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PREAMBLE

To live in community is to teach how to build it and how to practice it. Community stands
between the impersonalism of mass society and the self-centeredness of individualism.To build community requires compassion for each other, coordination of leadership, painstaking development of communication and dialogue, the creative use of common facilities and the promotion of many opportunities for formal and informal gathering, embracing every sector: administration, students, staff and faculty. ..All this holds true also for the variety of ethnic and cultural communities as well, for community has a healthy respect for diversity. This requires those human virtues of congeniality: civility, humor, balance and trust. There is no community after all, if its members do not work to respect religious, racial and cultural diversity….The rights and obligations of all members of the University community should be clearly stated and appropriate procedures established to deal with conflicts regarding these rights…..We at Seton Hall acknowledge our responsibility to strengthen human bonds and to do this most particularly by continuing the service that we have historically offered to the education of the poor and disadvantaged. We acknowledge and resolve to address the need to promote the dignity and advancement of the poor, of women, of the elderly, and communities of people of color – in particular those populations that are numerous in this region.

Seton Hall A Catholic University
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Seton Hall University

Towards Faculty Diversity: Pluralism and Our Mission

As a Catholic institution of higher education committed to equality and respect for the dignity of all human beings, Seton Hall strives to offer a working environment which acknowledges and celebrates, but not uncritically, both individual and collective social identities based on race, ethnicity, age, religion, gender, sexual orientation or ability/disability. Faculty recruitment and retention policies, therefore, will address the continuing challenges related to access and equity in a diversified and stratified society such as ours.

This emphasis on faculty diversity reflects the Catholic and universal nature of the university and helps us fulfill our responsibility to serve the public, especially the poor and underrepresented. Just as Seton Hall in its past provided access to generations of previously excluded groups to full participation in the benefits of America, once again we look to extend and continue that tradition of commitment and openness to a new generation of Americans. Multicultural communities characterize the state of New Jersey and Seton Hall draws its students largely from this area. To be effective, the faculty should mirror the student body.

Our intent here, however, is to go beyond merely proportioning diversity and to make interactive diversity an institutional priority and practice. This way we will be able to enhance human potential in the context of a caring and accepting social environment. Achieving this objective will be the result of expanding the spirit of responsible citizenship by our commitment to inclusiveness.

Seton Hall intends to enhance, sustain, and celebrate the diversity of our faculty and student body. Both are intimately connected constituencies and together define the essence of the university enterprise. Nothing is more central to our commitment to educate the next generation than the role of the faculty. As our society and our student body change and evolve towards inclusiveness, it is imperative that students see their worlds and histories reflected among those who instruct them. Students look to their teachers as guides not only in subject matter but also in the task of creating a more just and compassionate society. For students to see their own heritage in the lives and faces of their teachers and in the curriculum is for them an affirmation of their own experiences.

This vision and commitment to mutual respect, wherein our university encourages a multicultural environment, is essential for our future health and relevancy as a viable academic enterprise. Democracy and Catholicity challenge us to move beyond our individual and institutional comfort zones of acculturation (cognitive, affective, and behavioral) to engage, understand, and respect differences and similarities among peoples, societies, and cultures. An inclusive institutional vision encourages a nurturing and challenging intellectual and social climate for all members of the campus community.

To live in community is to teach how to build, practice and nurture that community. This means sustaining an active commitment to inclusiveness. Building community as a refuge against the impersonalism of mass society with its self-centered individualism requires compassion, understanding, and determination. In practice, this means that all dimensions of university life reflect diversity and all of its organizational and administrative units work together in a coordinated fashion to sustain a pluralistic environment. If administrators and faculty together set the standards and live out the vision of respect proposed here, the whole campus environment would be radically altered. Respectful dialogue and dissent means mutual concern, the shared use of common facilities, the promotion of formal and informal multicultural gatherings, and involvement in each other’s concerns and needs, whether they concern issues regarding gender, racial, ethnic or religious heritage. To do otherwise is to encourage divisiveness and suspicion.

Mutual respect and the right to dissent requires the human virtues of congeniality, civility, humor, balance and trust. After all, there is no community if its members do not work to respect religious, racial, cultural and life-style differences. Each Seton Hall constituency brings to the table different, important and relevant knowledge and perspectives about work, learning, and relationships, thus, challenging some of our basic assumptions about who we are and what we do (and do not do) as an institution. To sustain respect for each other, the rights and responsibilities of members of the Seton Hall community need to be clearly stated and appropriate procedures established regarding implementation of those rights and responsibilities and conflicts associated with these expectations.

