Advancement's function is to raise funds for people—faculty, students, or administrators, as well as funds for capital projects, such as building structures on campus, which are relevant to the people associated with the University.

Noel Appel, Director of Foundations and Liaison for the College of Arts and Sciences and School of Nursing Advisory Boards

Ms. Noel Appel commented that the core area of her emphasis is the private foundation activity, which is the oldest part of her position. Her effort is around securing support for faculty research, programmatic activities, curricular and faculty development, financial aid, and outreach into the community. These categories are the primary areas around fundraising on the Foundation side.

Matching funds to initiatives is accomplished through many different angles. Conversations with faculty to determine faculty research agendas are helpful. As Advancement receives donor opportunities from a particular foundation, it is useful to have the knowledge of the areas that match the donor's wishes. Opportunities emerge stimulating dialogs around campus to imagine how that might come to fruition in a competitive proposal. The trend that they experience is that the foundations are interested in a lot of internal collaboration. Another trend is a tremendous interest in assessment and evaluation. More recently the collaboration that is making the University very competitive is the willingness to engage in cross-institutional collaboration. This adds a lot of dimension and work to a project but it also extends the investment that the foundation is making. For example, one of the grants in the Center of Faith and Public Life is touching a school in California, in Chicago, and in Connecticut. This offers a geographic reach for the foundation's investment, which is important to them.

Faculty could play an important role by sharing projects they are working on, so that Advancement could keep their eyes open for opportunities and for different RSPs. The Directors of Foundation Relations, Corporate Relations, and Government Relations attempt to share and understand important initiatives across each of the areas that they develop with faculty, so they have the opportunity to see if there is work that would benefit the other two areas of Advancement.

The good work of these proposals is shared with the College Board of Advisors to understand if our message is really marketable. They have engaged in some interesting conversations and we

received useful feedback from these discussions and sometimes individuals become interested in these projects.

The engagement out in the field with Alumni has been incredible and to be able to share the detail story of faculty work has been a huge leverage point to those discussions. Ms. Appel reiterated the importance of faculty voice; she encouraged them not to be strangers. A quick e-mail or an important chat about interested initiatives could begin the pipeline of a very prosperous opportunity.

Stephanie Frost mentioned that with the unfortunate resignation of Noel Appel, Ms. Claudia Nielsen, Assistant Director of Institutional Giving, will be available to assist faculty with the process of submitting RFPs and helping them with grant applications. A search to fill Ms. Appel's position will take place with the hopes of a new hire in the spring.

Rob Cottle, Director of Corporate Relations and Liaison for the Dolan School of Business and School of Engineering Advisory Boards

Mr. Rob Cottle mentioned that a lot of the corporate work mirrors that of Foundation and Government Relations; however there are some differences. Corporations are in business to make money rather than give it away. Corporate giving annually is a significant number. The charge is to continue to develop relationships where Fairfield has been successful. Many of past request have been locally, where there has been a third party community partner. Some of the larger grant request for six figure programming is challenging; however, they continue to gain success in this area.

Mr. Cottle encouraged faculty to share their research ideas, so the Advancement team could attempt to gain funding support. There is no idea or research topic that is too off base for a connection. From the Corporate Relations standpoint, gaining support is beyond just writing a grant. It is important to partner with the community, by demonstrating visibility and bringing the face of Fairfield to our local and regional business councils and organizations.

Mr. Cottle shared that Fairfield had the *Turn Around Management Association and Association of Corporate Growth* hold an economic symposium in the Dolan School of Business for Governor Malloy, who was the keynote speaker, and Katherine Smith, the Connecticut Economic Development Commissioner. This exposure cannot be underestimated; it offers funding connections for the University. We have been successful with some sponsorship, particularly those from the Open Visions at the Quick Center, bringing in \$100,000 this year, which is much more than in the past, simply from generating activity and hosting local businesses on-campus.

Cottle commented that the University experiences success with companies that are hiring our graduates, especially in senior level positions, so placing our students with internships within these companies opens up opportunities for funding to the University.

