

To: The Faculty Senate; Bill Haltom, Chair
From: The Faculty Diversity Committee; Carolyn Weisz, Chair
Re: The 1998/99 FDC Annual Report
Date: April 23, 1999

1998-99 Faculty Diversity Committee (FDC) Membership

Michele Birnbaum	Peggy Firman	Erin Campbell (spring)
John Dickson	Rosa Beth Gibson	Rafael Gomez
David Droge	Judith Kay	Dori Rosenberg (fall)
Charles Hommel	George Mills	Jennifer Way (fall)
Michael Valentine (spring)	Carrie Washburn	
Carolyn Weisz (chair)		

The FDC began the year by focusing on the following three charges from the Senate (of a total of six charges):

- solicit broader faculty and student input by organizing one or more informal discussions with faculty about issues of diversity in the curriculum;
- finalize the curriculum report including revisiting definitional issues and obtaining more information about the models at other institutions; and
- decide how to best disseminate the Diversity Committee's work on the curriculum.

In response to these charges, the committee decided that rather than make changes to the 1998 curriculum report, it would create a brief summary and update of the report to distribute at the faculty meeting on 11/11, and through e-mail (see Appendix 1). At this meeting, faculty were invited to attend a forum to discuss ways to include diversity in a revised core. Faculty hired since 1990-91 also received an invitation to the event through campus mail. The forum occurred on 11/20 and was attended by eight faculty members, including two members of the FDC.

In order to keep the faculty at large focused on issues of diversity in revising the core, the FDC asked the Senate, at its meeting on 11/9, to support a resolution that "the discussion of decision 2 in the Senate's memo on procedures for revising the core should not conclude until the Faculty has discussed the issue of diversity in the core." Bill Haltom noted that the Senate could not dictate any faculty action and it was decided that Haltom would announce at the faculty meeting that the Senate has been in receipt of two proposals for themes for the Core: Citizenship and U.S. Pluralism.

The FDC decided, as a next course of action, that C. Weisz should address the faculty directly at the faculty meeting on 2/10/99. Based on the FDC's work on the curriculum report and on discussion from the forum on 11/20, Weisz presented two questions to the faculty: (1) Is it important for students to study, within the core curriculum, issues related to diversity and pluralism? and (2) If yes, should diversity within the core curriculum focus on international study, diversity within the United States, or both? Weisz also announced that at the faculty's request, the FDC would solicit input from the larger faculty regarding these questions, formulate arguments both for and against particular responses to each question, and put a report together for faculty. The FDC decided it would await instruction from the faculty or the Senate before proceeding with these activities.

At the FDC meeting on 3/10, members of the committee agreed to informally talk with individuals proposing various core plans to the faculty about the role of diversity in their proposals. Committee members reported back to the FDC regarding these conversations.

Student members kept the FDC informed about attempts to collect input about diversity in the core from students through the curriculum survey conducted in fall of 1998. Results indicated that of the 1,166 students surveyed, 59% of respondents answered "yes" to the question "Should there be a Multicultural component in the new core curriculum?"

Beginning in January, the FDC formed subcommittees to address the Senate charge to

- assess the progress the University has and has not made in its diversity initiatives since the University Diversity Committee, appointed by President Phibbs, issued its extensive report in May 1990.

Subcommittees solicited and reviewed numerous reports on information pertaining to diversity at Puget Sound over the last decade. Information gleaned from this process is summarized in the "Report by the 1998-99 Faculty Diversity Committee on Recommendations to the President from the University Diversity Committee May 1990." (See attached cover letter and report.) Each section of the report includes a brief assessment of progress made toward goals in each of the major areas of the original report.

Additionally, at its meeting of 10/9/98, the FDC discussed ways the committee could be effective in the annual Budget Task Force (BTF) process. Although the FDC did not find it necessary to submit a statement to the BTF this year, committee members recommended that the FDC should poll administrators early next fall and, if new funding is being requested, consider supporting these requests.