Acknowledging and integrating faculty diversity into the curriculum, structures and operations of the university will contribute to the education of our students who will become, under our guidance and, we hope, because of our example, part of the global workforce and world community both as contributors and democratic participants.

Institutional and faculty diversity are realities created by individuals and groups from a broad spectrum of demographically and philosophically distinct groups. By acknowledging these differences we value individuals and groups and foster a climate where equity, dissent and mutual respect are intrinsic. Seton Hall commits itself to creating and sustaining a person-oriented, cooperative and caring community that draws intellectual strength from its Catholic tradition while encouraging creativity through the synergy of its people. Such an environment will enhance the human potential of all the members of the University community as related to our mission to achieve excellence in research, teaching and community service. Faculty diversity and civility are essential for Seton Hall’s distinctiveness as a progressive Catholic University committed to excellence and equity.

Understanding diversity is at the core of effective human interaction. Various individuals and groups have contributed over the years to diversity efforts at Seton Hall and those efforts have been extremely important. Yet despite these achievements, much work and application remains to be done. There are growing indications that some groups and individuals at Seton Hall feel excluded, marginalized and treated with disrespect.

As a broad blueprint that links vision, commitment and action, our faculty diversity plan at Seton Hall is an extension of the University’s strategic plan to be a leading Catholic educational institution that offers a vision of hope, faith and love for our world. Like other institutional initiatives, our commitment to faculty diversity represents a visible symbol of our institutional identity and of how we do business and live our lives.

The face of America is changing and Seton Hall needs to be at the forefront of this new frontier for our history to continue in a relevant way. The future is here, around us now, on our campus. We have, as an organization and community, an opportunity to build and celebrate, but not without critical thinking, our growing pluralism. Therefore, since the university is already composed of faculty, staff, students, and alumni from different backgrounds, social groups, and cultures, it behooves us to respond carefully and fruitfully to where the people of other cultures and genders are now, where they have been in the past and what crucial problems they face now so that together we can move to a more compassionate and just society both here and in the wider society.

The Diversity Plan

I. Access, Development, and Retention

Access means welcoming all faculty into the Seton Hall community and ensuring their full participation in the life of the campus. Current efforts at recruiting members of under represented groups should, thus, be enhanced. Development and retention means providing the necessary personal and professional support that will allow individuals to be long term contributing and productive members of Seton Hall.

Goal 1: Seton Hall will increase the presence and contributions of diverse groups of faculty to the life of the university

II. Institutional Climate

Campus climate includes the culture, decisions, practices, policies and behaviors that, taken together, constitute the working and learning environment for faculty at Seton Hall. Such a climate is everyone’s responsibility and includes fostering an atmosphere of civility and respect for others, elimination of unlawful discrimination, and providing easy access to redress, if needed.

Goal 2: Seton Hall will create a working climate and learning environment for the faculty where differences are welcomed and open to honest dialogue.

III. Curricular and Pedagogical Transformation

Seton Hall faculty is committed to teaching, research, scholarship, and community service. The University’s curriculum should contribute to student preparation for the realities of the 21st century. Seton Hall should encourage a diversity of course content and pedagogy. The two must occur simultaneously, since student exposure to new material, alternative perspectives and teaching techniques cannot occur effectively unless students have the skills to enhance cognitive understanding. Such skills are the product of dynamic and diversified classroom environments and effective instruction. Thus, the faculty represent a critical group concerning the successful acceptance and implementation of diversity.

The process of decision making should occur in a forum that promotes open debate and academic integrity. Faculty should be assured that neither academic freedom nor faculty governance will be violated.

Goal 3: Seton Hall will incorporate a spirit of multicultural diversity into the ways we teach, do scholarship, plan research and govern ourselves.

IV. Institutionalization

The commitment to faculty diversity should be evident in Seton Hall’s institutional identity and in all its communications, including admissions literature, first year and transfer orientation literature programs, course catalogues, and should be frequently expressed by University administrators in written and oral presentations. It is important that both faculty and administration be fully committed to the goals and that this commitment be demonstrated in speech and in action.

Goal 4: Seton Hall’s commitment to faculty diversity will be evident in all its operations and reflected in its public personae.

Our Faculty Diversity Plan is a working document and is consistent with the concept of continuous improvement. Evidence indicates that faculty diversity enhances the quality of the educational experience and must become an integral part of the institutional culture. An intentional effort, such as is embodied in this Presidential Commission On Faculty Diversity, can contribute to that cultural change. A measure of our success is when a spirit of multicultural diversity becomes a part of the everyday business of the institution.

