

**Committee on Diversity
2013-2014 Annual Report to the Faculty Senate**

Committee on Diversity Members

Michael Benitez (Chief Diversity Officer, Dean of Diversity and Inclusion), Aislinn Melchior (Fall 2013), Heidi Orloff, Czarina Ramsay (Director Multicultural Student Services), Amy Ryken (chair), Oriol Siu, Hannah Smith (student member), George Tomlin (Spring 2014), Jennifer Utrata, Mike Valentine, Carolyn Weisz

Senate Liaison: Ariela Tubert

Committee Responsibilities and Activities

| Committee Responsibilities per the Faculty Bylaws and Senate Charges | Committee Activities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|--|--|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. To serve the university's goal of increasing the social diversity of the campus. | --See numbers 2-8 below. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. To participate in the development of initiatives that enable the university to hire new faculty from historically under-represented populations and to support better the retention and success of such faculty. | <p>--Hiring and Retention Data (Tenure Line) Each year the Committee on Diversity reviews hiring and retention data for tenure line faculty in relation to sex and race (the only social diversity categories that the University systematically documents for faculty). Rates of hiring and retention from 2005-2014 are roughly equal according to sex, but vary greatly according to race.</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Hiring Rate (Tenure Line)</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Retention (Tenure Line)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Women: 51% (43/84)</td> <td>Women: 85% (35/41)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Men: 49% (41/84)</td> <td>Men: 86% (32/37)</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hiring (Tenure Line)</td> <td>Retention (Tenure Line)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Faculty of Color: 19% (16/84)</td> <td>Faculty of Color: 67% (10/15)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White Faculty: 81% (68/84)</td> <td>White Faculty: 90% (57/63)</td> </tr> </table> <p>A chi-square analysis of the differences in retention by race suggests that faculty of color are retained at a statistically significantly lower rate, $X^2(1, N = 78) = 5.643, p < .02$.</p> <p>--Diversity Liaison As a result of a recommendation made by the COD in 2011, departments conducting faculty searches are asked to appoint a Diversity Liaison. Percent of departments conducting tenure line searches that designated a diversity liaison:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% in AY 2013-2014 100% in AY 2012-2013 83% in AY 2011-2012 | Hiring Rate (Tenure Line) | Retention (Tenure Line) | Women: 51% (43/84) | Women: 85% (35/41) | Men: 49% (41/84) | Men: 86% (32/37) | | | Hiring (Tenure Line) | Retention (Tenure Line) | Faculty of Color: 19% (16/84) | Faculty of Color: 67% (10/15) | White Faculty: 81% (68/84) | White Faculty: 90% (57/63) |
| Hiring Rate (Tenure Line) | Retention (Tenure Line) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Women: 51% (43/84) | Women: 85% (35/41) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Men: 49% (41/84) | Men: 86% (32/37) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hiring (Tenure Line) | Retention (Tenure Line) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Faculty of Color: 19% (16/84) | Faculty of Color: 67% (10/15) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| White Faculty: 81% (68/84) | White Faculty: 90% (57/63) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>The Committee developed post search follow-up questions for search chairs and diversity liaisons. Dean Bartanen solicited responses. The committee will review responses and make recommendations for better supporting the work of diversity liaisons.</p> <p>--Curriculum Review (Question 6 in the 5-year Program Review) See also #5 below regarding the COD recommendation to and meeting with the Curriculum Committee.</p> |