Through activities described above, the FDC fulfilled the Senate charge to

- serve as a resource regarding faculty diversity and diversity in the student body.

In order to devote adequate time to the work on curriculum and the report on diversity, no action was taken on the following charge from the Senate:

- investigate sources of funding for faculty development and course development to implement curricular changes.

Recommended Charge for the 1999-2000 Diversity Committee

The committee recommends that the Senate charge the 1999-2000 FDC to act as a "think tank" focusing on one or two issues throughout the year. In this role, the committee would not duplicate work of other faculty committees or administrative offices, but serve the University by providing information, carefully researched and analyzed, to the Faculty Senate. The FDC identifies increasing diversity in the student body as a high priority for such sustained analysis.

Additional Recommendations

As a next step following from our work reviewing progress made toward the goals described in the 1990 Report to the President, the FDC recommends that the President appoint an independent *ad hoc* committee (which would include at least one member of the FDC) to assess the University's progress in increasing diversity--using our 1999 FDC review of the 1990 Report to the President, as well as any other relevant material--and then develop a new set of goals regarding diversity at Puget Sound.

Finally, the committee recommends that the Senate reconsider its proposed change to the Faculty By-laws requiring the diversity committee to "report annually to the Faculty the University's efforts and results achieved in recruiting and retaining members of ethnic and minority groups on campus." The FDC suggests, instead, that the appropriate administrative offices circulate this information directly to the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Diversity Committee at the beginning of each academic year.

Appendix 1

**U.S. Pluralism in College and University Curricula (Summary and Update)
A Report of the Faculty Diversity Committee**

In 1996-97 the Faculty Diversity Committee (FDC) forwarded a resolution to the faculty calling for the inclusion of a component on pluralism in the United States in the core curriculum. Building on this commitment, the 1997-98 FDC reviewed national research and models of curricular programs at other colleges and universities. The FDC did not endorse a specific model. Rather, the committee concurred with conclusions reached by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) that 1) a successful program must fit the local context, mission and vision of the faculty, and student needs at the institution; 2) design and implementation is a multi-year endeavor; and 3) the planning and implementation process is important in ensuring success of the program. Regardless of the model chosen, the committee concluded that successful implementation of a core component in U.S. pluralism must "involve an explicit commitment from the faculty and administration that goes well beyond current efforts."

Rationale

Although the FDC applauds efforts to increase diversity in the curriculum through the departmental curriculum review process and new programs of study, the committee seeks to ensure that courses addressing diversity will have a central place in a liberal arts curriculum. A U.S. pluralism component would focus on contemporary and historical issues of race, ethnicity, gender, social class, and religion in the United States. This component would:

- help prepare students for informed, active citizenship in an increasingly diverse society;
- include the systematic study of structured inequalities and prejudicial exclusion;
- encourage students to study their own traditions and identities; and
- expand students' ability to analyze critically issues that stem from group differences in U.S. society.

Models

A report by the 1997-1998 Faculty Diversity Committee describes models one and two below in more detail as well as examples of these models currently being implemented at specific institutions (<http://www.ups.edu/dean/zzzz/CommMinutes/DIV/9798/div9798r.html>). Since completing the report, the committee has discussed two other models that address concerns about core size, staffing, and competing priorities currently under discussion by the Puget Sound Faculty. The four models are:

1. Infusion--no separate requirements, but all departments, divisions, and general education requirements include material on diversity and pluralism. This model is most effective at smaller institutions with a shared commitment to diversity as a core component of the institutional mission. It is difficult to assess and requires extensive faculty development and commitment.

2. Required course or courses--three variants of a separate requirement are:

A. Required course among various options--students may take one U.S. pluralism course among a menu of available courses. This option builds off existing courses, but it requires attention to assessment to ensure that courses meet common goals.

