

Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting, November 26, 2007

Present: Hans Ostrom (scribe of the day) , Robin Foster, Mike Segawa, Amy Ryken, Ana O'Neil, Ross Singleton, Richard Anderson-Connolly, Reilly Boland, Suzanne Holland, Stacey Weiss, John Hanson, Nancy Bristow, Kris Bartanen, Douglas Cannon (Chair), Juli McGruder, and Terry Beck.

Cannon called the meeting to order and sought approval of the minutes from the meeting of November 12. **Action: M/S/P to approve the minutes of November 12.**

Cannon sought approval for the minutes from the meeting of October 29. Singleton noted that on page two, the intent of his remarks had been to draw an analogy between how the Dean of Students works with the Student Life Committee and how the Chief Diversity Officer (Kim Bobby) may want to work with the Diversity Committee. He will send a revision of his remarks to Suzanne Holland. Understanding that the revision will be included in the minutes, the Senate unanimously **approved (M/S/P) the minutes from October 29.**

Senators enthusiastically applauded Nancy Bristow for her having been named Washington State Professor of the Year.

Special Orders

Holland asked senators whether the Senate should reinvigorate the process whereby the evaluation-form (by which students evaluate courses) might be revised. She noted that on an earlier Senate, she and Eric Orlin had begun to work on this project. Holland noted that she will meet with Associate Dean Sarah Moore, is open to working on this project.

Holland asked whether the Senate wanted formally to take up the issue of revising the evaluation-form. Singleton asked whether the form had been revised recently, and the consensus of senators was that while discussions about the form had taken place recently, the last revision may have occurred as long ago as 10 years. Bartanen affirmed that a Senate committee (Holland, Orlin) had done some research on the form but had reached no conclusions about how to revise it. Bristow asked Holland to report to the Senate about a) the work she had done with Eric Orlin and b) her conversations with Associate Dean Sarah Moore and c) any material from the committee that Bartanen had mentioned. Holland happily agreed to do so at a subsequent Senate meeting.

Committee-Liaison Reports

Bristow reported that the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) has proposed a new policy with regard to University Honors. The new policy combines a Grade Point Average with a minimum of 16 units taken at Puget Sound. The new policy will appear in recent ASC minutes on the web. The ASC has yet to decide whether the new policy

will be retroactive, but if it were to become retroactive, approximately 16 students from the period 1997-2007 would be eligible for Honors, based on diligent and timely research pursued by Brad Tomhave of the Registrar's office.

Holland reported that the University Enrichment Committee (UEC) is considering changes in conference-funding. She noted that in a meeting of the UEC, members learned that in at least one University program, members of the faculty are asked to recruit students for the major and to pay for recruitment-trips out of their travel-account. Holland noted that members of the UEC were aghast to learn about this situation. Members of the UEC had asked Holland (in her role as liaison) to find out from the Senate if this practice was widespread on campus.

Bartanen noted that in some departments, recruitment takes the place of advising but that she was unaware of professional-travel funds being used to pay for recruitment trips. Holland worried that untenured members of the faculty may feel as if they have no choice but to spend their professional-travel budget on recruitment-trips. McGruder noted that in OT/PT, there was a budget-line, thin though it may be, for recruitment, and she said the budget-line was, of course, separate from the budget-line for professional travel (to conferences, for example). Bartanen told senators that she would investigate the matter.

Revisions to the Code

Cannon invited Hanson to lead the charge once more in the Senate's attempt to implement revisions to the Faculty Code that both ad hoc committees had proposed (Professional Standards [Bristow, Sousa, Hanson] and Evaluation [Bristow, Foster, Tullis, and Ostrom]). Senators applied the magnifying glass to several changes and suggested further editorial improvements, including the removal of hyphens, some rephrasing, and choices between "and" and "or." Ultimately senators decided that one more draft of the suggested revisions was appropriate, and Hanson, exhibiting the patience of Job, agreed to bring another draft back to his senatorial colleagues for their consideration.

One major suggested addition to the Code would create a new Section f to Part 4 of Chapter III of the Code, and this section would require that if a dispute concerning ethical behavior on the part of an evaluatee or an evaluator were to arise during an evaluation, the evaluation would temporarily stop until the dispute was resolved by the grievance-process.