| <p>3. To work with the President, Vice-Presidents, and the Chief Diversity Officer concerning diversity initiatives that can benefit from faculty presence and leadership, as needed.</p> | <p>--Amy Ryken served as the Committee on Diversity representative on the Diversity Advisory Council (DAC).</p> <p>--The Committee has worked collaboratively with the Academic Vice President to review hiring and retention data and to support and review the diversity liaison role.</p> <p>--The Committee has worked collaboratively with the Chief Diversity Officer by reviewing and providing feedback on the goals of BHERT.</p> |
| <p>4. To establish liaisons with key university units including staff and student diversity groups to assess strategic needs and work collaboratively in diversity-related initiatives, as needed.</p> | <p>-- The Committee collaborates with and works to support the work of DAC, BHERT, CWTL, the Chief Diversity Officer, and Multicultural Student Services.</p> <p>--Amy Ryken met with student leaders during the Student Diversity Governing Council Retreat to discuss campus climate survey results and the KNOW proposal. In addition she participated in the Resident Assistant Training to discuss LGBTQ issues on campus.</p> <p>--The COD read and discussed open letters to the campus written by Puget Sound students Mariana Molina and C.J. Queirolo. The COD wrote a public response.</p> |
| <p>5. To work with colleagues to maintain an educational environment that welcomes and supports diversity even as it protects and assures the rights of academic freedom outlined in the Faculty Code.</p> | <p>--See Charge 3.</p> <p>--The COD sent a recommendation to the Curriculum Committee (CC) and Faculty Senate about the CC's action to change question #6 in the 5-year program/curriculum review. Members of the COD met with the CC to discuss this issue.</p> |
| <p>6. To activate annually a group of faculty, staff and students that will review aggregate data about patterns of bias and hate in our campus community with the purpose of creating educational opportunities for reflection and dialogue.</p> | <p>-- To enact this charge, each Fall the COD appoints two of its members to serve on BHERT. Mike Valentine and Carolyn Weisz served as the COD representatives on BHERT.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>7. To report annually to the Faculty Senate on the committee's work related to diversity goals 1-6.</p> | <p>--This document is our annual report.</p> |
| <p>8. Such other duties as may be assigned to it by the Faculty Senate.</p> <p>1. Assess the viability of expanding the number of faculty HROs (harassment reporting officers) and make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate.</p> <p>2. Identify areas of concern for the faculty based on a review of faculty responses to the campus climate survey and make recommendations to the senate.</p> <p>3. Collaborate with the Burlington Northern group to draft a revised proposal for a diversity requirement.</p> | <p>--Charge 1: The COD reviewed and discussed the Report of the Sexual Assault Work Group (SAWG). The COD did not assess viability of expanding the number of faculty HROs because the Chief Diversity Officer is currently in the process of establishing a campus wide Sexual Assault Committee that will be charged with reviewing policies and making recommendations about HRO selection and role.</p> <p>--Charge 2: The COD read and discussed the campus climate reports shared with the campus this academic year (e.g., gender, religion, socioeconomic status, political beliefs, race & ethnicity). The COD asked the Office of Institutional Research to analyze if minoritized faculty respondents (by race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, and/or disability status) had different patterns of reply. The COD discussed the report provided, identified patterns, and wrote a report summarizing recommendations (see Appendix A).</p> <p>--Charge 3: Throughout the academic year the COD discussed evolving drafts of the Knowledge, Identity, and Power (KNOW) learning objectives and guidelines and provided input and feedback to the Burlington Northern group. Members of the COD also joined the Faculty Senate for conversations about the KNOW proposal. The COD unanimously endorsed the KNOW overlay requirement, which was passed on April 9, 2014 by an electronic vote of the full faculty (132 yes; 82 no). The COD discussed the potential role of the committee in supporting the implementation of the KNOW proposal and recommended a charge.</p> |