Cottle shared that Ms. Claudia Nielsen sent out about 30 or 40 RPs to identify a funding match. He also commended Dr. Laura Nash, stating that she is champion of seeking and identifying opportunities for the University to pursue. He reiterated that the Advancement team welcomes partnership with faculty and are available to support them in any way they can. Mr. Cottle works with the SOB and the SOE Advisory Board and had the opportunity to engage in a joint Board

meeting with the SOB and CAS last June. The awards dinner is a good source, bringing in a tremendous amount of scholarship funding (approximately one million or more per year over the past five to six years). He works with a portfolio of 250 people, most of which are alumni and some parents. Interaction on multiple levels creates successful results; often funding can be found by working with these individuals.

The Dean mentioned that one project Rob worked on was the BASE Camp, the Broadening Access to Science Education Program for high school girls. We received Bank of America funding, which helped us launch this program and leverage us for multi-year NSF funding. This type of multi-step approach can result in great success. Ms. Appel added that this is an important case study for Fairfield. The plan for the BASE Camp sat in a Howard Hugh's Medical proposal for two million dollars. Dr. Shelley Phelan took this plan and moved it forward towards little foundation grants, and Corporate and Government funding. This project is on a trajectory for more than eight years. The Dean commented that even if a proposal is not accepted, we still accomplish gains by placing the institution in a positive light.

Mr. Cottle highlighted Gita Rajan's project with Fr. Rick Ryscavage, Director of the Center for Faith and Public Life. This project, *Impact India 2021*, opened up an opportunity to engage with the international arena. This centered on the imbalance of the population of India and its trending in a direction of more male than female. They engaged in a pilot study and the University is attempting to fund a three year study, bringing in the seven Jesuit institutions in India, some other NGOs, and community organizations in India, with hopes of understanding the trends and decision making within the families of India. The expectation is that this study leads to some policy change within India that could impact them by 2021. From a corporate standpoint, we started to gain visibility. The University took a leap of faith and joined the United States India Business Council located in the US Chamber of Commerce. There are only three universities that are members—Boston University and Rutgers are the other two educational institutions. There was a nice write up relative to our project in their Chamber's newsletter. The University is trying to figure out a pitch that would make our project enticing to the corporations within India and US based companies that are doing business in India. We are trying to find a way to articulate to potential sponsoring corporations that our project goal is to create a greater balance that will avoid economic instability and social violence. Cottle mentioned that they plan on engaging in a little more work, over the next six months, with hopes to attract corporate partners, foundations, and other individuals.

Ms. Appel added that the business on the grant side is so much about trends and what the field is communicating, as well as the use of footprints on grants that were already proposed to open the door for other opportunities.

Mr. Cottle shared that they were invited to be guests at the USIBC as an educational representative to India. This is an opportunity for high visibility for the University.

Comprehensive Campaign

Stephanie Frost shared that the Comprehensive Campaign task force consists of approximately 40 individuals representing all constituents on campus—selective students, faculty and staff, and all current and past chairman of the Advancement Committee were invited to serve. This campaign was launched on July 1, 2011. The first ambition of the campaign was accomplished by meeting their goal to raise 30 million dollars. There is a working goal of 160 million dollars.

Advancement spent a lot of time over the course of the past three or four years talking with alumni and leaders and matching up initiatives from the Strategic Plan and the University's priorities with opportunities. Out of the 160 million dollars, 90 million is for endowments. Out of the 90 million the campaign is hoping to double the endowment the University currently has for financial aid, 30 million dollars in endowed professorships, endowed teaching and curricular development funds. Most of these funds come through Fairfield Funds, which are Advancement's annual unrestricted support funds. They would like to continue to raise the current use funds in the amount of \$35 million dollars. These funds come from current use programmatic grants that individuals receive from foundations and/or corporations for research. These funds are designated to areas of the University based on the greater needs of the institution. Traditionally, most of these funds were distributed to Financial Aid.

This year some of the money will go to students, who have been displaced by hurricane Sandy. Another piece of the campaign is to raise 35 million dollars for facilities, which is not really efficient enough to meet the needs of the University.

The primary academic building in this goal is the renovations of the SON/Health Sciences initiative. Donor interest for this initiative is not what the building is going to look like, but more importantly what is going to happen inside of the building and how it is going to advance Fairfield. Deans Babington and Crabtree chaired a committee over the summer that came up with wonderful ideas, leveraging existing strengths and pushing the needle further informing what will happen between the SON building and BNW. This project was estimated at approximately 15 million dollars.

