Diversity and Equity Advisory Board

2018-2019 End of Year Report

2018-2019 DEAB Membership

Faculty: Andreea Marinescu (Co-Chair), Jessica Kisunzu, Karen Roybal, Manya Whitaker

Staff: Megan Rhodes (Co-Chair), Amairani Alamillo, Melanie Alexander, Bethany Grubbs, Paul Buckley (ex officio), Jan Edwards (ex officio), Steve Lawson (ex officio), Barbara Wilson (ex officio, Heather Kissack (ex officio)

Summary of the Year’s Activities:

The Board met once each block for 1.5 hours. We maintained a record of all of our meeting/agendas and reports, which are available by request.

One of our main priorities for this year was the ongoing charge of faculty recruitment and retention, which is also highlighted as an issue to address in the 2018-2019 CC Antiracism External Review. As part of this effort we compiled and systematized the suggestions and recommendations for faculty searches that have been made in the past several years. We have submitted this document to President Tiefenthaler in May 2019 and have included it in the Board’s year-end report to the Faculty Executive Committee. We would like to request that the Office of the Dean consider these recommendations and follow up with the Board regarding plans for implementation.

Recommendations for faculty searches

May 2019

1. Information for search committee chairs and search committee members

The “Faculty Recruiting Handbook” on the Dean’s Office website is over 30 pages-long.

   **Recommendation 1:** Make the handbook easily accessible by all search committee members (not only link for chairs and program directors).

   **Recommendation 2:** Condense the document into a useable handout. Every search committee member should have to look at the document. It is important that this document include information on where the search process might be different for a different type of position (e.g., lecturer vs. tenure-track faculty). The document should contain an FAQ section on accommodations.
2. Accessibility

Recommendation: Make on-campus interviews more accessible to candidates’ needs.

Search committees should offer the opportunity for candidates to request disability-related accommodations for the campus visit. Provide all candidates the opportunity to self-disclose specific needs (if they choose to) at each stage of the application process (from application to on-campus interview).

3. Search committee composition and expectations

Recommendations

1: Clarify the number of people on search committees, who gets to vote, and what the qualifications are for the cognate members (formalize the selection process of cognate members).

2: Clarify expectations about level of engagement of cognate faculty members. Ensure consistency among cognate members.

3: Strengthen the role of the diversity representative: clearly flag diversity representatives and clarify their roles and responsibilities. Specify that one of the two required representatives must be a member of the department and the other must be a cognate member. Provide search-specific training/tools/resources to competently, comfortably and confidently provide feedback and guidance in the selection process.

4: Clarify the role of the chair.

5: Once the search committee is formed, the Dean should consider meeting with the entire search committee to go over guidelines.

6: Create an Honor Code for search committee members, to include unacceptable behavior (such as Google candidates, etc.) and expectations for honorable behavior.

7: Ensure consistency among all departments and programs in who reads files.

8: Build a post-search survey for individual search committee members. The survey should be anonymous; respondents could identify their specific role on the search (cognate, diversity representative, chair, department member).

4. The role of DEAB in the search process

While the role of DEAB in tenure-track faculty searches is clearly delineated in the Faculty Handbook and the Faculty Recruiting Handbook, DEAB has had minimal, if any, interaction with the Dean’s Office with respect to the faculty recruitment process. **Overall recommendation:** ensure that the Dean’s Office complies with the steps outlined in these documents regarding DEAB’s role in the faculty recruitment process.

In particular, we would like to highlight:

a) The Faculty Handbook states that advertisements for tenure-track faculty positions “must be approved by the Diversity and Equity Advisory Board and the Dean, in consultation with the Provost.” (p. 12) DEAB has never received these ads and has never been able to review them.
**Recommendation:** Ensure that DEAB receives and reviews all advertisements for tenure-track faculty positions.

b) Section VII of the Faculty Recruiting Handbook states: “Evaluating the search: Report back to the Dean with a short, written summary of the process/outcome so the Dean can provide this information to the DEAB.” (p. 13) DEAB has yet to receive any such reports.

**Recommendation:** Ensure that DEAB is able to receive reports at the end of all searches conducted, either from the search committee chair or the diversity representatives.

5. **The Riley Scholars-in-Residence Program**

This program supplies a high number of US racial-ethnic minority faculty at CC, yet it is a non-tenure track position with unclear expectations for the future. In the past the program retained a significant number of scholars in tenure-track positions at CC, yet currently there is no clear pathway from the post-doctoral program to a full-time position. This has created confusion among Riley scholars (who receive mixed messages from different constituencies) and has affected them negatively. Furthermore, departments have begun seeing these positions as “free” replacements, with little regard for the scholar’s professional future beyond the program. This has had an overall negative impact on the experience of Riley scholars at CC.

**Recommendation.** There need to be clear policies and expectations in place for departments and Riley candidates before and during their employment at CC. The Board recommends that Riley Scholars-in-Residence should be hired with the expectation of an offer for a tenure-track position at CC. To that end, we also recommend revisiting CC’s relationship to the Consortium for Faculty Diversity (CFD).

We also continued our examination of the current procedures for faculty and staff leaving the college (exit interviews, etc.) and the process for on campus interviews for applicants. While the HR Office is continually revising their existent exit interview process for staff leaving the college, **currently there is no exit interview for faculty**, nor is there an established exit process. Based on our discussions/review of the existing policies and procedures, DEAB has recommended that the faculty exit process be formalized - for tenure-track faculty, as well as for full time visiting faculty and post-doctoral faculty (Riley Scholars in particular). In particular, we recommended that faculty 1) be able to complete an exit interview tailored to faculty (a form to be developed in collaboration with HR) and 2) be offered a delayed exit interview six months after leaving the college (in the form of an informal interview with the Provost and/or the Director of the Butler Center and/or a future Chief Diversity Officer) to ascertain the faculty’s professional and personal experience at the college. (This recommendation is modeled on procedures in place at Metro State University Denver.) The implementation of this recommendation is particularly urgent since all tenure-track faculty who have left the college in the past seven years were faculty of color. Also, as the CC Antiracism External Review Report notes, the majority of CC faculty who identify as US racial-ethnic minorities are either non-tenure-track (63.5%) or tenure-track (37.5%) rather than tenured (14.7%) (p. 4). We have made these recommendations in October 2018 to the President and the Provost, who were receptive to these recommendations, but concrete steps are yet to be taken.

