

**Committee on Diversity
Minutes
October 1, 2012**

Committee Members Present: Amy Ryken, Mark Martin, Margi Nowak, John Lear, Aislinn Melchoir, Carolyn Weisz, Bill Beitenbach, Czarina Ramsay
Guests: Ellen Peters, Mike Segawa

I – Introduction

- The meeting was called to order by chair Amy Ryken at 4:02. Brief introductions were shared.

II – Review and Approval of the Minutes

- The minutes of September 10, 2012, were approved.

III – Announcements

- Saturday, October 6, 2012. Race & Pedagogy Conference on Race, Education and Criminal Justice.
- Brief report of BERT meeting by Mark Martin, Carolyn Weisz, and Czarina Ramsay. BERT will be discussing its objectives and will bring these to the Faculty Committee on Diversity. BERT is also discussing issues including the secure storage of confidential information and the sharing of reports.
- Friday, October 5, 2012. Speak Out Loud Series event on “Debunking the Myth of Tacoma” at the Diversity Center.
- Mark and Amy announced that they are collaborating to invite Jo Handelsman from Yale University to speak about gender and mentoring/hiring in the sciences.
- Amy announced that a list of Diversity Liaisons has been created, and that this year the role of liaisons will be focused on tenure-line searches. A question was raised by a search chair about whether this is a support or advocacy role. The committee will discuss this at a future meeting.

IV – Discussion of Excerpt and Role-Out of Preliminary Report on the University of Puget Sound Campus Climate Survey comparing 2006 and 2012 responses

- A draft of an excerpt of the report was provided. Reading and discussion ensued.
- Amy Ryken explained that this committee was one of the first to see an excerpt, other than DAC and the Cabinet. The role out will continue in waves including a Wed at 4 Session on October 10.
- Ellen Peters provided context and asked questions about responses to the information.
- The following themes and questions were discussed:
 - Does the pattern of change from 2006 seem optimistic? Does it indicate that diversity-related efforts on campus are paying off? What problems are still present? How has the wording of questions changed?
 - It was noted that the 2012 instrument is better in asking about a more specific set of social identities.
 - Aggregated patterns may primarily reflect perspectives of students with majority identities because they are represented in greater numbers among respondents. Disaggregation will be informative.
 - Patterns for having “heard a stereotype or negative remark” in the past year raise questions about who hears what, who recognizes remarks as harmful, the developmental trajectory of students, and when and where are people guarded or less guarded in what they say. The role of norms about civility and the difference between a stereotype and negative comment were also discussed.
 - Discussion focused on the dangers versus utility of including illustrative comments. Are the comments representative?

- How can this information be useful? How will it affect and be received by individuals with historically oppressed identities? How can we prevent information overload?
- What is the relationship between the role out of this information, its methodology, and efforts to diversify the campus? If diversity is perceived as “less” of a problem, does that mean we have met our diversity goals? Are we achieving a better climate at the same time that we diversify?

V – Next Meeting on October 22.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn Weisz