PROFILE OF THE UNIVERSITY: 1998- 1999

BOARD OF REGENTS

Of the 29 current members of the Board of Regents there are three European American women, two African American males, no African American women, no Latinas or Latinos and no Asian Americans or Native Americans. In the case of Latinas and Latinos this is of special concern since the Latino community now comprises close to 50% of the membership of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States.

Administration

At the highest levels of the administration during the 1998-1999 academic year there are a total of 29 males and 15 women; of the 29 men only 2 are men of color and of the 15 women there are 2 women of color. Of the total of 44 listed under Executive/Administrator/Managerial in the University there is no African American male, 2 African American women and 2 Latino males.

Office of the Chancellor, President, Provost

Executive Cabinet 1 person of color

Academic Council 1 person of color

Provosts, Associate, Assistant 1 persons of color

Vice Presidents, Assistant Vice Presidents, Assistants to the President 1 persons of color

Academic Affairs

Deans 0

Associate Deans 0

Assistant Deans 0

Chairpersons 8

Table 1

Students: Undergraduate, Full-Time Total = 4409 (Fall 1998)
Faculty/Librarians: University Total = 365 (Fall 1998)

( 12 Sch of Grad Med Edu, 181 Sch of A&S, 53 Sch of Bus, 36 Col of Edu, 26 Sch of Nurs, 3 Sch of Theol, 43 Sch of Law, 11 Librarians)

White Men Men of Color \*All Men White Women Women of Color \*All Women
Students 1218 (28%) 481 (11%) 1973 (45%) 1342 (30%) 777 (18%) 2436 (55%)
Fac/Lib 170 (47%) 40 (11%) 222 (61%) 121 (33%) 18 ( 5%) 143 (39%)

(\* The All-columns above include race/ethnicity given as “Other” and race/ethnicity Unknown)
(priests are not included)

Table 2

Students: Undergraduate, Full-Time Total = 4409 (Fall 1998)
Faculty/Librarians: University Total = 365 (Fall 1998)

( 12 Sch of Grad Med Edu, 181 Sch of A&S, 53 Sch of Bus, 36 Col of Edu, 26 Sch of Nurs, 3 Sch of Theol, 43 Sch of Law, 11 Librarians)

African Amer Latinas/Latinos Asian Ameri Ameri Indian People of Color
Students 537 (12%) 425 (10%) 294 ( 7%) 2 (<1%) 1258 (29%)
Fac/Lib 16 ( 5%) 11 ( 3%) 29 ( 8%) 2 (<1%) 58 (16%)

African Amer Latinas Asian Amer Amer Ind Women of Color
Women Women Women
Students 349 (8%) 274 ( 6%) 154 ( 3%) 0 (<1%) 777 (18%)
Fac/Lib 8 (2%) 3 ( 1%) 7 ( 2%) 0 18 ( 5%)

The figures above speak for themselves but it is important to highlight the following: in the College of Arts and Sciences there are only 5African American Professors out of a total of 181 faculty. When the University recently established a mentoring program funded by the New Jersey Commission on Higher Education, we attempted to match students with faculty taking into account major, gender and ethnic/racial background. When it came to the needs of women of color students, we encountered a small pool of faculty from which to ask for volunteers: a total of 7 African American women faculty, 2 Latina women faculty, and 5 Asian American faculty women for the entire University.

As the total number of students of color grows their need for mentors, courses developed to meet their expectations, role models, advisors and guides from among the faculty will continue to increase. This by no means implies that their only teachers, advisors and mentors will be or should be faculty from their background; but a proportional representation from their own communities lets the students know that they are not alone and that this is indeed a University committed to diversity from its Board of Regents, to the upper administration, to the faculty as well as secretaries and support personnel in student services.

Table 3

S.H.U. Comprehensive Achievement Program (CAP)

CAP Students: Total = 264 (Fall 97)
CAP Mentors: Total = 30 (Fall 97)
(T.A.G. Cell ½; Fall 1997 So/Jr/Sr Full-Time, non-EOP)

White Men Men of Color \*All Men White Women Women of Color \*All Women
CAP Stu 59 (22%) 35 (13%) 105 (40%) 84 (32%) 57 (22%) 159 (60%)
CAP Fac 14 (47%) 5 (17%) 19 (63%) 9 (30%) 2 ( 7%) 11 (37%)

(\* The All-columns above include race/ethnicity given as “Other” and race/ethnicity Unknown)

Total Students of Color Total Faculty of Color

African American 629 12.7% 16 7 women 9 men

Latinas/Latinos 478 9.7% 10 2 women 8 men

Asian American 316 6.4% 23 5 women 18 men

American Indian 4 0.1% 2 0 women 2 men

Total 1427 28.9% 51 or 15%

RESULTS OF THE FACULTY SURVEY

DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE SAMPLE POPULATION

The sample population of 113 (124 were received but 11 were too late to include).