Singleton asked whether the Code should direct the President to do something specific with regard to the grievance so that the evaluation could take the grievance into account. Hanson responded that the President, under existing policy, currently has several options that he or she may take in such cases. Hanson noted that the underlying rationale of the Code-change is as follows: An evaluation probably cannot be fair if an unresolved ethical issue is hanging over it. Holland asked whether there are limits to the number of grievances an evaluator or evaluatee might bring, and Hanson responded that the PSC has the authority to reject a grievance that is redundant or unworthy.

Anderson-Connolly also asked about the possibility of multiple grievances, and Hanson reaffirmed the PSC's authority to reject grievances that had no merit. Anderson-Connolly wondered about the logic of the Code-change, whereby a department, program, school, and/or the FAC would be directed to suspend the evaluation process. He wondered how a department could suspend the process if the process had already reached the FAC. Ostrom suggested that in such a case, the department will have been finished with its part of the process so that, as far as the department is concerned, there is no process to suspend. However, Singleton asked how, in such cases, the outcome of the grievance would be factored into the evaluation.

Hanson replied that much depended on the nature of the grievance. The final report, which is issued by the President, might include a finding that no ethical violation had occurred, in which case the outcome of the grievance need not be factored into the evaluation; the final report might also, in extreme cases, eventuate in the dismissal of a colleague; or it might involve a violation on a spectrum between these two extremes. Hanson therefore advised the Senate not to include a specific directive to the President.

Ostrom concurred and noted that sections **a** and **d** allow the President flexibility. He noted that the Trustees would have to approve the Code change and that, for fiduciary reasons, they might find the current Code revision acceptable but might find a constricting directive to the president (in cases where grievances are brought during evaluations) unacceptable. Anderson-Connolly argued in favor of directing the President to make sure that the report on the grievance was included in evaluation-materials, and he cited Chapter III, B, 8 as a venue for such a directive. Hanson noted that, according to a separate Code change, the President shall be required to send his or her final report to the parties involved in the grievance and that this requirement will be sufficient. Bartanen observed that Chapter III, B, 8 had more to do with how an evaluation-file is to be retained in the Dean's office and may not be the proper place to address the inclusion of new material, such as the outcome of a grievance-process.

McGruder agreed and urged senators not to stray too far from the intent of the two ad hoc committees, who had, she said, interviewed individuals involved in specific past grievances and evaluations with which particular difficulties in departments and at the PSC-level had arisen, arguably demonstrating the need for the Code change that would suspend an evaluation over which an unresolved ethical dispute hung.

Foster agreed with McGruder and said that the current discussion had introduced a topic different from the one that the Code-change attempts to address.

Senators agreed to revisit the issue when Hanson brought back a new revision of the Code-changes.

Cannon observed that the Senate, when it presents the Code-changes to the faculty, may want to do so in two separate steps, presenting relatively minor changes first and presenting the major change (regarding grievances and evaluations) in a separate process.

Bylaws Change

The Senate considered the following change to the Bylaws, drafted by Ostrom and improved by senators:

Article V. Section 6. H. The Committee on Diversity.

- a. The Committee shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex-officio); the Dean of Students (ex officio); the Dean of Admission (ex-officio); the Chief Diversity Officer (ex officio); no fewer than five appointed faculty members; a maximum of three members of the staff, to be selected by the Staff Senate; and four students.**

The result of the proposed change is to remove “the Affirmative Action Officer” and replace that phrase with “the Chief Diversity Officer,” retaining “(ex-officio).” Bartanen noted that the Chief Diversity Officer also serves as the Affirmative Action Officer, so that the role of the latter would not, in fact, be absent from the Diversity Committee.

Action: M/S/P unanimously the change to the Bylaws (above). Cannon promised senators that he would move the Bylaws change on to the faculty for its consideration.

Diversity Report

The Senate discussed the report submitted by the Diversity Committee (DC) in Spring 2007. The report includes three major sections: I. The University’s Strategic Goals, II. Where We Are Now [with regard to diversity], and III. Findings and Recommendations.

