

# Committee on Diversity

## December 8, 2006

**Committee Members Present:** Ed Cole, Monica DeHart, Rosa Beth Gibson, Janet Marcavage, Jim McCullough, Mike Segawa, Joyce Tamashiro, Carrie Washburn, and Nila Wiese (chair)

**Guests Present:** None

**Committee Members Absent:** JD Barton, Kim Bobby, Heather L. Clifford, Danielle M. Drangsholt, Mikiko Ludden, Yoshiko Matsui, Michelle A. Stoler, Mike Valentine, and Harry Velez-Quinones

The meeting was **called to order** by chair Wiese.

Gibson was identified as the **minutes-taker** for the day.

**M/S/P** to approve the October 7 and November 10 committee meeting minutes.

Marcavage will send the October minutes and Wiese the November minutes to the Associate Deans' office ([facultycomms@ups.edu](mailto:facultycomms@ups.edu)) to be posted.

Wiese called for **announcements**. Marcavage encouraged committee members to spread the word about submissions for the Diversity Theme Year Art Show and distributed posters for committee members.

The first item on the meeting agenda was a discussion of the **Bias and Hate Education Response Team document** prepared by the subcommittee. Copies of the document were distributed at the November committee meeting. A lively, wide-ranging discussion of the document included the following:

- Is this an on-going responsibility of the Diversity Committee?
- Under whose jurisdiction would the Bias and Hate Education Response Team fall?
- Should this be a pilot program, initially under the auspices of the Diversity Committee? If so, then what? Does the “then what” question need to be answered now or can that be determined as one of the outcomes of the pilot?
- Does the team composition support the central education and engagement goal? Is membership on the team determined by role or interest? The team composition in the subcommittee document could result in a huge group, especially if members of the Diversity Committee are *ex officio* members of the BHERT. The Diversity Committee should not be the BHERT.
- Subcommittee members present reminded the committee of Bobby's notion of alerting this wide-ranging group of faculty and staff to a critical incident and then using electronic tools to identify who is in the best position to lead a response and

to discuss possible educational opportunities. Subcommittee members also reminded the committee that the BHERT was not intended to be one that meets regularly (perhaps once a semester).

- If participating in responding to a critical incident is optional, then who will jump in? Shouldn't this be a group that meets regularly to be proactive rather than reactive? If so, the team identified in the BHERT document would be impossible to convene regularly.
- There's no need for the BHERT to create data. The team's focus should be on response and education. The data should be provided by administrative offices to a working team to alert the team to initiate educational programs and services. The Diversity Committee should receive a report on bias and hate incidents once a semester.
- Many individuals and organizations on campus are involved in multicultural programming and services. Harassment officers and conduct officers have incident-specific data and are resources for themes/trends, none of which are a surprise but are indigenous to our campus. There is no lack of information but rather a lack of analysis to drive programs, policies, and services. The target for this and other such initiatives must be community building. We also need to attend to recruiting a diverse faculty, staff, and student body.
- The Diversity Committee's next step should be to develop a recommendation to the Faculty Senate for faculty involvement and discussion. The committee should present a proposal to the senate, asking the senate what they want us to do.

The committee asked the subcommittee to meet again prior to the committee's January 26, 2007 meeting, to reconsider the document in light of the committee's discussion, and to present a new edition of the document for committee members to review prior to the January meeting with the understanding that the objective is to finalize a BHERT recommendation from the Diversity Committee to the Faculty Senate. In subcommittee chair Matsui's absence, Gibson offered to convene the subcommittee in January.

The next item on the agenda was to discuss **next steps regarding Admission data**. Data requested by the committee, provided by Melanie Reed, Director of Freshman Admission, was distributed at the November committee meeting. Wiese has reviewed the full packet of information Reed provided. A subcommittee of the Diversity Committee (Wiese, McCullough, and DeHart) will review the full packet of information Reed provided and prepare questions to provide Reed so that she will have a focus for her conversation with the committee. Reed has indicated that she will be happy to talk with the committee at any time. The subcommittee will present its proposed questions to the full committee at the second spring semester meeting of the Diversity Committee, and Wiese will invite Reed (and anyone she wants to partner with) to attend the third spring semester meeting of the Diversity Committee

The committee meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosa Beth Gibson