B. A single required course on U.S. pluralism--the "stand alone" option. This option would ensure that all students are reached, is easier to assess, and is interdisciplinary; the model requires extensive faculty development.

C. A required course sequence or infused general education sequence--more than one course offered throughout the students' undergraduate years. This option allows courses to build off each other, and requires extensive faculty development.

3. Overlay--a variation of Model 2A above in which a required course with a U.S. pluralism focus can also fulfill other requirements. U.S. pluralism courses would be offered as both general education courses (i.e., first-year and upper division core courses) and elective courses.

4. Option within the core--a general education requirement (e.g., freshman course, sophomore course, or junior/senior course) that involves a choice between a U.S. pluralism course (Model 2A above) and some other course designated as central to Puget Sound's liberal arts mission. For example, students might choose a course from a set of courses on "U.S. pluralism and international relations" or "Pluralism, unity, and citizenship".

To: Faculty Senate
 From: The 1998-1999 Faculty Diversity Committee
 Date: April 23, 1999
 Re: Report on Senate Charge to Review the Recommendations to the President from the University Diversity Committee, May 1990

The Faculty Diversity Committee committed spring semester to taking up the Senate charge to review and assess the University Diversity Committee's 1990 recommendations to improve diversity among students, faculty, and administration, to increase diversity within the curriculum, to improve campus climate with relation to diversity, and to develop accountability and compliance procedures to monitor these improvements. The FDC responded by having several subcommittees investigate specific goals identified with the 1990 Recommendations, gather the material from, for the most part, administrative and department sources, and offer brief assessments of the information in each section. Attachments referred to in our report have been provided to the Faculty Senate Chair rather than appended to the electronic version of this document.

Each section of our report includes a specific assessment paragraph; rather than simply repeat the conclusions of our findings in this cover letter, we would like to briefly comment on the process of review and assessment itself. As a committee, we all felt that assessment was the most important part of the review—in fact that the review meant little without assessment. Yet it was also the most difficult part of our work, not only because we lacked enough time to thoroughly develop assessments, and because the raw information, drawn from so many different sources, offered no easy or self-evident conclusions. More problematically, it was difficult because the committee debated whether assessment itself potentially falls beyond the authority of the FDC (to the extent that recommendations might appear to border on advocacy). Some on the committee felt no more review of past activities was necessary, and rather, that the University needs to establish new goals more appropriate to a post-affirmative action era. Others felt that new goals could not be responsibly established before the reasons for the “failure” or “success” of past attempts to improve diversity were not just noted but more clearly understood in their political and institutional contexts. As a result of these discussions, we would like to make several suggestions for the necessary assessment of diversity at Puget Sound:

- 1) Designate an agent such as the existing Office of Institutional Research, or another new or existing body, which would operate on behalf of the entire University, to collect and maintain data on diversity. The information gathered by the Office could be used for assessment purposes, as well as serve as a clearing-house that consolidates, coordinates, and standardizes information for different administrative branches, department heads, and program chairs—and most importantly students and faculty. It was clear from our work that some administrators knew more about certain projects related to diversity than faculty or student representatives did on the committee, so in part we are suggesting a mechanism for broader dissemination of information, particularly during this period of curricular reform. But we are also assuming that faculty and students may well interpret that assembled information somewhat differently than staff and administrators, if only because different elements of the University community naturally have different perspectives, concerns, investments, goals, expertise, and so on.
- 2) Request that the President identify an independent ad-hoc committee/task force trained to critically assess the overall progress of diversity in institutions of higher learning. Since so much of the information on diversity is compartmentalized—generated by the Office of Admission or Human Resources or School of Education etc.—this body would be in a position not just to review but to evaluate all these efforts from a broader angle (currently most evaluation is in the form of self-assessment). Perhaps using our report as the beginning rather than end of inquiry, the committee can develop criteria for and recommend new goals based on a more formal and broader reconsideration of where we have been and where we want to go as an institution.