The liaison to the DC, Senator Weiss, noted that the DC was looking for some direction from the Senate with regard to the report’s recommendations. O’Neil wondered what authority the Senate had to get involved with matters of diversity, given that the members of the DC had the expertise. Senators noted that the DC is a standing committee of the Senate and thus reports to the Senate, and Weiss reiterated that the DC not only welcomed but sought advice from the Senate.

Holland suggested disseminating the report to the faculty, and Bartanen said the report was already available to the faculty. Holland and Ostrom suggested making diversity a topic either for a formal meeting of the full faculty or for one (or more) forum(s).

Holland also wondered what steps the DC or the Senate might take to follow up on an idea that had been raised several years ago: namely, the potentially productive strategy of attempting to recruit more South-Asian-American students from such regions as the Bay

Area of California. O'Neil noted that the DC's report had tentatively found that Asian-American students were among the most disaffected on campus. Ostrom said that the presence of more Asian-American students on campus might be among the factors that would reduce such disaffection.

Anderson-Connelly argued that "diversity" was too narrowly defined at UPS and was weighted too much toward ethnic diversity. He observed that in his course on Social Stratification, he and the students had raised the issue of whether recruiting middle-class students of color constituted diversification. He also called for broader involvement of students and faculty in diversity initiatives, involvement that included more than the self-selected members of the DC, Race & Pedagogy, and other programs. He said that some students in his class were disgruntled by the university's definition of diversity, which did not, in the students' opinion, include the category of social-class. He suggested that the University may need to go back to "square one" with regard to diversity.

O'Neil reported that many students were angry about the diversity issue, perhaps, she suggested, because of faulty or insufficient information. She said some students believed, for example, that the university gives financial aide to students of color who do not need the money, and she said that some students were angry about the possibility of a "multicultural sorority." She suggested that the DC might work to inform students more fully about such matters.

McGruder noted that, when Race & Pedagogy had been planning its conference, a visiting scholar (Philip Bowman) had reviewed some of the history and tensions that lie behind white students' anger concerning both ethnic diversity in general and perpetuated misinformation about financial aid in particular. She noted that the anger and confusion described by O'Neil were part of fairly typical reactions to diversity-initiatives on campuses that have been relatively homogenous.

McGruder argued against disseminating the DC's report more widely because one of the "barriers" to diversity identified seemed insufficiently supported: namely, that "liberal arts education is not likely to be the first choice of students from ethnic and racial minority groups." She wondered on what basis that conclusion had been reached. Beck observed that the DC had admitted in the report that much of its evidence had been anecdotal and informally generated. Ostrom quibbled with the "barrier" related to the academic preparedness of "students from minority groups" and said there was too great a gap between the conclusion and the single supporting example, which concerned only a percentage of those students who were involved with the Opportunity Grant Program.

Bartanen argued that the university need not go back to "square one" because the Diversity Planning Task Force had already produced a Diversity Strategic Plan, which has as its Goal I (as stated in the DC's report) "to increase the recruitment and retention of students, staff, and faculty from under-represented minority groups." Other goals include improving the quality of experiences for a variety of under-represented groups of students, staff, and faculty, and promoting the retention of persons in these groups.

Bartanen also noted that the appointment of a Chief Diversity Officer (Kim Bobby) was an important step in insuring that the Strategic Plan would be implemented.

[After the meeting, Bartanen circulated an executive summary of the Diversity Strategic Plan to senators; the summary expands on her comments above and lists numerous steps already taken to implement the Plan. The executive summary appears as an appendix to these minutes. In the cover-memo accompanying the executive summary, Bartanen listed several recent initiatives connected to diversity: 1. Deans Bartanen and Segawa have met with Karen Russell from Davis, Wright, Tremaine concerning three elements of diversity: recruitment, retention, and communication. 2. Dean Segawa has undertaken a “diversity audit” of the campus. 3. Kim Bobby has begun to interview students and faculty from groups that were under-represented in responses to the recent survey on diversity. 4. Kim Bobby has begun to work with departments who are conducting searches. 5. Race & Pedagogy and the Center for Writing, Learning, and Teaching have planned more workshops. 6. Kim Bobby has begun to work with the Staff Senate and the staff in general on diversity-issues. 7. Members of the science and math faculties have drafted a plan to encourage more students from under-represented minority groups to major in science or math. 8. A Bias and Hate Education Response Team has been established and it has already acted to address one incident on campus this semester. 9. The President’s Cabinet has been working on a variety of diversity-issues.]