Of this population 83 (74%) were white. There was only 1 African-American, 11(9%) Asian Americans, and 2 Hispanics. Eight answered other and an additional 8 gave no response. The distribution along this variable is so disproportionately white any analysis undertaken in regard to this variable would be unreliable.

The sex distribution was 60 male (53%) and 36 female (31%).

71 (62%) of the sample were not physically challenged, 8 (7%) were and 34 (30%) did not respond.

The distribution along religion revealed that 45(40%) were Catholic, 22(20%) were Non-Catholic Christian, and 36(32%) were Non-Catholic, Non-Christian.

82 (72%) of the sample are American Born, 17 (15%) were Born Abroad.

The Colleges were represented as follows:

College of Arts& Sciences 47 (42%)
School of Business 23 (20%)
School of Diplomacy and International Relations 0
College of Education and Human Services 12 (11%)
School of Law 10 (9%)
University Libraries 6 (5%)
School of Graduate Medical Education 5 (4%)
College of Nursing 2 (2%)
School of Theology 0

IT IS DIFFICULT TO INTERPRET THE DATA. It cannot be determined based on the data, how representative the sample population is. The findings below represent only those faculty who answered the questionnaire. This may be a biased sample. For example, the racial distribution of the sample is predominantly white with only 1 African-American respondent. This observation alone indicates non-representativeness of the sample.

For this reason only some descriptive findings have been provided. To conduct further analysis, more information is necessary regarding the total population. The data must also be recoded or exported to a different statistical application such as Microcase or SPSS which can be done if the committee has more time for additional analysis.

SOME OBSERVATIONS OF THE DATA:

Responses to questions 1 – 5 on the questionnaire revealed slightly more people reporting good or very good as opposed to poor or very poor.

57% answered good or very good (22% poor or very poor) in regard to the issue of all levels of the university establishing and fostering an environment free from discrimination and absence of “diversity” barriers.

40 % answered good or very good (25% poor or very poor) in regard to whether all faculty are fairly or equitably provided with the opportunity to develop, participate, contribute and exercise their full creativity and expertise toward goals at all levels.

44% answered good or very good (30% poor or very poor) regarding whether an environment is cultivated which values differences and individuality and encourages full development of talents.

44% answered good or very good (34% poor or very poor) regarding the promotion of trust, enhancement of communication, and nurturing of respect and concern for welfare of all individuals and all levels.

45% answered good or very good (31% poor or very poor) regarding the providing of an environment that supports cooperation, team work, and mutual understanding among faculty irrespective of diversity.

Questions A 11-15 show more even split between those who report good or very good and those who answered poor or very poor.

39% answered good or very good (35% poor or very poor) regarding all levels of the university making sure that each faculty member feels valued.

33% answered good or very good (39% poor or very poor) that all levels of the university promotes a management style that accepts and appreciates the unique differences of individuals based on their diversity.

36% answered good or very good (36% poor or very poor) that all levels of the university give due consideration to unsolicited input from all faculty members without retribution.

29% report good or very good and 30% poor or very poor in regard to all levels of the university providing honest and timely feedback to members’ concerns based on their “diversity”

30% report good or very good and 29% poor or very poor that all levels of the university correct situations where cultural differences result in a faculty being unfairly taken advantage of.

Question B1 and B2 revealed answers which heavily favored generally yes or definitely yes.

59% report generally yes or definitely yes and 23% decidedly not or often not that one feels that they are personally treated fairly by management at all levels of the university

67% report generally yes or definitely yes and 23% decidedly not or often not that one feels that they are personally treated fairly by fellow faculty members.

Response to question “Do you feel that you are treated with the respect that you should be treated with? 30% Decidedly not or often not 31% Definitely yes

Of those who did not answer (definitely yes) (59%), 24% reported it was decidedly not because of their “diversity”, 30% said it was generally or definitely was because of their diversity.