We thank for you the opportunity to study our progress in increasing diversity in all facets of the University from 1990 to the present. We hope that our report will be made easily accessible to faculty and students.

**Report by the 1998-99 Faculty Diversity Committee
on Recommendations to the President from the University Diversity Committee
May 1990**

I. Increased Diversity Among Students

Goal #1: *Set the following immediate, 5-year, and 10-year enrollment goals for African-American, Hispanic-American, Asian-American and Native-American students:*

<i>Actual</i>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>2000</u>
<i>African-American</i>	37	60	100	120
<i>Asian-American</i>	170	200	220	
<i>Native-American</i>	21	25	30	35
<i>Hispanic-American</i>	36	50	60	70
<i>Total</i>	238	305	390	445

As of 1999, the University has met or exceeded enrollment goals for the year 2000 for all but African American students.

<i>Year:</i>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	
<i>African American</i>		44	50	60	58
<i>Asian American</i>		311	313	341	311
<i>American Indian*</i>		42	49	36	40
<i>Hispanic-American</i>		85	84	90	89
<i>Total</i>		482	496	527	498

*identified as Native American in 1990 Report. The category now also includes Hawaiian and Alaska Native students.

(Source: Drawn from the University of Puget Sound IPEDS Fall Enrollment Report--previously HEGIS. Statistics include number of all students, including undergraduate and graduate students.)

Goal #2: *Allocate financial aid resources sufficient to meet the University's immediate, 5-year, and 10-year enrollment goals for students of color. Set fund-raising goals for scholarships for students of color within the general institutional goals for scholarship fund-raising. Solicit the support of one or more corporations or foundations to make no-interest loans of up to \$10,000 per year for Puget Sound students of color which loans would be forgiven at 20% per year of teaching at the high school or college level.*

Puget Sound has developed and implemented the Puget Sound Opportunity Grant Program. This program, intended to reduce unmet financial need for ethnic minority students, has been the primary source of financial aid for students of color, and in its first year (1991) awarded 37 special minority grants to students to reduce the amount of unmet need they faced. The program awarded an average of \$4,646 for the 1998-9 academic year. The average freshman minority student enrollment 1986-1990 (prior to these special programs) was 54; the average freshman minority enrollment 1991-1999 (with these programs) was 116.

The Will and Susanna Thomas Scholarship is a merit award of \$7,000, one for each of the four identified groups. This award is made each fall and is renewed for students who continue at Puget Sound in good academic standing.

The loan plan has not been implemented.

(Source: Confidential admissions data and charts on Puget Sound Fund Grants for Students of Color, 1991-1998.)

Goal #3: *Establish a long-term plan to expand the ongoing PUSH/EXCEL program by involving more students, faculty, staff, and local alumni.*

The program, developed by the Tacoma Public School District, was eliminated by the District in 1995 and has not been renewed. While PUSH/EXCEL was in existence, the Community Involvement and Action Center worked closely with the program in mentoring elementary and middle school children, and hosting programs at the University. Working with temporary funds from a donor, the Access to College Initiative (ATCI) was designed to replace PUSH/EXCEL. The Tacoma Schools have reduced their support for ATCI but remain minor partners in the program. Puget Sound institutionalized ATCI in 1997 by having existing offices assume responsibility for various components of the program and reallocating funding from the ATCI program and its full-time director to the Director of the Community Involvement and Action Center and the Office of Admission. The initial idea was that the PUSH/EXCEL program, followed by the ATCI, would enable Puget Sound students and staff to encourage students who did not plan to attend college. The goal of these programs was to identify students, and to raise their interest in attending college.

Goal #4: *Establish partnerships with high schools in Tacoma and Seattle with high enrollments of students of color and establish partnership with the Registry Program.*

The 24 Hours of College Program, funded and organized through the Office of Admission, is the result of this goal. Through “24 Hours,” high school counselors become advocates of the University when they recommend potential participants for the program. The assumption is that “24 Hours” participants become prime recruits since they have been to campus. Currently no information is available on how many “24 Hours” participants finally enroll at Puget Sound upon completion of high school.