Segawa reported that the DC desires to hear from the Senate as to what direction the committee should take and how aggressively the committee should pursue initiatives. Ostrom said he believed the DC should “go for it” and be as proactive as necessary. He said that with regard to recommendation #1 (concerning concrete, measurable objectives), the Senate should simply charge the DC with establishing such objectives. Based on the discussion that ensued, the Senate decided to have a small group of senators (Bristow, Weiss, Ostrom) meet with Segawa, some members of the DC, and Kim Bobby. One purpose of the meeting will be give the DC the direction and senatorial affirmation it seeks. Another purpose will be to find out what role the DC desires the Senate to play with regard to recommendations in the DC’s report.

Meetings and Sabbaticals

Cannon noted that the Senate had decided to meet on December 10 and December 17. He said the Senate would indeed meet on December 10 but at that meeting would discuss whether the December 17 meeting is necessary. Holland advised Cannon that she would attend a meeting on the 17th only if the Senate Chair were to be costumed as Santa Claus.

Ryken noted that multiple senators are going on sabbatical in Spring 2008, and McGruder provoked the envy of senators by reminding them that she is retiring in four weeks. Cannon promised to take the steps necessary to replace senators who were being paroled from the Senate in Spring 2008 and thanked Ryken for the reminder.

Respectfully submitted, Hans Ostrom

Appendix to the Minutes of November 26, 2007

Diversity Strategic Plan for University of Puget Sound: Creating a Culture of Inclusive Learning

Executive Summary December 2006

Introduction

During the academic year 2005–06, University of Puget Sound completed a strategic plan for the university. In this plan, the first strategic goal is to enhance and enrich the Puget Sound experience to build upon our reputation for distinguished teaching and learning. It states that we will be nationally recognized for providing the most successful integration anywhere of a traditional liberal arts curriculum with innovative interdisciplinary programs; distinctive centers for learning and research; vibrant co-curricular programs; and a campus community that embraces cultural diversity, the challenges of global citizenship, and meaningful partnerships in the region.

Among the top strategies under this goal is to develop and implement a diversity strategic plan for University of Puget Sound. Accordingly, the Diversity Planning Task Force (DPTF)¹ was appointed by President Ronald R. Thomas in September 2005. President Thomas charged this task force with creating a strategic plan for diversity that would provide a road map for our campus to achieve the following:

- Create a campus environment that fully welcomes and supports diversity in order to prepare students effectively for leadership in a pluralistic world.
- Increase the number of students, staff, and faculty from underrepresented minority groups.
- Enhance curricular and cocurricular programs that engage campus community members on the challenges and rewards of valuing diversity and multiculturalism.
- Ensure greater awareness and use of pedagogical approaches that are culturally and racially aware.
- Improve working relationships with racially and ethnically diverse communities in the region.

¹ Members of this task force were: Kris Bartanen, Academic Vice President and Dean; Kim Bobby, Director of Access Programs; Rosa Beth Gibson, Associate Vice President for Human Resources; Jean Kim (Chair), Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students; Sunil Kukreja, Professor, Department of Comparative Sociology; Janet Marcavage, Assistant Professor, Department of Art; Yoshiko Matsui, Director of Multicultural Student Services; Randy Nelson, Director of Institutional Research; Lyle Quasim '70, alumnus; Mark Rosasco '08, student; Nell Shamrell '07, student; Sarah Stall, Publications Manager/Writer.

In order to move the university's strategic plan forward, the Diversity Planning Task Force recommends the adoption of the Diversity Strategic Plan for University of Puget Sound outlined below. We devised the plan after taking a thorough environmental scan of common and best diversity practices of institutions of higher education—including peer schools in the Northwest and nationwide—and regional businesses, and carefully evaluating the current status of diversity practices on our campus through the Campus Climate for Diversity Survey and review of institutional data. A summary of the campus climate survey results is contained in the appendix.