The campaign will address the needs of the RecPlex, which was state of the art in 1979 but not much more was put into this facility since then. This is an important piece of the campus community. Swipe card access indicated that over 95% of our students use this facility regularly. Unfortunately, the current condition of the RecPlex is not a selling point for prospective students.

The final piece of the campaign is the Alumni Stadium, which will be the new home for men's and women's varsity lacrosse and also a signature place to host tournaments for the northeast. This will give the University greater exposure to students around the country who may not have heard about Fairfield University.

The University is in the first three years of this campaign (2012-2014), which we call the leadership phase. Although we are receiving gifts, through conversations with donors, Advancement is trying to ascertain if 160 million dollars is a feasible goal; considering the sensitivity of economic times, changes in charitable contributions, etc...

The hope is to make a public launch of the campaign in October of 2014, but about one-half of the projected 160 million dollars would need to be raised, before comfortably moving ahead with the campaign. A preliminary launch of the campaign will take place on-campus involving all constituencies, ideally on a Friday and Saturday, engaging in lectures, open classrooms, and tours, with faculty, students and alumni, so that people could visibly see how gifts are being put to work.

The ultimate hope is that this campaign would be completed by 2017 to coincide with the 75th year of the founding of the Prep School. We are engaging individuals of all sectors on campus, through the campus campaign task force, individual meetings, alumni events, and a variety of other ways.

The Dean commented that the template for Endowed Professorship was distributed to chairs and directors. The Dean has been collecting case statement requests for potential endowed chairs in the College. Over the winter break she will be putting these together into a portfolio. The idea is to generate these in hopes that one of them will be of interest to a particular donor.

The Dean shared that she pulled together a group of summer humanities fellows to look at the Humanities Institute and planning for the future. The goal is to build this endowment and have a grander focus. This is a multi-phase, long range plan that she will share with the SVPAA and Stephanie Frost, VP of Advancement. The idea is to secure the Humanities Institute for the future.

Dr. Nancy Dallavalle asked Stephanie Frost to share the types of projects most appealing to donors. When you talk about endowed professorships, what excites them? The interest varies from individual to individual. Sometimes the interest is in their own particular field of study or what they studied while at Fairfield, some are of self-interest, some show interest in advancing in areas of need at Fairfield and interested in how it would move forward, and others ask how we would strengthen various areas. It really depends on what is of interest to the donor at that particular time. Giving is not transactional but exceedingly emotional and psychological. One thing donors like to hear is about the interdisciplinary nature and opportunities. This impresses people, especially people who have come from more complicated and more bureaucratic institutions. The ways we leverage strength really appeals to the people.

Dr. David Gudelunas mentioned that he is a chair on the Faculty Handbook and meets with Ms. Frost throughout the year. If there are any faculty concerns, he would be glad to bring them to the folks in Advancement.

Advising Action Plan

Associate Dean Manyul Im introduced AVP Beth Boquet and Ms. Suzanne Solensky, Director of Undergraduate Academic Planning to lead a discussion of action steps for the College of Arts and Sciences relative to advising. We would like to collaborate and discuss the different types of advising and situations based on the variety of programs we have in the College. It would be useful to learn about the different practices, and structural and conceptual issues in the College around advising.

Dr. Boquet mentioned that she and Ms. Solensky engaged in an extensive presentation at the CAS Faculty meeting a few weeks ago. A few slides were circulated *prior* to the Dean's Council meeting relative to the Advising Focus Groups select finds, as well as a survey questionnaire to use as talking points during the DC meeting.

Dr. Boquet shared that she will be cycling back to her faculty role. She reflected on why she wanted to engage in administrated work and what she is bringing back to her faculty work. She discussed threads that connected to the advising question particularly as it related to faculty role.