Suggested Charges for 2014-2015

Collaborate with the Curriculum Committee to consider strategies for supporting and reviewing department responses to Question 6

Support implementation of the Knowledge, Identity, and Power (KNOW) proposal

Host discussions about student letters that speak to classroom and campus climate

Review hiring and retention data by gender, race/ethnicity, and their intersections, and work with the Academic Vice President and Dean of Diversity and Inclusion/Chief Diversity Officer to obtain data on subcategories of faculty of color (e.g., disaggregating by race and international affiliation)

Continue to collaborate with the Chief Diversity Officer in the development of the sexual assault committee structure and accessibility of HRO's.

Support the 2014 National Race and Pedagogy Conference

Appendix A

TO: Faculty Senate
FM: Committee on Diversity
Michael Benitez, Heidi Orloff, Czarina Ramsay, Amy Ryken (Chair), Oriel Siu, Hannah Smith (Student Member) George Tomlin, Jennifer Utrata, Mike Valentine, Carolyn Weisz
RE: Senate Charge: Campus Climate Concerns for Faculty
April 29, 2014

Charge: Identify areas of concern for the faculty based on a review of faculty responses to the campus climate survey and make recommendations to the senate.

To engage this charge, members of the Committee on Diversity (COD) read the five campus climate reports released by the Diversity Advisory Council (DAC) this year. These reports focused on campus climate issues in relation to gender, religion, socio-economic status, political beliefs, and race/ethnicity. The COD did not have access to the full data set of comments written by faculty because access to that data is restricted to the Office of Institutional Research and the DAC to protect the anonymity of survey respondents.

In discussing themes and patterns in the reports a number of concerns about the data collection and reporting processes were identified:

- The climate survey responses represent majority group responses and reporting empowers the opinions of faculty in majority groups;
- The COD wondered how the campus can meaningfully solicit and hear the perspectives of minoritized groups when we do not currently have broad representation, especially of faculty of color;
- The COD highlighted that a focus on equity and inclusion refers to the process of creating equivalent outcomes for members of historically underrepresented and oppressed groups, and assuring that historically underrepresented groups feel they are empowered to participate in majority culture in ways that shape and redefine campus and community

The COD asked the office of Institutional Research to re-analyze the climate survey data to determine if the views of faculty differed based on race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and disability status. The COD reviewed the report and noted differences in response patterns. A significant and overarching pattern across these four facets of identity/social participation is that faculty who identify with a minoritized group are more likely to report feeling excluded, silenced, ignored, discriminated against or harassed, even subtly as a result of minoritized group belonging. Below we share data from the report:

Race/Ethnicity: Whereas less than 1% (n = 1) of White faculty respondents reported that they felt excluded, silenced, ignored, discriminated or harassed, even subtly, as a result of their race/ethnicity, 29% (n = 2) of Asian faculty and 50% (n = 2) of Hispanic faculty reported that they felt excluded, silenced, ignored, discriminated against, or harassed, even subtly, as a result of their race/ethnicity. It is important to note that no African American faculty (n = 3), American Indian faculty (n = 1), or faculty of two or more races (n = 1) responded to this question on the survey.

Gender: Of the 86 female faculty respondents, 28% (n = 24) reported that they felt excluded, silenced, ignored, discriminated against, or harassed, even subtly as a result of their gender, compared to only 4% (n = 3) of male faculty respondents. Faculty members who self identify as female are also more likely to report feeling marginalization based on age (17.4% (n=15) of female faculty compared to 9.6% (n=8) of male faculty) and race/ethnicity (5.8% (n=5) of female faculty compared to 0% of male faculty).

Sexual Orientation: Fifteen percent (n = 2) of gay/lesbian faculty respondents reported feeling excluded, silenced, ignored, discriminated against, or harassed, even subtly, as a result of their sexual orientation, and no other faculty respondents reported this.

Disability Status: Of the 11 faculty respondents who reported having a physical or learning difference on the 2012 Climate Survey, 18% (n = 2) reported that they felt excluded, silenced, ignored, discriminated against or harassed, even subtly, as a result of their disability status (compared to the 0% of the 164 faculty who reported not having a physical or learning difference).

While the numbers of faculty who self identify as members of minoritized groups and who report feeling marginalized are small these findings are important to note and attend to precisely because Puget Sound has not yet achieved structural diversity as articulated in the Diversity Strategic Plan.

Each year the Committee on Diversity reviews hiring and retention data in relation to sex and race. Rates of hiring and retention from 2005-2014 are roughly equal according to sex, but vary greatly according to race.

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Hiring (Tenure Line) | Retention (Tenure Line) |
| Women: 51% (43/84) | Women: 85% (35/41) |
| Men: 49% (41/84) | Men: 86% (32/37) |

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Hiring (Tenure Line) | Retention (Tenure Line) |
| Faculty of Color: 19% (16/84) | Faculty of Color: 67% (10/15) |
| White Faculty: 81% (68/84) | White Faculty: 90% (57/63) |

A chi-square analysis of the differences in retention by race suggests that faculty of color are retained at a statistically significantly lower rate, $\chi^2(1, N = 78) = 5.643, p < .02$. The COD was unable to do a chi-square analysis of differences in hiring rates because in order to do so we would need to identify hiring rates nationally for comparative analysis.

The Faculty Bylaws charge the Committee on Diversity (Section 6 H.b.2) to participate in the development of initiatives that enable the university to hire new faculty from historically under-represented populations and to support better the retention and success of such faculty. In considering how to summarize the reports, members of the COD strongly expressed how the one key issue with respect to diversity on campus is achieving racial diversity in faculty hiring.

