

Committee on Diversity Annual Report May 2002

The Committee on Diversity (inaccurately referred to as the FDC) received four charges from the Faculty Senate on September 11, 2001.

1. Continue to work with the Office of Admission staff to implement the telephoning project. The telephoning project, initiated during the 1999-2000 academic year, was conducted for the first time in the spring semester. The project initially targeted potential African-American applicants. This year African-American, Hispanic, Native American and Native Alaskan applicants were contacted. Students were called after they had received acceptances from the university. It was felt that contacting all self-identified minority students who merely request an application was an unwise use of faculty volunteer's time. Also, working from the list of accepted minority students would better allow Paula Meiers in Admissions to determine the usefulness of faculty phoning. For more on this issue, I would direct the reader's attention to the committee minutes of 10/09/01. Also, for the first time, faculty volunteers were given the option of attending "telephoning parties", making these calls from the university's phone bank in Jones Hall ("The Link"). Committee member Eric Orlin was the lead on this year's effort. He did a fantastic job organizing the event and he deserved many thanks.

2. Continue to work with the director of Access programs and the faculty support committee to collaborate with Access programs and to implement the Speakers' Bureau. The director of Access programs, and committee member, Kim Bobby reported that Julian Edgoose, Ili Nagy, and Nancy Bristow were appointed to the Faculty Support Committee for Access Programs. Development of a speaker's bureau still is progressing but still needs committee support. No further committee interaction with Access program or work on the Speaker's Bureau was taken this year.

3. Present a revised draft of the University Statement on Diversity to the Senate during the fall 2001 semester and facilitate University-wide deliberation regarding the statement. The Statement on Diversity has had a long (now three year) history. The document was returned from the senate, with revisions. The committee incorporated senatorial revisions and new committee member suggestions and created a new draft (see minutes of 11/6/01). It reads as follows:

Faculty Diversity Committee Diversity Statement Subcommittee DRAFT 5 (11/06/01)

We Acknowledge

- the richness of commonalities and differences we share as a university community.
- the intrinsic worth of all who work and study here.
- that 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 community through commitment to diversity as a recruitment and selection criterion.
- 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 insure full educational opportunity for all who teach and learn and work here.
- to prepare effectively citizen-leaders for a pluralistic world.

Upon seeking advice from the senate chair, we have circulated this draft to the staff and student senates for their approval or suggested modifications of language. Both groups have endorsed the document as-is as of the end of April 2002.

4. Work with appropriate offices and governing bodies to explore initiatives regarding disability as an aspect of diversity.

Committee member Ivey West had been previously charged by the committee to meet with individual academic departments to discuss awareness of the needs of students with disabilities, including mental illness. We discussed ways in which we might be able to support her in this project. It was agreed that West would continue to contact departments herself, and that the committee would provide backup if departments hesitated to schedule meetings.

Committee member Margi Nowak led one of the workshops for January's Professional Development Week. The workshop was entitled "**Singing in a Different Key: Disability Awareness in the Workplace**".

Further committee discussion on this charge is reviewed in the minutes of 10/23/01.

Additional Business:

B. Bates and R. Gibson expressed concerns about faculty diversity at UPS in the meeting of 11/20/01. The committee expressed interest in pursuing this topic, leading to a presentation on 2/13/02 by Beverly Smith (HR) who provided a summary of the strategies for advertising positions at the University. Her discussion centered primarily on faculty positions. Also presenting that day was R. Gibson who provided a statistical report (as of Nov-1-2001) of the numbers and percentages of employees by job category, race, and gender. The committee invited Academic Vice-President Terry Cooney to meet with the committee on 3/12/02 to discuss the university efforts to diversify the faculty (see the minutes of 3/12/02). The committee is interested in continuing to pursue this topic in the next academic year.

Suggested Future Charges for the Committee:

1. Continue to work the Office of Admission staff [on ways to evaluate and regularize](#) the telephoning project.
2. Continue to work with the director of Access programs and the faculty support committee to collaborate with Access programs and the Speakers' Bureau.
3. Present a revised draft of the University Statement on Diversity to the Senate during the fall 2002 semester and facilitate University-wide deliberation regarding the statement.
4. Work with appropriate offices and governing bodies to [monitor and support disability](#) as an aspect of diversity.
5. The Diversity Committee should discuss the potential merits and drawbacks of establishing some 5, 10, 15 and 20-year benchmarks for both recruitment and retention of different groups of students, [faculty and staff](#) of color.

Questions for the senate:

Charge #2: Should this be a standing charge?

Charge #3. Should **we be recharged with this? Do we have a continuing role to play? Should it be up to the senate to take it to the next step (present to full faculty)?**

Charge #4. Should this now be a standing charge?