There was an even split on the issue of whether one felt that they could be more effective in achieving one’s goals at all levels if you were treated differently than you are now – 39% decidedly or generally yes vs. 39% generally or decidedly not. (No indication in the question that this is related to “diversity”)

47% answered generally or decidedly yes that SHU has made progress in promoting diversity.
18% answered generally or decidedly no

RECOMMENDATIONS

The members of the Presidential Commission identified eight main areas of concern:
1. salary equity
2. working environment
3. matters regarding to rank and tenure
4. recruitment and retention
5. mentoring program
6. professional advancement
7. curricula
8. executive cabinet

SHORT TERM

Issues that can be addressed immediately:
1. Faculty of color should be represented whenever possible on University-wide committees
2. ACE Committee
3. University-wide committees
4. Information Technology
5. Virtual University
6. Rank and Tenure
7. Search Committees: Affirmative Action
8. Academic Planning
9. Budget
10.Curriculum

2. Salary equity cf. Women’s Faculty Association

3. Hiring, Retention and Recruitment
a. Minority Academic Careers Program
b. Mentoring Program: New Jersey Institute of Collegiate Teaching and Learning and Center for College Teaching
4. Curricula
a. University Core Curriculum
b. Peoples and Cultures of America in Arts and Sciences
1. Continue funding and support
c. Curriculum Committee in each college of the University

5. Environment sensitive to and that promotes diversity
a. Survey: personal interviews and questionnaire

6. Professional Development

7. Executive Cabinet and Academic Council
a. Inclusion of faculty of color

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION
ON FACULTY DIVERSITY

The Presidential Commission on Faculty Diversity has structured its recommendations into four major categories.

1. An Affirmation for Salary Equity

A. We recommend that the University establish a salary policy and structure that will ensure that faculty of color and women receive equitable pay based on rank, years of service, performance and disciplinary benchmarks to comparative institutions by September 1, 1999.

2. An Affirmation for UniversityPolicies and Practices that Strengthen Affirmative Action and Promote Diversity

A. We recommend that by January 1, 2000 at least one faculty member of color (African American, Asian American, Latina/Latino, American Indian) be placed on the Board of Regents.

B. We recommend that the University establish an objective along with a strategy to increase the number of faculty of color who serve in such administrative positions as Associate or Assistant Dean by September 1, 2000.

C. We recommend that a formal search process be required and put in place by September 1, 1999 so that all faculty have an opportunity to apply and compete for available administrative positions; faculty of color should be actively recruited for such positions.

D. We recommend the establishment of a mentoring program for all incoming faculty by the Fall of 1999.

E. We recommend that University advertisements for available faculty and administrative positions include standard language to the effect that SHU urges people of color and women to apply, effective as of June 1, 1999.

F. We recommend that Departments that have manifested a commitment to hire a person of color but have have nonetheless been unable to make a diversity hire not have their faculty allocation reduced. Departments with no faculty of color should be required to develop an affirmative action plan.

G. We recommend that faculty of color should be represented whenever possible on University wide committees.

H. We recommend that the University develop and fund an aggressive recruitment campaign for faculty of color.

I. We recommend that all University promotion, public relations, and external communications materials in the form of brochures, ads, and catalogues reflect a sensitivity to the cultural, ethnic, gender, religious, and racial diversity of the University community

3. An Affirmation for Clear grievance Procedures and Due Process

A. We recommend that the Presidential Commission on Faculty Diversity be established as a continuous advisory body to assist in the revision and implementation of the grievance procedure in the Faculty Guide and to review grievances from faculty of color and women who are contemplating bringing a grievance and to make recommendations to the Provost and the President on how best to resolve these issues. Whenever patterns of discrimination arise the University commits itself to vigorously seek ways to eradicate them.

B. We recommend that the University establish the position of an ombudsperson who shall assist faculty with the grievance process.

4. An Affirmation for Curriculum and an Academic Program that Promotes Diversity

A. We recommend that the faculty continue to enhance and enrich existing curricula, co-curricular and extra-curricular activities and programs that reflect and celebrate the diversity of our student body, faculty, university community and society. A multicultural and global perspective should be infused at all levels of University teaching and learning, for example, in the Setonian, the University Club, WSOU, the Pirate’s Cove, Theatre in the Round, Poetry in the Round and International Festivals. This challenge to institutionalize diversity in the University should be addressed in the Five year Evaluation Plan required of all academic units and in the periodic evaluations for the Middle States Report.

B. We recommend the establishment of a University wide committee in the Fall semester of 1999 to develop a proposal for a University Core Curriculum which requires at least 6 credits in world cultures and civilization of all students as a prerequisite for graduation.

C. We recommend that the University develop and fund a grow your own pipeline program in cooperation with the Minority Academic Careers Program that would recruit and attract promising undergraduates of color to graduate study and preparation for college teaching and research at SHU and elsewhere.

Finally, we recommend that meetings between the President, the Provost and the members of the Commission take place at least twice a semester in order to continually monitor progress toward the objectives articulated by the Presidential Commission on Faculty Diversity.
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