

**Committee on Diversity  
2014-2015 Annual Report to the Faculty Senate**

**Committee on Diversity Members**

Michael Benitez (Chief Diversity Officer, Dean of Diversity and Inclusion), Chad Gunderson, Nakisha Renee Jones (student member), Aislinn Melchior, Heidi Orloff, Czarina Ramsay (Director for Intercultural Engagement), Oriol Siu, George Tomlin (chair), Mike Valentine, Carolyn Weisz

**Senate Liaison:** William Beardsley

**Prepared by:** George Tomlin, Chair, with input from CoD Members

**Submitted:** April 30, 2015

**Committee Duties and Activities**

Duties per Faculty Bylaws (1-8) and Senate Charges (C1-C6)	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). In any one year the rates can be volatile due to the small numbers. Accumulating data over many years addresses that limitation, but can mask trends. With these stipulations, the CoD reports the following.</p> <p>Rates of hiring (AY0506 through AY1415) and retention (AY0506 through AY1314) are nearly equal according to sex, but differ for retention 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: 52% (47/91)</td> <td>Women: 86% (37/43)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Men: 48% (44/91)</td> <td>Men: 88% (36/41)</td> </tr> </table> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Hiring (Tenure Line)</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Retention (Tenure Line)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Faculty of Color: 20% (18/91)</td> <td>Faculty of Color: 69% (11/16)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White Faculty: 80% (73/91)</td> <td>White Faculty: 91% (62/68)</td> </tr> </table> <p>A chi-square analysis of the differences in retention by race suggests that the lower rate of retention of faculty of color is unlikely to have occurred by chance, in a world where equal rates of retention are assumed, <math>X^2(1, N = 84) = 5.726, p &lt; .02</math>. One can be 98% confident in this</p>	Hiring Rate (Tenure Line)	Retention (Tenure Line)	Women: 52% (47/91)	Women: 86% (37/43)	Men: 48% (44/91)	Men: 88% (36/41)	Hiring (Tenure Line)	Retention (Tenure Line)	Faculty of Color: 20% (18/91)	Faculty of Color: 69% (11/16)	White Faculty: 80% (73/91)	White Faculty: 91% (62/68)
Hiring Rate (Tenure Line)	Retention (Tenure Line)												
Women: 52% (47/91)	Women: 86% (37/43)												
Men: 48% (44/91)	Men: 88% (36/41)												
Hiring (Tenure Line)	Retention (Tenure Line)												
Faculty of Color: 20% (18/91)	Faculty of Color: 69% (11/16)												
White Faculty: 80% (73/91)	White Faculty: 91% (62/68)												

	<p>statement.</p> <p>--Hiring Data (Visiting Faculty)  Data from visiting faculty hires for fall 2012-fall 2014 were provided this year by the Office of Institutional Research. Omitting the 7% who choose not to report race/ethnicity, the rates of minority hiring F12 to F14 have been 17.8%, 8.6%, and 23.7%, respectively (3-year rate 16.9%). Removing international faculty they are 15.9%, 5.9%, and 14.7%, respectively (3-year rate 12.5%).</p> <p>From faculty composition data provided by the Academic Vice President:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Tenure Line Faculty</th> <th>Full-Time Faculty</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Self ID: white</td> <td>89.36% (168)</td> <td>86.45% (217)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Of color</td> <td>10.64% (20)</td> <td>13.55% (34)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Subtracting the tenure line numbers from the full-time numbers to arrive at the visiting faculty composition yields 14 of 63 as faculty of color, or 22.2%.</p> <p>Combined with the recent hiring rates for tenure track faculty of color (28.6% last year, 50% current year, with four searches pending), it can be concluded that the university is making some progress toward increasing the proportion of under-represented groups among the tenure line faculty. We are holding close or slightly slipping for visiting faculty. Obviously, to realize the long-term gains an increase represents, the hiring trend among tenure line faculty needs to continue. The current differential retention rate, if continued, would work to decelerate the long-term hiring trend toward a sustained representative faculty.</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 follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>85.7% in AY 2014-2015</li> <li>100% in AY 2013-2014</li> <li>100% in AY 2012-2013</li> </ul>		Tenure Line Faculty	Full-Time Faculty	Self ID: white	89.36% (168)	86.45% (217)	Of color	10.64% (20)	13.55% (34)
	Tenure Line Faculty	Full-Time Faculty								
Self ID: white	89.36% (168)	86.45% (217)								
Of color	10.64% (20)	13.55% (34)								
<p>3. To work with the President, Vice-Presidents, and the Chief Diversity</p>	<p>--Chad Gunderson and Carolyn Weisz served as the CoD representatives to the Diversity Advisory Council (DAC).</p>									