- Faculty are engaged in their best work when they engage in one on one advising sessions with students. This promotes academic success for students, particularly when we think about accessibility and educational equity issues and working with students who are new to our discipline, new to academic discourse, etc... The role that academic advising plays in that relationship is essential in getting students through college, as well as connecting them to the things that matter about an education.
- Connectivity to faculty is not only nationally benchmarked as a contribution to student success, but Fairfield's data demonstrated how important a student's relationship with faculty impacted their lives.
- Faculty engage in tremendous mentoring relationships with students through initiatives, such as Fulbright and lab experiences, but for some reason these experiences do not translate into University's statistical data. Looking at the quantitative evidence prior to the Focus group, on the 2011 CAS senior survey, Fairfield was below all peer institutions, in terms of satisfaction with academic advising, which ranked 53%. Since 2006, the satisfaction rate at Fairfield has not exceeded 59.2%.
- Dr. Boquet commented that these statistics did not seem to match to what she actually saw in terms of faculty engagement with students. There are structural and conceptual issues to address in order to move the needle on academic advising. The Dean commented that she had pondered with this too. Her understanding is that in the DSB faculty do not advise undergraduate students intensively, nor are they the primary academic advisor for students. If this is the case, given the number of business students, this could affect our data. Dr. Boquet commented that what is likely happening across the schools is that advising at the University is coupled to registration and we have too many problems around the registration process.
- Students generally do not begin their academic career with the experience of having an academic advisor. Students need to be informed about what an academic advisor is, when they are being advised, why they are being advised, etc... This is a big piece about what was observed around the University's advising data.
- A Focus Group was generated to help determine what the 53% satisfaction with academic advising at Fairfield meant. Through conversations, it was determined that the definition of academic advising was a missing link; therefore, focus groups were setup primarily to get behind this. Students are checking off a box on a quantitative survey, so it was important to determine student and faculty understanding of advising. The focus groups gave a sense of what advising looks like to our students and further direction for research.
- Dr. David McFadden mentioned that breaking the link between registration and advising is essential. A lot of students see this as a way to come and receive their registration pin number. Students are upset when they learn they cannot receive their pin without engaging in academic advising. It is hard to have a productive advising session when students are upset. If all departments could setup a meeting of advisors and advisees early in the semester to talk about academic work, goals, etc... This would help with the understanding of the productivity of student/faculty advising.
- Dr. Mary Ann Carolan commented that faculty are continuously advising their students in the classroom. There is so much unofficial advising from the first day of class, as students come to faculty to talk about their homework, papers, projects, etc...
- Dr. Yohuru Williams commented that students could go on-line to seek guidance in terms of what courses they need to fulfill their requirements. What students really need is

mentoring. We need an organic relationship, so students feel comfortable talking to faculty not just during registration time but because they want to benefit from faculty knowledge. What courses make sense, what minors make sense, what long-term career options do they have?

- Dr. Primavera commented that if the question was proposed to students differently, we most likely would not receive 53% satisfaction rate. How satisfied are students around faculty mentoring relative to course and career choices? Changing the use of words, such as mentoring, invite, etc...may help students translate questions differently. Ms. Solensky mentioned that because this is a nationally administered survey, the questions cannot be change. The University engages in the national survey, because it offers year-to-year national norms to the University. This does not mean we cannot change wording on our own campus surveys. The data from this survey is the College Senior Survey, which is a national norm survey. We could think of what terms are operative on our own campus and ways we can work with students to understand them. We are also in the position of thinking about our own accredited body and agencies and ways other institutions think about and report on this type of information. Distinction between mentoring and academic advising is essential, as well as determining ways we can make academic advising meaningful and make the connections we need.
- Dr. Gudelunas mentioned that in the Communication Department have approximately 330 majors, 50 minors, and only six faculty to advise students within their major. It is a stretch to engage in quality advising. We need to rethink ways in which this could be managed productively. He suggested that the department engage in advising during the students second year in the major. Another issue is that registration is a disaster; therefore time is wasted on a system that needs to be fixed. Having three different times on three different forms is a waste of faculty and student time. The closing of UC created a problem in terms of the type of advising part-time students were accustomed to receiving. Part-time students expressed that they were advised on taking classes based on the easiest classes. This is not a way he felt comfortable advising. Major conversations should take place around advising practices and consideration should be taken in terms of the logistics in the number of students needing advising in a given discipline.
- Dr. Boquet shared that the University has a high retention rate. Dr. Dallavalle commented that with a high retention rate, she does not think the advising piece is a great issue. She engages in advising all of the time. The problematic issue is the registration piece. The Dean shared her conversation with a Dean from another school, where they received the same type of feedback from students. They developed a multi-prong approach to advising. After this process was in place, they experienced a tremendous change in the advising survey data. There are programmatic ways to help manage advising and reach positive outcomes. The College could develop their own advising methodology and programs for students.
 - Advising Fair—During this session, faculty engaged in open advising for a broad type of conversation.
 - Majors were advised in groups, not for registration but for orientation. At registration time there was the usual advising, where students receive their pin.
 - Peer Advising—Majors developed peer advising, where students shared their wisdom. These advisors were trained in peer advising programs, as well as trained through the department.