Goal #5: *Establish a summer program for students of color.*

The Academic Challenge Program (ACP) developed from this goal, beginning in 1990. ACP is directly funded by Puget Sound, corporations and foundations, and the University also provides in-kind support. From 1995 to the present, the summer program has cost about \$1500 per students; enrollment varies between forty and sixty students. According to the program director, a total of 429 students have participated from 1990-1998; five Academic Challenge participants have later enrolled in the University, though at least two indicated that they wished to attend but did not because of financial reasons. They study topics in mathematics and science, visit locations (businesses, firms, etc.) where they experience the math or science being put to use. As a class or in small groups they produce final written and oral reports on the subject they learned or a question central to the study topic. Teachers involved include those from the University, from other colleges, from public schools, from the community. No extensive evaluation system on the program’s success is in place. (Source: David Scott, Professor of Mathematics, Director of Academic Challenge)

Goal #6: *Develop a sister-city-like relationship with African-American university that is comparable to Puget Sound in size and focus, perhaps one that was founded by the Methodist church, that would include the opportunity for students to transfer from one institution to the other on a temporary basis (one term or one academic year, for example).*

No relationship has been developed.

Goal #7: *Set the following enrollment goals for students of color in the MAT program in the School of Education and set fund-raising goals and establish scholarships for students of color enrolled in the program:*

	<u>1991</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>2000</u>
African-American	2	3	3
Asian-American	2	4	4
Native-American	0	2	2
Hispanic-American	2	3	3
Total	6	12	12

The Master of Arts in Teaching Program in the School of Education has exceeded its recruitment goals for African American students but not for students in other ethnic categories. Some fluctuation in enrollment, however, is not reflected in the chart below—for example, in 1996, the MAT program had nine Asian/Pacific Islander students enrolled, down to three the following year.

The MAT program has taken additional steps to recruit and retain all students, some of which have aided students of color even when, as in the case of financial aid assistance and arrangements, these initiatives are not directly targeting minority students. Other activities, including an internal student monitoring procedure in which the faculty alert the dean to students encountering difficulties, are particularly helpful in responding to minority student needs. More specifically geared towards issues of student diversity, the MAT program curriculum has also expanded to include literature by authors of color dealing directly with racial and ethnic experience. Further, in 1995, the School of Education developed a Compliance Plan for Faculty and Student Diversity, subject to annual review. Goals for recruitment and retention of students of color, in particular, included 1) considering special qualities of each candidate, 2) maintaining familiarity with the information distributed by ETS regarding minority performance on GRE when considering applicants of color, 3) making an effort to recruit from high-minority pools such as military populations and other non-traditional groups, and 4) reviewing the process with Office of Admission each year in an effort to explain why any minority candidates chose not to enroll after being admitted.

Year:	1991	1995	1998
African American	0	1	5
Asian American	1	1	1
Native American	0	1	1 (now also Pacific Islander)
Hispanic American	1	2	0
Total	2	5	7

(Source: Carol Mertz, Dean of School of Education)

Assessment (Section I):

The University has met or exceeded enrollment goals for students of color with the exception of African American students. The Tacoma Public School system eliminated the PUSH/EXCEL program, and the University did not pursue a sister-institution alliance. Because PUSH/EXCEL and a relationship with a historically black college both represent connections with community, one assessment might be that the University must continue strengthening similar or other connections with local and national communities of color, particularly African American populations. Such institutional links should not be underestimated since they identify and create both a pool of applicants for recruitment and a viable context for retention. ATCI and Academic Challenge, though very successful in other ways, nevertheless apparently do not significantly impact recruitment. Currently, no formal system of feedback and evaluation, either as a procedure within AC or ATCI, or as dialogue between the program and the Office of Admissions, apparently exists so there is little way to assess just why these programs do not generate more students of color

interested in Puget Sound. Such a formal dialogue, perhaps modeled after the one proposed by the School of Education and Admissions, might explain more fully how AC and ATCI—or for that matter, any single program—could be more successful in this regard, and might also identify strategies for a program to respond to the many other variables involved in recruiting and retaining students of color.

