

Diversity Committee Minutes
October 13, 2006

Attending: Rosa Beth Gibson, John David Barton, Ed Cole, Monica DeHart, Heather Clifford, Jean Kim, Janet Marcavage, Yoshiko Matsui, Michelle Stoler, Mike Valentine, Carrie Washburn, Kim Bobby, Jim McCullough, Nila Wiese

Meeting was called to order at 8:05 A.M.

Chair Nila Wiese asked for comments on or corrections to the September 29 meeting minutes. There were no changes and the minutes were approved. (M/S/P)

The Chair called for announcements and the busy activity calendar was reviewed by Yoshiko. It was mentioned that Race Readers is a new group on campus currently studying the works of Dr. Cornell West. The SDC House Cup was also explained. This year the theme is pumpkins and groups cook and carve them to be judged. Nila announced a Latino immigration talk on October 23 and mentioned the Western Washington Students of Color Reception will be held on November 18. Additional speakers are being sought for presentations on that day. Jim mentioned a two week visit to UPS by Thai students starting October 15.

Nila and Jean attended the Faculty Senate Meeting October 9 to clarify charge 8 to the Diversity Committee. She also spoke to Nancy Bristow, Faculty Senate liaison to Diversity Committee. Nila was told that charge 8 relates to our charge 1 of assisting Admission with recruitment of students of color. This charge seeks to provide us with more information about the recruitment process and evaluation. Nila was told that we have considerable flexibility and we can do whatever we want within this charge. Faculty Senators are interested learning more about the process of recruiting students of color. Jean said this charge is clearly related to charge 1. Jim suggested this may signal a change from us being reactive to becoming more proactive in the process. Kim suggested we talk with Admission. Discussion continued on what we might recommend as a committee. We should explore this further and discuss it when we have more information. It was agreed that we ask Admission to provide data on recruitment of students color and a list of activities related to this recruitment, and that we schedule a meeting with representatives from Admission to discuss this topic. (M/S/P)

The committee discussed our schedule for the next few meetings and it was agreed that next meeting would be devoted to discussion of the Bias and Hate subcommittee and the November 10 meeting would focus on the Admission data and program. We will seek a meeting with Admission staff in January.

The committee discussion shifted to the required Self-Evaluation. The committee has received the following charge:

**Charge to Standing Committees
Self-Evaluation**

**(ASC; Curriculum Committee; FAC; UEC; PSC; Student Life Committee; Library, Media,
and Information Systems Committee; Committee on Diversity; and IRB)**

Rationale

Regular review of standing committees is a responsibility charged to the Senate Executive Committee according to the Faculty Bylaws (Faculty Bylaws, Revised Edition, February 2002, Sec. 5 Responsibilities). Such a review has not occurred in recent memory. The Senate recommends committees discuss the items in this self-evaluation and to encourage involvement of the all members in their discussion. It is expected that standing committees shall report the results of their deliberations to the Faculty Senate. See Section 3A below.

Faculty Bylaws, Revised Edition, February 2002

Sec. 5. Responsibilities.

- B. The Executive Committee, jointly with the Dean of the University and President.....regularly structure a review of all standing committees' responsibilities and operations in order to sustain effective organization.*

Specific Charges for Self-Evaluation

I. *Conformity to Faculty Bylaws.*

Please review Article V of the Faculty Bylaws (www2.ups.edu/dean/zzzz/faculty/bylaws.shtml), which outlines the general purpose, membership, organization, and responsibilities of the Standing Committees (Sections 1-5). Please also review specific information for each committee (Section 6). Is this committee's operation consistent with the Bylaws and Faculty Code? Please identify and explain any exceptions identified during the self-evaluation in the committee's practice regarding committee membership, committee size, election of a chairperson, scope of responsibilities, etc.

II. *Issues to consider in the self-evaluation deliberation.*

A. *Committee size*

1. How many faculty, students, staff, and administrators (ex-officios) serve on this committee? Is this number appropriate to complete the committee work with a fair and reasonable distribution of work load among members?
2. How many hours per month, on average, do committee members spend doing work for this committee? Is this work fairly distributed among committee members?
3. How often does this committee meet? For how long? Is this meeting schedule adequate to complete the work of this committee?
4. In general, is this committee optimally served by its current size and meeting schedule? If not, what would you recommend?

B. Committee membership

1. What are the distinctive contributions made by various groups of members (i.e., instructional faculty, faculty and staff administrators, students, and staff) to this committee? How central are these contributions to the operation and responsibilities of this committee?
2. Is the mechanism by which instructional faculty come to serve on this committee (e.g., selection by the Executive Committee of the Senate, jointly with the Dean of the University and President OR faculty election) appropriate given the nature of the work done by this committee? If not, what would you recommend and what is the rationale for this recommendation? (For example, would the university be better served by having faculty with special skills or training serve on this committee?)

C. Committee organization

1. Implicit in Article V, Sections 2 of the Bylaws is that each committee should be led by a Chairperson. Does the committee have a chairperson? If not, should the committee have a chairperson?
2. If so, how is the chairperson chosen? Would you recommend any changes in the mechanism by which the chair is chosen?
3. How does the Chairperson contribute to the operation of this committee?
4. What role do faculty and staff administrators (ex-officios) serve on this committee? For example, does the ex-officio provide information about the Code and rules of governance?
5. Which members of this committee vote? Are these voting privileges appropriate to the nature of the committee work? Recent Senate discussions have debated whether ex-officios should vote in certain circumstances. Do ex-officios on this committee vote? Is their vote appropriate and/or necessary to decisions made by this committee?

D. Committee responsibilities

1. Is the domain of charges to this committee adequate and appropriate? What additional work might this committee include among its charges? Is its work sufficiently narrow that it could be merged into a different committee or group? Do committee members feel that this committee should be sunsetted? What charges are rarely addressed or seem peripheral to this committee? How else might the responsibilities be logically divided?

III. *Report to the Senate*

A. Summary

Please submit to the Senate as part of your year end report conclusions from your discussion of the above items, as appropriate. The report may include additional comments about committee structure and organization not captured in items II A-D.

B. Recommendations

The committee's report to the Senate may include suggestions for changes—of any magnitude—to committee membership and responsibilities that emerge from the self-evaluation, accompanied by an explanation of how these changes would improve the committee's operation and allow it to more effectively meet the general goal of doing constructive work for the good of the University.

Carrie asked about our relationship to the By-laws and about the structure of the committee. Since the report is due on December 1, we discussed how to approach this requirement. There was a brief discussion about the role of Diversity Committee on campus followed by an agreement to create a sub-committee headed by Jim with Carrie and Nila to prepare a draft report. Committee members were asked to submit information related to the specific charges by October 20 to Jim at mccullough@ups.edu, and a draft report will be presented at the October 27 meeting.

There being no further business at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 8:45.

Respectfully submitted,
Jim McCullough

The next meeting of the Diversity Committee is Friday, October 27 at 8 A.M. in the Student Diversity Center.