- Dr. Boquet mentioned that peers, particularly in the larger majors, are an underutilized resource. Educating peers is an essential piece, especially in discipline areas where the numbers are too high for faculty to manage.
- Dr. Petrino shared that the English department engaged in a peer advising event that was a huge success. A group of six peer advisers shared their own experience with students. They worked with their peers to identify and answer specific questions. She made a suggestion that two additions be added to the planning for the next round of peer advising—publicizing the event more thoroughly, so students could use this opportunity to network with other students in fields of their own interest. Also, it would be helpful to find students who could represent each of the tracks in the English Department major. Core writing is an essential component of the major, and it is also a place where much of the informal advising takes place.
- Dr. Petrino heard that faculty are being encouraged to advise minors as well as second majors. Each student has a primary adviser that they look to for most of their advising needs. When advising is needed for their minor or second major, they should reach out to the respective discipline for academic advice. How do we get the word out to students that they need to visit with the department for this type of advising?
- Can the national survey data be broken down by schools and by majors? Ms. Solensky mentioned that they could ask if this is possible. What information does faculty want? How and where are we having conversations about faculty recognition or accountability? Dr. Boquet commented that disentangling of the registration issues should include faculty involvement/input, but issues such as disaggregation of data, is faculty work. We want to be careful where these conversations land (handbook committees, department, college, etc...)
- Ms. Solensky mentioned that there are approximately 55 new student leaders—sophomores, juniors, and seniors, who are trained to work with incoming students. They receive ongoing training as peer academic advisors. These students receive a stipend for their work. Most institutions have a central location for their student leaders, where the peers are staffed at certain hours and there is supervision by a professional staff or faculty. This model allows for more accountability. This is a challenge for the University and restricts us from expanding the number of student leaders available for peer advising. Ms. Solensky mentioned that she trust peer student advisors to reach out to her or other professional staff when they have questions, but having a location is a better scenario.
- Dr. Gudelunas mentioned that our students are very happy to engage in peer advising but having a staff person available during advising is important in terms of handling all of the nuts and bolts. Students have many questions, such as study abroad questions or seeking information relative to other disciplines. He expressed his concern about sending students off in many different directions to get all of their answers addressed. There should be a centralized area to handle these nuts and bolts. Dean Crabtree mentioned that at her previous institution, which was a large state school, at registration time faculty would sign up for student advising hours at a central location. The process was very separate to the advising they engaged in with their own majors.
- The Dean emphasized that advising is teaching and having an efficient process in place really matters. Our institution should have great advising, where students understand that it is highly consequential, but we want it to be advising as teaching not as service. It is a form of teaching and faculty should be seeing this as enriching their portfolio of

teaching accomplishments. Faculty should be accountable to their colleagues, so colleagues hold colleagues accountable for the quality and quantity of advising they offer to students. If you want better advising, different advising, and more advising then colleagues should hold each other accountable. They should solicit conversation about what the programmatic expectations are for the kind of advising they want for their students. We do have staff who help us think together about advising at Fairfield—first year advising and transition—but it is the faculty's responsibility to think about what that means for their own students.

- Dr. Im collected the Academic Advising surveys that were distributed to chairs and directors. This information will be compiled and shared. He also suggested that the College consider initiating an Advising Teaching Award, which would be separate from the CAS Teaching Award already in place.

Announcements and Routine Issues

- FY '14 budget requests are submitted to the SVPAA's Office. The Dean may reach out to department or programs for tweaking if necessary. She is starting to work with the SVPAA's on prioritizing personnel issues to move forward in his budget. If chairs or directors have any major changes, they should send them to Ms. Jean Daniele, along with the updated worksheet and justification.
- Searches are completed in History and Sociology with the hiring of two outstanding colleagues in both of these departments. We are on the verge of getting a new colleague in Biochemistry and unfolding searches in Math and Economics in the spring.
- The Dean is pleasantly surprised with the candidates in the Dean of Engineering search and the committee is in the process of scheduling four campus visits. Some faculty may find opportunity to meet with them, particularly Physics. Candidates may ask to touch base with CAS departments.

Adjourn to Dean's Dinner at Bangalore.