

**Diversity Committee Minutes**  
**January 26, 2007**

**Committee Members Present:** Rosa Beth Gibson, Carrie Washburn, Heather Clifford, Ed Cole, Jim McCullough, Janet McCarvage, Yoshiko Matsui, Mike Valentine, Nila Wiese, Monica DeHart, Mikiko Ludden, Harry Velez-Quinones, Jen (student rep)

**Guests Present:** None

The meeting was called to order at 8:05 by chair Wiese.

DeHart was identified as the minutes-taker for the day.

Gibson presented hard copies of the December 8 committee meeting minutes and invited members to suggest additional details to be added, as needed. The group briefly reviewed hard copies. **M/S/P to approve those minutes.**

Chair Wiese called for announcements (see more at end of minutes). McCarvage reminded us of the DTY Exhibition. An opening reception will be held in the Center for Writing and Learning on February 2 from 6-8, and then the art will remain in on exhibition in the Center for about one month. McCarvage noted that they have about 15 pieces included in the exhibition.

McCullough noted the Asian Film Festival currently in progress, including a Korean film on Wednesday night and then following Thursday evenings. McCullough also noted an upcoming Taiwanese Film festival on Feb 12.

Members noted that February is Women's History Month and that there would be a number of speakers and other events on the horizon.

**BHERT Report:**

Chair Wiese then turned the meeting toward the substantive business at hand—namely, review of the Bias and Hate Education Response Team Report. Gibson noted that electronic copies of the newer draft had been e-mailed only to subcommittee members; Matsui handed out hard copies of the revised report to all committee members present.

Matsui commenced discussion on the Report by noting that the BHERT subcommittee had met last week to discuss questions and comments on the original report draft. She noted that they had based their recommendations on research conducted on similar response initiatives at Willamette, Cornell and Indiana. She described how they had focused their attention on the issues of response team composition and goals (especially those noted on the last page of the report). She explained that the subcommittee had re-evaluated the purpose and goals of the team in light of suggestions that the team take a more pro-active role in relation to campus events; however, while the pro-active element remained important, the subcommittee felt that the original purpose of the team was to

act as a group that could orchestrate and plan responses in particular. Therefore, a more proactive role might evolve for the team at a later moment, when they were able to identify patterns in campus hate incidents and, thus, more accurately anticipate them.

Matsui also noted that the report does not address the issue of where to house the BHERT, or under whose auspices/authority the team might operate. She suggested that this was a question for further discussion, as there were many potential umbrellas under which the initiative might fit.

At this point, McCullough mentioned that he felt that the Diversity Committee was not responsible for this kind of initiative, that the mission of the BHERT did not fall under faculty senate concerns. Instead, he suggested that this work would fall under the authority of an administrative committee, perhaps a presidential cabinet, an advisory committee, etc. He likened the function of the BHERT to natural disaster response teams that were similarly directed by the administration. **The BHERT ultimately does not reflect an educational initiative that would fall under the rubric of faculty senate authority.** That said, he emphasized that the initiative was definitely something that the committee could participate in launching, even if it retained no further responsibility.

Wiese affirmed McCullough's concern, noting that **we do not have authority to convene the kinds of people noted to compose the BHERT.**

Washburn noted that people sometimes participate in these kinds of initiatives voluntarily (rather than being convened by the Diversity Committee per se). For example, years ago another initiative was launched based on the experience of a member's son. The committee worked hard to formulate the initiative. Bartanen then made the effort to put it into action, taking it through the trustees, etc. In that instance, the initiative was not "ours" but rather got started in the diversity committee and went on to be institutionalized within university practice. Therefore, she posed the question of how we might get this initiative going and ensure its implementation as it goes through other chains of authority. Gibson pointed out that this approach resonated with the previous proposal to think of this as a pilot project, which could start with the Diversity Committee and then become institutionalized.

Wiese asked the committee if everyone was happy with the general language of the report, to which Gibson replied that even if the committee didn't want to sponsor the initiative, that it was still appropriate to recommend to the senate that the president apply it. McCullough noted that the recommended BHERT composition include an ombudsman and asked if there was one. Gibson confirmed that Grace Kirschner was the harassment ombudsperson. When asked whether the subcommittee had consulted with Kirschner, Matsui noted that they had not.

At this point, Washburn proposed that we send the proposal through an intermediate step, by way of review by Bartanen or Segawa to have them think about how the university might implement this plan. She felt that if we sent the proposal directly to the cabinet, then the President would probably take it and run, but that with this intermediate step the

proposal could be vetted first. Gibson concurred with this proposal and said it would be especially appropriate given Bartanen and Segawa's personal interest and strong perspectives on this matter. Matsui added that they are the ones with the DCTF and that the BHERT could ultimately be part of that initiative. Consequently, she likened this initiative to the trajectory of the Climate Survey.

In response to Wiese's further inquiry as to proposed changes, McCullough replied that we should desist from further tweaking of the document, as it was likely to face further revisions as it passed through the next steps. He **presented a motion to forward the report to the faculty senate** with the recommendation that the senate pass the report to the Dean for further consideration. Velez-Quinones **seconded the motion**, and the **committee approved**.

In closing the discussion, Washburn proposed a **resolution to thank the subcommittee** for their hard work on the report. All in presence nodded to affirm their approval of the resolution.