In addition, we continued to discuss and continue to recommend the following:

- Need to provide more than one avenue/mechanism for feedback from faculty and staff leaving the institution
• Consider giving more importance and opportunity for employees to participate in “stay-interviews” and/or similar mechanisms to encourage retention and thriving.

In our Block 3 meeting (November 2018) we met with Dr. Worthington and we answered questions about the Board’s purpose and function, as related to antiracism efforts on campus. In his Report Dr. Worthington references our committee as relatively new to the college and one who is “yet to become fully functional within existing structures of governance” (39). The current members of the Board agree with the assessment and we have been discussing ways to increase our ability to implement our recommendations. We want our work to matter and to be able to have productive and concrete outcomes. We believe that one fundamental missing piece is the Board’s relationship to the Dean’s Office, which impacts our ability to foster accountability on issues of faculty diversity and development. Board members believe that the Board would benefit from adding the Dean of the Faculty as an ex-officio member. Many staff-related issues are addressed the HR Director is an ex-officio member. The Dean would act as a valuable equivalent for faculty-related issues, issues that this committee is asked to address on a regular basis. We have discussed this matter with the President and the Provost and have informed the FEC of our recommendation. Here we reiterate our formal recommendation to add the Dean of the Faculty as an ex-officio member of the Board.

In Block 4, the DEAB discussed the nominations for the Victor Nelson-Cisneros Leadership Award in Diversity and Inclusion and selected our top two choices for the President’s consideration. Members discussed the nomination process for the award and have noted variability from year to year. We suggest the following steps: after DEAB receives the nominations, we first discuss as a group and then vote individually after the discussion. The goal for the discussion is to clarify the criteria and purpose for the award and achieve consensus on how to assess candidates. Members agreed that the committee should know what is associated with the award (e.g., money). Members suggest that the instructions for nominations be standardized and enforced. It is difficult to select candidates based on the nomination letters provided when there is so much variability between these letters. Some candidates receive a paragraph while others receive several pages. To remedy this, members suggested a minimum and maximum page count for nominations. The call for nominations should ask for the nomination letter to speak to the nominee’s leadership, collaboration, etc., and particularly how those qualities go beyond the expectations of the person’s regular job responsibilities. It should also be clear that one can nominate groups or individuals.

DEAB received a second message from CCSGA in March 2019 requesting student representation on the board (the initial inquiry was in April 2018). The board along with President Tiefenthaler considered the proposed change and its impact on the mission of DEAB. We reiterated that the mission and focus of DEAB is specific to faculty and staff and the general consensus of the board was that that mission was important and should continue to be a part of the campus community. DEAB was intentionally created as a space for staff and faculty only and members agreed that it is important for faculty and staff to have their own space to discuss issues. The Board proposed alternative venues for student engagement without restructuring Board membership:

1. DEAB can have a collaborative meeting with CCSGA once a semester. This would be separate from regular meetings so that DEAB can still move through the year’s agenda.
2. Another suggestion was that the co-chairs attend a CCSGA meeting once a semester.
3. Currently, students can approach any member of DEAB with a concern related to faculty and staff.
In addition, we continually updated and maintained the newly revised DEAB website with up to date upcoming agenda items, meeting minutes, member spotlight, and highlighting diversity-related developments at the College.

**For the 2019-2020 academic year DEAB would like to continue and/or revisit the following initiatives:**

- Continue to consider issues related to faculty/staff recruitment and retention
  - Monitor progress on the formalization of the faculty exit interview process
  - Analyze and give assessment on data provided by HR on staff and faculty recruitment and turnover.
  - Explore the idea that one DEAB tenured faculty member review FEC’s recommendations for tenure and promotion
- Update the initial “Faculty and Staff Diversity Action Team 2013-14 Recommendations Status Report” (last updated Spring 2017) to reflect the Board’s recent work and the College’s recent accomplishments on issues related to diversity and inclusion.
  - Consider using this updated document to generate a progress dashboard (similar to USC’s Commitment to Change Progress Dashboard: [https://change.usc.edu/change-progress-dashboard-grid/](https://change.usc.edu/change-progress-dashboard-grid/)).
- Reassess the Board’s current name (remove the word “advisory” from the name) and revisit the description in the Faculty Handbook: review this Board’s purpose/charge, evaluate its role as a campus committee with a view to increase its functionality and its ability to foster accountability. Consider revising the committee description to allow for closer collaboration with Staff Council and the Faculty Executive Committee.
- Discuss and make formal recommendations for professional development for faculty and staff related to issues of diversity and inclusion
  - compile a list of professional development opportunities
  - DEAB can coordinate resources
  - allow for post-conference debriefing
  - staff/faculty can attend as cohort
  - “earn a block” for faculty: 18 diversity-related conference days = 1 teaching block
- Work intentionally with the Crown Faculty Center on professional development related to diversity and inclusion
- Collaborate with Tutt Library librarian to create the new database of faculty expertise

Respectfully Submitted,

Andreea Marinescu - DEAB Faculty Co-Chair 2018-2019

Megan Rhodes - DEAB Staff Co-Chair 2018-2019