We have designed the Diversity Strategic Plan to serve as a vehicle to help move the university from its current state with regard to diversity practices toward the future state to which we aspire. Arranged in priority order, the plan outlines strategic goals and objectives to accomplish this objective. It begins with the vision articulated in the University Diversity Statement, previously adopted by the Board of Trustees.

The Vision: University Diversity Statement

We Acknowledge

- the richness of commonalities and differences we share as a university community.
- the intrinsic worth of all who work and study here.
- the education is enhanced by investigation of and reflection upon multiple perspectives.

We Aspire

- to create respect for and appreciation of all persons as a key characteristic of our campus community.
- to increase the diversity of all parts of our University community through commitment to diversity in our recruitment and retention efforts.
- to foster a spirit of openness to active engagement among all members of our campus community.

We Act

- to achieve an environment that welcomes and supports diversity.
- to ensure full educational opportunity for all who teach and learn here.
- to prepare effectively citizen-leaders for a pluralistic world.

Diversity Strategic Plan: Creating a culture of inclusive learning

Strategic Goal I. We will increase the recruitment and retention of students, staff, and faculty from underrepresented minority groups.

OBJECTIVE A: Improve the campus' structural diversity by increasing the number of faculty, staff, and students from underrepresented minority groups.

OBJECTIVE B: Improve the quality of experiences for underrepresented minority groups of students, staff, and faculty.

OBJECTIVE C: Promote the success and retention of underrepresented minority individuals.

Strategic Goal II. We will create a campus environment that fully welcomes and supports social diversity.²

OBJECTIVE A: Enhance professional development training and cocurricular programs that engage campus community members in the challenges and rewards of valuing diversity and multiculturalism.

OBJECTIVE B: Support continued development of curriculum and scholarship that addresses issues of social diversity, pedagogy, and multiculturalism.

OBJECTIVE C: Address the gains, opportunities, and challenges of becoming a more diverse campus.

Strategic Goal III. We will improve working and business relationships with race/ethnic and other diverse communities in the Puget Sound region.

OBJECTIVE A: Build additional mutually beneficial relationships with race/ethnic and other diverse communities in the Puget Sound region.

OBJECTIVE B: Develop supplier and business relationships with the various minority communities.

Strategic Goal IV. We will be accountable for implementing the Diversity Strategic Plan and working towards achieving diversity goals.

OBJECTIVE A: Regularly assess campus climate for diversity to assist with diversity strategic planning and its implementation.

OBJECTIVE B: Create an institutional structure to provide oversight and support for Diversity Strategic Plan implementation.

² *Social diversity refers to characteristics that could cause groups or individuals to be systematically excluded from full participation in higher education, including age, disability, gender, race/ethnicity, religion/spiritual tradition, sexual orientation, job status or socioeconomic class, personal appearance, and political beliefs.*

OBJECTIVE C: Implement a strategic communication plan around diversity issues in order to make visible our strengths and bring diversity concerns into the dominant discourse of the campus.

OBJECTIVE D: Conduct an asset mapping of current personnel, budget lines, and resources dedicated to diversity work.

It is the hope of the DPTF that the Diversity Strategic Plan will be adopted and implemented by the university community; in addition, there are general next steps that we recommend be taken immediately.

General Recommendations

The DPTF recommends that the following five steps be put into action as soon as possible, while the Diversity Strategic Plan is being reviewed and adopted.

Continue analysis through focus groups. Follow up the Campus Climate for Diversity Survey with further research through focus groups. We suggest that research begin with the groups listed below for two reasons: (a) the group(s) did not have sufficient respondents, and/or (b) surprising results warrant further investigation (in the case of Asian-American students).

- Asian-American students
- Dining and Conference Services staff
- Facilities staff
- Faculty of color
- Staff of color
- Students of color

As we continue to analyze the Campus Climate for Diversity Survey results, other focus group needs may emerge which should also be addressed.

Communicate Survey results. Share the results of the Campus Climate for Diversity Survey with the campus community.