### **New Business:**

At this point, Wiese opened the meeting to the discussion of new business and two new points of discussion were introduced by Velez-Quinones. First, Velez-Quinones raised the question of how efforts to integrate diversity are operating in other areas of university life—specifically, **how is diversity factored into the committees** where other important decisions are being made. In particular, he expressed concern about committees like the UEC, where funds were granted, asking whether deliberate efforts were being made to ensure representation of diverse groups within that process.

Washburn responded by briefly explaining some contours of the committee composition process. She noted that senate executives and the faculty dean worked together to construct the committees, taking things like faculty requests, sabbatical schedules, etc. into account. She emphasized that faculty do not represent their departments in their committee work, but act simply as representatives of the faculty. She noted the potential importance of representation in the various committees because of the impact their decisions have on faculty development, curricula etc.; however, she stated, to her knowledge, diversity was not now a formal criteria in committee composition.

McCullough pointed out that since faculty request certain appointments, efforts to increase diversity would require directly recruiting faculty. Washburn speculated that sometimes faculty might want to participate simply as faculty, rather than as members of a particular group identity. Velez-Quinones emphasized the obvious importance of this issue in any serious effort to improve faculty of color recruitment and retainment. Members noted the UEC, the FAC, the professional standards, and the curriculum committee as several important spaces for this kind of representation.

McCullough asked whether people were simply not included on committees or whether there was a sense of people being actively excluded from them. Were we ultimately

thinking about setting formal criteria or simply suggesting a principle? Velez-Quinones noted that he was interested in emphasizing the general principle. Wiese noted that this issue should be seen against the backdrop of the university's stated effort to "build critical mass" of diverse faculty through new recruitment or, at the very least, to support the increasing influence of diverse faculty already on campus. The latter strategy would include supporting efforts to ensure the tenurability of minority faculty, as well as promoting their presence on committees with significant decision-making power.

In response to McCullough's inquiry about the organizational status of minority faculty on campus, Matsui noted previous efforts to form a caucus, but stated that nothing of that nature came out of the more recent meeting with Bartanen. She mentioned that previous efforts to mobilize an LGBT caucus were built on similar need to meet and support one another. This kind of organization could not only encourage individual faculty to request appointments on specific committees of importance, but also pressure committees to consider diversity in their deliberation.

Given the significant implications of these matters, Wiese asked whether this was an issue for the committee to take up, to which there was a positive response from all members. Washburn noted that while the faculty senate and others have taken the lead, we need not look to the institution to initiate these efforts; rather, it is in our best interest to have a caucus. McCullough noted that faculty meetings are not well attended, even when important topics such as tenure procedure and salaries are raised. Wiese noted that several meetings with junior faculty had been scheduled outside of the regular senate meetings last year because of the sensitivity of broaching these topics within the faculty meeting forum. Valentine noted that it would put people in a difficult position if they were put on a committee with the goal of advancing another minority faculty. Velez-Quinones insisted that this was more about having a way to keep diversity in people's mind during decision-making processes, not simply about the product of the decisions. The university has to be able to mentor, nurture and show a vested interest in the retention of the diverse faculty that it already has. Matsui offered the Diversity Center as a place to help support the formation of caucus meetings.

To the elation of all present, Wiese noted that it appeared that this was, indeed, an issue that falls within the authority of the diversity committee. That we should broach the topic with Bartanen, but it is possible that the FAC meets during our meeting time and, thus would require a delegation.

Gibson requested that in addition to our efforts to promote diversity criteria within committee composition, we should remember this issue in regards to staff as well. University wide task forces, presidential advisory committees, etc. should also be scrutinized in this regard. Also, she recommended that we remember group affiliation.

As a second issue to be considered, Velez-Quinones questioned whether, in light of demographic changes across the U.S. and within UPS in particular that have made Spanish more visible and prevalent, should we continue to **consider Spanish as part of the Foreign Language Department**. Should we not, he suggested, begin to think of it as

a second domestic language? If so, what role might the university play in addressing that significant shift?

Reminded of time constraints, Chair Wiese turned our attention to the agenda for the next meeting.

**Next Meeting Agenda:**

It was agreed that between now and the next meeting, the appointed subcommittee (Wiese, McCullough and DeHart) would review **admissions data** in preparation for our meeting with Melanie Reed on Feb 9. An additional meeting with Maggie (Financial Aid) is scheduled for Feb 23.

It was also agreed that we would take up the issue of **diversity in faculty committees** so as to have time to formulate strategies before the distribution of faculty committee selection forms in April.

Finally, Wiese noted that she had agreed to serve on the **Race and Pedagogy Task Force** that is studying the implications of the Race & Pedagogy events. She clarified that she was invited to participate in that committee as a representative of the diversity committee, so that the committee might be a party to that conversation.

Before closing Matsui provided **additional announcements** of upcoming events, to include:

- Brazilian Ache performance, Friday night, 1/26/07
- LGBT Top-20 celebration on 1/30  
(this previously-planned event was postponed by inclement weather)
- Harlem Gospel Choir on 1/31
- Rebecca Walker, keynote speaker, on 2/6
- Roger Daniels on 2/19 or 20, to speak on Japanese internment
- cherry tree signs will be placed in front of Wheelock to commemorate internment victims from UPS. Also, an alum has funded a new display to be placed in the dish-collection area of the sub during this same time.

Meeting was adjourned by Wiese at 8:50.