<p>Officer concerning diversity initiatives that can benefit from faculty presence and leadership, as needed.</p>	<p>The CoD sent two faculty this year at the request of CDO Michael Benitez, because DAC was working on a new campus Diversity Strategic Plan and needed more faculty representation on its four subcommittees.</p> <p>--Michael Valentine served as the CoD representative to the Bias-Hate Education Response Team (BHERT).</p> <p>--The CoD worked collaboratively with the Academic Vice President and the Associate Dean to obtain and review hiring and retention data (see Duty #2 above).</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 CoD collaborates with and works to support the work of DAC, BHERT, the Sexual and Gender Violence Committee (SGVC), the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO), and the Director for Intercultural Engagement.</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 Duty 3.</p> <p>--The CoD began a preliminary review of the issue of conflicting wording about academic freedom between the Faculty Code and the response protocol of BHERT, at the request of the Faculty Senate. The CoD discussed the memo issued by the PSC on this topic (email memo of March 24, 2015 from MacBain to Tomlin, Reich, and Buescher). Because the CoD believes an important distinction was over-looked by the PSC between harm experienced by members of systemically advantaged versus systematically disadvantaged groups (CoD minutes of April 8, 2015), the CoD recommends that a meeting be convened in the fall among representatives of the PSC, the CoD, BHERT, and the Student Life Committee to exchange views and agree on a process of decision-making to resolve the seeming conflict of wording.</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 normally appoints two of its members to serve on BHERT. At the request of the CDO (CoD Minutes, 11 Sept 2014), one BHERT faculty representative was shifted to sitting on the DAC. Mike Valentine served this year as the CoD representative on BHERT. The CoD was informed that there were 48 reports of confirmed bias this year, and 9 sexual misconduct reports.</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</p>	<p>--See Charges 1-6 below.</p>

<p>assigned to it by the Faculty Senate.</p> <p>C1. Review department responses to Question 6 written during five-year curriculum assessments during 2014-15 in order to evaluate how well the new language elicits useful information on diversity in the curriculum. Propose feedback to the Curriculum Committee regarding Question 6.</p> <p>C2. By the end of spring semester provide to the Faculty Senate and the Curriculum Committee an analysis of the distribution of approved KNOW courses among departments, disciplines, and cores. If there appears to be an insufficiency of KNOW courses based on the target goal for the first year, informally encourage colleagues, in collaboration with the Office of the Associate Deans, to submit KNOW proposals.</p> <p>C3. Make recommendations to support better the work of the diversity liaisons for hiring based on assessment of feedback solicited last year (from search chairs and diversity liaisons for hiring) as well as from 2014-15 interviews with faculty of color about their hiring and retention experiences.</p>	<p>--Charge 1: The CoD collected department responses to Question 6 of the Curriculum Reviews of the past few years from the Associate Deans office, which had collated them. The review and analysis has begun and will continue next year, when a more meaningful comparison can be made with more recent data.</p> <p>--Charge 2: The CoD received the list of KNOW courses approved by the Curriculum Committee in AY1415. The CoD noted the lack of lower division courses and sciences courses among those approved for KNOW status. CoD members have participated in the KNOW Burlington planning group.</p> <p>--Charge 3: The CoD discussed with the CDO the role, history, and outcomes of the Diversity Liaison program. CoD members did not undertake interviews of recent faculty of color hires about their experiences, deterred by confidentiality concerns. The CoD also considered the work of similar faculty on other campuses, and came to the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) that the Faculty Search Diversity Liaison not be the search chair;</li> <li>(b) that the Faculty Search Diversity Liaison could be a non-voting member of the search committee from outside the department conducting the search;</li> <li>(c) that the university establish and train a pool of Faculty Search Diversity Liaisons to draw from for searches, to provide departments flexibility as to how the role is filled;</li> <li>(d) that the Faculty Search Diversity Liaison should connect with the CDO to discuss search criteria prior to position posting;</li> <li>(e) that diversity liaison service be recognized as</li> </ul>
--	---