Encourage self-assessment. The task force recognizes that there are many aspects of diversity at Puget Sound that it was unable to explore comprehensively. We encourage self-assessment in relevant academic and administrative departments and programs as a way of developing a more thorough understanding of current strengths and weaknesses to inform implementation of the Diversity Strategic Plan.

Adopt the Diversity Strategic Plan. Develop an inclusive campus process to review, adopt, and implement the Diversity Strategic Plan.

Monitor and evaluate the university's progress on implementing the Diversity Strategic Plan. Establish an institution-wide process to monitor our progress as a campus community in executing the Diversity Strategic Plan. In addition to creating a monitoring

process, develop a set of critical success factors that can be used to assess our progress on improving diversity practices at Puget Sound.

Appendix: Campus Climate for Diversity Survey Report, 2006 Executive Summary

As part of the work of the Diversity Planning Task Force, the students, staff, and faculty at the University of Puget Sound were invited to participate in the Climate for Diversity Survey in the spring semester of 2006. The purposes of the survey were to document the attitudes and experiences of members of the campus community on issues related to diversity, especially those related to the mission and strategic goals of the University; to identify current strengths and weaknesses; and to provide a benchmark for measuring progress on strategic diversity goals.

Earlier surveys found that, compared to our peer institutions, the ethnicity of Puget Sound's students, faculty, and staff is fairly typical. Puget Sound appears to have a somewhat greater curricular emphasis on issues of diversity, but students report that the frequency of interaction with people with different backgrounds does not meet their expectations.

Twenty-four percent (656 respondents) of the students who were enrolled in the spring semester answered at least part of the survey. The response rate for members of the faculty was 34% (130 respondents, including adjunct faculty) and 45% for staff members (234 respondents). Among student respondents, freshmen and women were over-represented. As only 21 students from underrepresented ethnic groups completed the survey (11% of enrolled Black, Latino/a, or Native American students), results for this group must be viewed with extreme caution.

Some of the findings from the survey include the following:

- Respondents were most likely to agree that they felt comfortable as a part of the Puget Sound community. The climates for differences in gender, age, and sexual orientation were rated the most positively and the climates for political, socioeconomic, and religious diversity were rated the least positively.
- Eighty-two percent of respondents said that creating a diverse campus environment at Puget Sound is a moderate or high priority. In spite of the generally favorable ratings, only 34% agreed that they were satisfied with Puget Sound's multicultural environment.
- Members of the faculty tended to rate the climate less positively than students and staff. As a group, less than half agreed that (a) the campus encourages contact with faculty members from different backgrounds, and (b) they would recommend Puget Sound as a good place for faculty of color to work.
- The majority of students agreed that the University of Puget Sound shows concern for students as individuals.
- Respondents considered the two most common problems on campus to be harassment due to political beliefs and sexual harassment. However, the most common reason for discrimination or harassment cited by students and staff was job or socioeconomic status

(over 25%). For faculty members, the most commonly cited cause was gender (over 20%).

- The frequency of disparaging remarks was quite low. Students were more likely than members of the faculty or staff to be the source of disparaging remarks. The disparaging remarks most commonly heard were about political beliefs.
- When students described incidents of discrimination or harassment, nearly all were instances in which they were made to feel uncomfortable, generally because of another's stereotyping, condescension, or insulting comments. Students were more likely than faculty or staff members to describe discrimination or harassment as a result of their political beliefs, appearance, and ethnicity. One-third of the incidents described by students of color had to do with ethnicity.
- Of the faculty members who described incidents of intolerance, 21% of the incidents had to do with issues of ethnicity, 19% with political beliefs, and 17% with gender. Most of the incidents described by faculty of color (86%) involved issues of ethnicity and 23% of the incidents described by women faculty involved issues of gender.
- Of the staff members who described incidents of intolerance, 31% of the incidents had to do with issues of job or socioeconomic status, 15% with political beliefs, and 14% with gender. Although a few staff described disrespect from students, most focused on what one called "the caste system" between staff and faculty.
- Over 90% of the respondents reported that they understood the importance of having a diverse campus community. However, fewer than half agreed that their experiences had improved their understanding of the issues related to living in a diverse community.
- Students were likely to agree that (a) members of the faculty pay attention to their comments, (b) they are not the target of ethnic stereotyping, and (c) faculty members are sensitive to multicultural concerns. However, students often disagreed that that they have had the opportunity to interact with students of different races/ethnic groups in class and that students and faculty can easily engage in conversations about issues of race.
- Students with major disabilities were more likely than other students to agree that (a) they have felt isolated or left out when their class assignment required work in groups, and (b) their professors ignored their comments or questions.
- All groups agreed that (a) having more ethnic diversity among students would improve the educational environment and (b) helping students to develop the ability to function in a multicultural and diverse community is an important educational goal.
- Puget Sound was less diverse than students' home communities for 42%, and less diverse than students' high schools for 47%. Compared with students' friends at home, Puget Sound was less diverse for 35% of the respondents.