Below is an outline of the goals of hiring a diverse applicant pool as articulated in the Diversity Strategic Plan.

Goal 1: We will increase the recruitment and retention of students, staff, and faculty from underrepresented minority groups.

Underrepresented minority: Racial or ethnic groups that have been historically minoritized and/or are typically underrepresented in American higher education including people of Black/African-American, Latin/Hispanic, and Native American heritage.

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

Social diversity: Characteristics that could cause groups or individuals to be minoritized and/or 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.

Literature in higher education points to key findings about hiring and retaining underrepresented and minoritized groups and what institutions can do to address challenges with faculty diversity. Findings indicate that assuring underrepresented and minority faculty are represented in hiring processes and practices is important to achieving diversity in recruitment. With respect to hiring, findings indicate that institutions are not doing enough to assure accountability in hiring practices even though literature points to the importance of formalizing and centralizing diversity as a hiring component. This requires moving beyond nice intentions and individual perspectives about “best candidates” to situating departmental and institutional hiring practices in relation to best practices literature. According to the research, successfully recruiting of faculty of color is informed by a combination of the following:

1. Representation of key diversity personnel on search committees,
2. Presence of underrepresented faculty and staff of color in the community,
3. Development of faculty learning communities focused on cultural/community needs,
4. Faculty mentorship opportunities available, and;
5. An institution’s ability to create and maintain department climates that encourage the fair and equitable treatment of pre-tenure faculty of color.

In addition to the findings listed above about hiring underrepresented and minority faculty of color, much literature also exists that focuses on retention. Both, recruitment and retention need to be considered as different but highly connected themes to be addressed to the success of assuring a diverse faculty through a lens of equity and inclusion. Hence, both goals listed above require us to consider them in integration. Working to achieve our goals will require that institutionally we work towards creating the welcoming, inclusive, and equitable campus climate necessary to achieve recruitment and retention of faculty for historically marginalized groups. Similarly, intentionally recruiting and retaining a representation of diverse faculty is a significant element to cultivating a welcoming campus community that addresses the challenges faced by underrepresented and minoritized faculty, staff, and students of color.

The Committee on Diversity poses the following questions:

- Is the Faculty committed to the goal of diversifying the faculty? If not, why not?
- Where does commitment to diversifying the faculty exist, and what might promote a broader commitment?
- What incentives might be provided to faculty of color to provide time to build community (as defined/outlined by the needs and challenges of faculty of color), to focus on teaching and/or to develop a research agenda (e.g., reduced teaching load, research funding, intentional mentorship, etc.)?
- Given the decentralized nature of hiring, how might departments be held accountable for goals articulated in the diversity strategic plan?

The Committee on Diversity recommends that the COD collaborate with the Academic Vice President, the Dean of Diversity and Inclusion/Chief Diversity Officer, and the Office of Institutional Research to determine an intentional plan to:

- Conduct interviews with faculty of color to better understand
 - 1) What would have been important factors in hiring?
 - 2) What might community/belonging look like?
 - 3) What elements of the environment are welcoming and not welcoming?
 - 4) What aspects of your job provide or impede satisfaction?

Members of the COD also discussed their concern about the importance of intentional consideration of confidentiality in the way that information is collected and disseminated.

- Consider the decentralized nature of hiring
 - 1) How might departments be held accountable for goals articulated in the diversity strategic plan?
 - 2) What resources or information would help departments to achieve these goals?

References

- Turner, C. S. V. (2002). *Diversifying the faculty: A guidebook for search committees*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities
- Turner, C. S. V., Gonzalez, J. C., & Wood, J. L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(3), 39-168.
- Williams., D. A. (2013). *Strategic diversity leadership: Activating change and transformation in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A., Eddy, P. L., and Beach, A. (2006). *Creating the Future of Faculty Development*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing,
- Umbach, P. "The Contribution of Faculty of Color to Undergraduate Education." *Research in Higher Education*, 47 (3), 2006.
- Smith, J. W., and Calasanti., T. "The Influences of Gender, Race, and Ethnicity on Workplace Experiences of Institutional and Social Isolation: An Exploratory Study of University Faculty." *Sociological Spectrum*, 25, 2005.