<p>C4. Review hiring and retention data by gender, race/ethnicity, their intersections, and any other categories to see if the data might be disaggregated in more revealing ways.</p> <p>C5. Appoint a CoD faculty member to serve on the Sexual and Gender Violence Committee (SGVC) and with that group assess the advisability of expanding the number of faculty Harassment Reporting Officers (HROs). The CoD faculty representative to the SGVC shall report back to the full CoD with any specific recommendations of relevance to the faculty.</p> <p>C6. With respect to the work of the committee during 2014-15, indicate in the end-of -year report whether the size of the committee was appropriate and identify any committee work that seemed superfluous.</p>	<p>university service.</p> <p>--Charge 4. The chair of the CoD met with the Academic Vice President and the Associate Dean responsible for hiring visiting faculty. Updated data were obtained on hiring and retention with the finest grain possible given the current data collection protocols. See duty #2 above. The CoD recommends that such data automatically be collated each year by the Office for Institutional Research, in a format that allows for meaningful analysis of cumulative trends, including the tracking of numbers for members of specific racial/ethnic groups. The tenure track hiring data were enhanced this year by the addition of information about the minority/majority status in the original applicant pools, which was very helpful in gaining a more complete picture of campus progress in hiring more faculty from under-represented groups.</p> <p>--Charge 5. Aislinn Melchior was appointed by the CoD to serve on the SGVC. She participated in all its pertinent deliberations and reported back to the full CoD on the improvements coming to the accessibility of procedures to campus community members who feel they have been wronged, and to the processing procedures once a complaint has been made. As the SGVC work will continue AY1516, the CoD expects to also continue its representation on that committee.</p> <p>--Charge 6. The CoD had an extensive discussion at its meeting of 29 April 2015 as to its role, purpose, and size. Unlike many other standing committees, the CoD sends working representatives to several other groups (BHERT, DAC, SGVC). These representatives constituted a majority of faculty members on the CoD. Those remaining were too few to implement fully all the AY1415 charges to the CoD, despite having considerable help from the busy external representative members (Aislinn Melchior, SGVC, also sat on the CoD's KNOW course subcommittee; Carolyn Weisz, DAC, also sat on the subcommittee on Question 6; and Michael Valentine, BHERT, and Chad Gunderson, DAC, were also members of the CoD subcommittee on faculty hiring and retention).</p>
---	--

	<p>In order to fulfill its duties and charges in a timely manner, the CoD recommends that two faculty members be added to its numbers for AY1516, for a total of nine. The CoD affirmed the distinct value of its student member, both as a contributing voice from the student perspective, but also as a conduit for information about CoD actions to students. The two staff members of the CoD are also highly valued for their information on campus-wide diversity initiatives, their academic knowledge of diversity issues, and their helpful support during deliberations and implementation of committee charges. All members find their work on the CoD to be meaningful. Finally, CoD members felt it important to review how we coordinate with other campus entities, to clarify the nature of the relationships and the policies that undergird the work of these various offices and committees. This reflection was spurred by the PSC-SLC-BHERT-CoD memo on the seeming conflict of wording between the Faculty Code and the Response Protocol of BHERT.</p>
--	--

The CoD plans to continue its activities to fulfill the standing duties 1-8 from the Faculty Bylaws.

The CoD suggests charges for AY1516:

1. Review department responses to Question 6 written during five-year curriculum assessments.
2. Continue to monitor the number and distribution of approved KNOW courses and take what measures it can to encourage such proposals being submitted by faculty.
3. Monitor the work of the Faculty Search Diversity Liaisons and encourage a wider, trained pool of faculty liaisons from which departments may draw in their faculty searches.
4. Review faculty hiring and retention data by gender and race/ethnicity, and category of appointment (tenure line or visiting).
5. Send a CoD member to the SGVC, so as to continue supporting their work.
6. Work with the PSC, BHERT, and SLC to resolve apparent wording conflicts between the Faculty Code and the Response Protocol to Incidents of Bias or Hate with respect to academic freedom and respecting the rights of all members of the university community.