- In general, faculty members were less likely than students and staff to say they were comfortable at Puget Sound. Faculty members were more critical than students and staff of the climate for ethnic and gender differences and were more likely to see harassment due to disability or ethnicity as problems. Students seemed to have the most difficulty with political differences. Students were less likely than faculty or staff to see that an important educational goal at Puget Sound is helping students to develop the ability to function in a multicultural and diverse community.
- Women tended to rate the sense of community at Puget Sound higher than men, however women were more likely to feel excluded, silenced, or ignored due to their gender and to experience gender discrimination.
- People of color were less likely than White respondents to agree that Puget Sound is committed to diversity and multiculturalism on campus and that Puget Sound's actions related to diversity are consistent with its goals. People of color were also less likely to be satisfied with the multicultural environment and the campus' efforts to address issues related to diversity. They were less likely to agree that (a) the campus is responsive to concerns about the climate for diversity, (b) there is a strong sense of community on campus, and (c) there are enough people with similar backgrounds to feel comfortable.
- Asian students rated the climate for ethnic differences less favorably than other students and they were less likely to agree that (a) the classroom climate was welcoming, (b) faculty incorporate materials into the curriculum that acknowledge the contribution of diverse groups, and (c) faculty and staff members are sensitive to multicultural concerns.
- Bisexual, lesbian, and gay respondents were less satisfied with the campus' efforts to address issues related to sexual orientation and gender issues. They were less likely to agree that (a) the campus is responsive to diversity concerns and (b) there is a strong sense of community on campus. They were more likely than other people to consider leaving.
- Students who reported having disabilities rated their level of comfort on campus lower. They were also less likely to agree that (a) they have the opportunity to learn from people of different backgrounds, (b) there were enough people with similar backgrounds for them to feel comfortable, (c) Puget Sound shows concern for students as individuals, and (d) they were satisfied with the campus's efforts to address issues related to disabilities.
- People who described their political orientation as moderately or very conservative rated the climate for differences in political beliefs, religious beliefs, and sexual orientation lower than other respondents. Conservatives were also less likely to agree that (a) Puget Sound provides an environment that supports open expression and (b) there are enough people with similar backgrounds for them to feel comfortable; they were more likely to say that they felt excluded, silenced, or ignored due to their political and religious beliefs. Liberal respondents were more likely than others to view harassment

due to sexual orientation, sexual assault, and sexual harassment as problems and were more likely to have reported gender discrimination.

- As a group, students, staff, and faculty with Christian Evangelical beliefs rated the climate for religious difference less positively than people with other beliefs. Along with Buddhist respondents, they were more likely to view harassment due to religious beliefs as a problem and less likely to be satisfied with the campus' efforts to address issues related to religion. With Jewish respondents, they were more likely to have reported discrimination or harassment on the basis of their religious beliefs.
- Students with much less disposable income than average rated the climate for socioeconomic differences less positively than other students and were more likely to agree that they don't participate in some educational and extracurricular activities because they can't afford to participate.
- The vast majority of student comments were supportive of the overall goal of increasing and understanding diversity, but many were critical of the lack of ethnic diversity. The most frequent suggestion in faculty comments was to increase the number of students of color by providing more financial aid, which faculty saw as the major barrier.