

## **Participants**

Mike Valentine, Nila Wiese, Monica DeHart, Judith Kay, Margi Nowak, Janet Marcavage, Harry Velez-Quinones, Kim Bobby, Carrie Washburn, Paula Meiers, Yoshiko Matsui, Nancy Niaraeth, Heather Clifford, Mike Segawa, Doug Cannon.

## **Election of Chair**

The meeting was convened by Doug Cannon at approximately 8:10. As the first piece of business, he presided over the election of a committee chair. Mike Valentine and Nila Wiese volunteered their candidacy as co-chairs; that nomination was quickly seconded and approved.

## **Meeting Schedule**

Valentine confirmed the meeting schedule for the rest of the year. It was collectively agreed that bi-weekly meetings on Thursday at 8:00-9:00 a.m. would be the official schedule. DeHart was appointed as the meeting's notetaker.

## **Committee Representatives**

Washburn raised the question of student representation on the committee. She noted that ASUPS president Hart was responsible for appointing students. Matsui believed that Hart had identified potential appointees and forwarded the list to someone, but since that list of student names has not been confirmed, Washburn suggested that each committee member identify appropriate students for appointment. In the meantime, Matsui agreed to follow up on Hart's selections.

Washburn noted that one additional staff representative also needed to be appointed to the committee.

As for the Dean of Student Affairs, Matsui will be attending the meetings on behalf of Mike Segawa. Segawa noted that he would drop in from time to time.

## **Committee Charges**

Valentine inquired whether the questions posed in the Diversity Committee's year-end summary last year had been taken up at the Faculty Senate retreat, as had been indicated last year. Essentially, the summary had suggested that the Faculty Senate re-evaluate the authority and scope of the Diversity Committee before it passed down new charges to it this year. Cannon replied that the issue was not discussed at the retreat and asked for further clarification.

Several continuing members reiterated Valentine's summary that the self evaluation completed by last year's committee clearly asked the Senate to discuss the role of a faculty standing committee in campus issues of diversity. Is there a coordinating or clearing-house role might it assume over campus-wide diversity efforts? Wiese asked about the implications of Kim Bobby's new role as the Chief Diversity Officer for the Committee's identity and functions. Bobby responded that she did not yet have a clear sense of what the implications of her role might be; however, working with faculty on these issues was her first charge.

Matsui asked whether some charges relating to diversity were outside of the power of the faculty or should it be limited to faculty issues. Bobby replied that she had a strong sense of the faculty's role.

Wiese articulated a concern with whether this Committee had any "teeth." She noted that in terms of faculty development, there was no sense of the role of diversity in faculty evaluation. She felt that the Committee had no weight in initiating or recommending changes to faculty evaluation procedures that may recognize faculty efforts regarding diversity. Valentine reiterated this concern, noting that it took 1-2 years just to get language into the buff document.

Cannon noted that if the administration wants, it can convene a task force that has clout; a faculty standing committee is limited to faculty evaluation, curriculum and hiring. Faculty diversity is an area of faculty responsibility. The specific task of the committee is set forth in the Bylaws as (1) promoting the involvement of all sectors of the campus community...; (2) assist the Dean of Admission and the Dean of Students in the University's ongoing program of recruiting, retaining, and graduating a diverse student body. These reflect the limits of faculty's own power. In terms of specific coordinating duties, he added that if the Committee wanted to be charged, that is possible; the problem is generating a will on the part of the senate. As was noted at last spring's meeting, there was controversy over two lines [in the year-end summary?] on faculty evaluation. He noted that the Committee needed to get faculty on board. He added that there had already been tremendous improvement in faculty recruitment, especially with department chairs. Valentine communicated that the Committee's efforts to promote debate on this issue within the Senate was a reflection of its desire to sway the Senate. He asked whether the senate could charge the Committee with a coordinating role under the current language.

Marcavage noted that she felt there was a need for better integration among the mentoring, advising, and other tasks devoted to diversity. Bobby mentioned that that is what they're working on; how to leverage efforts. The Diversity Audit is a big part of that. However, Wiese mentioned the frustration the Committee experienced during last year's effort to "assist" diversity efforts by collecting data on recruitment. That experience repeatedly produced a sense that student recruitment/admissions was "not the Diversity Committee's territory."

Velez-Quinones raised the issue of what "promoting" diversity actually means. He mentioned informal faculty descriptions of the Committee as a "recreational committee"

and asked whether it existed only to appease community conscience or whether it existed for a concrete purpose. If the latter, what would be the avenue for this kind of activity to unfold?

Kay suggested that the Committee's charge of serving as an "advocate" might in fact be one of these avenues. She suggested that the ambiguous language of the bylaws might in fact allow the Committee room to do things. Also, through charges like serving as a liaison to student groups, the Committee could serve an important role in getting a pulse of group's status and activities on campus. This kind of help would be different from simply "promoting" diversity.

Segawa mentioned that in these discussions of diversity it is important to clarify the context. Kim Bobby's appointment by the Academic Vice President is an indication of the importance and primacy of curricular and faculty partnership within this community. He said that he felt the Committee could make of the language "what you will"—being proactive rather than reactive. The BHERT (Bias and Hate Education Responsibility Team) was one example of an effort that came out of this Committee. He noted that the BHERT protocols now needed urgently to be approved in response to an event over the last weekend. Bobby clarified that the BHERT was set up to look for certain patterns in campus diversity issues, to be proactive rather than simply to respond to things that happen. She noted that the initiative was set up to be flexible and draw strategically on the campus, with standing members as well as a campus-wide network.

Several Committee members responded to this request by noting that the BHERT is an example of an initiative that the Committee sent back to the Senate because it didn't have the authority to implement it. Wiese noted that the Committee had no power to approve and activate such protocol. Washburn asked why the Committee was being asked to staff the initiative, as it was to contain few faculty.

When Matsui asked about the administrative "home" of the BHERT, Segawa noted that he had volunteered to house the initiative in the Vice President of Student Affairs. However, he mentioned that he felt that the initiative "belonged" to the Diversity Committee; as it was born "here."

Washburn mentioned that this discussion reflected many years of frustration from faculty about what power it held. She suggested that it might be time for the bylaws to be looked at again. She noted that Bobby sat in the Committee as a representative of Affirmative Action, not in her capacity as Diversity Officer. Matsui was present as the VP of Student Affairs representative, rather than as Multicultural Coordinator. The shifting relationship between different offices and the Committee might therefore indicate that there are things wrong with the bylaws and that the Senate should give some thought to the Committee.

Segawa asked that the Committee give its blessing to move forward with the BHERT. He reiterated that he felt that the group should sign off on it. At this request, there was a quick motion, seconding, and vote of approval for the initiative, giving Segawa and Bobby the power to appoint individuals to the BHERT and to put it into action.

To conclude the meeting, Cannon noted that he would talk with the Senate on Monday, indicating his understanding that the Committee wished for no changes in its charges, but rather a discussion on its authority and make-up in order to consider what would be the most appropriate configuration and duties of the group.

At 9:00 the meeting was adjourned by Chair, Valentine.