On the other hand, identifiable success in recruitment of students of color from 1990 to 1998 seems tied to money: judging from the available data, the Puget Sound Opportunity Grant program, and the Will and Susanna Thomas Scholarship have directly increased the number of students of color who attend Puget Sound. A reasonable assessment, then, is that such grant programs and scholarships continue and that the University pursue the 1990 Report's suggestion to implement a corporate no-interest loan program.

II. Increased diversity among faculty, staff, administration, and on the Board of Trustees, and the Board of Visitors

Goal #1: Increase the number of people of color and women on the career faculty; in executive, managerial, and professional positions; and on the Board of Trustees and Board of Visitors.

Fail 1998	Faculty	Exec/Mngr	Professional	Trustee	Visitor
-----------	---------	-----------	--------------	---------	---------

African American	2	1	1	2	1
Asian American	7	3	2	1	0
Hispanic American	2	0	0	2	0
Native American	0	0	0	0	0

- Just under 5% (4.8%) of the full-time faculty identify themselves as people of color. There are no Native Americans on the full-time faculty. In 1990-91* 8.4% of faculty were people of color.
- More than 6% (6.3%) of executives and managers are people of color. There are no Native American managers and no Hispanic American managers. In 1990-91, 6.1% of managers were people of color.*
- More than 5% (5.3%) of the professional staff are people of color. There are no Native American professionals and no Hispanic professionals. In 1990-91, 5.3% of the professional staff were people of color.*
- Five (15%) of 35 members of the Board of Trustees are people of color; in 1990 one (3%) of the trustees was African American.
- One (6%) of 17 members of the Business Board of Visitors is African American; in 1990 three (11%) were African American.

Fall 1998	Faculty	Exec/Mngr	Professional	Trustee	Visitor
Women	85	30	33	10	4
Men	144	34	24	25	13

- Thirty-seven percent (37%) of the faculty are women; the proportion of women faculty members has increased from 31% ten years ago. There are no African American women on the full-time faculty.
- Forty-seven percent (47%) of the executives/managers are women, the same percentage as 1990-91.* There are no African American women managers.
- Fifty-eight percent (58%) of the professional staff are women; the percentage was 61 in 1990-91.* There is one African American male professional.
- Ten (29%) of 35 members of the Board of Trustees are women; in 1990 five (13%) of 38 trustees were women.
- Four (24%), including the chair, of 17 members of the Business Board of Visitors are women; in 1990 three (11%) of 27 visitors were women.

*The 1990-91 percentages include faculty and staff at the School of Law.

The September 13, 1993 Report of the Ad-Hoc Committee for the Survey of the Faculty addressed diversity by saying, "A considerable majority of the faculty feel that the university is doing too little to employ a diverse faculty, too little to employ a diverse administration, and too little to attract a diverse student body. The faculty senate should consider how to make substantive changes to promote diversity."

See Attachment #1 for information about the composition by race ethnicity and gender of all full-time faculty and all regular staff.

Goal #2: *Develop a directive and reporting mechanism to insure that faculty and staff members attending professional meetings and conferences are charged with the responsibility to introduce themselves and the University of Puget Sound to emerging scholars and administrators who are women and people of color; to identify scholarship that will support the University's curricular commitment to diversity; and to collect the names and addresses of women and people of color for the department's networking files; train faculty and staff to use the tool.*

Language encouraging professional contact with prospective faculty is included in the Faculty Recruitment Guidelines.

Goal #3: *Develop a proposal to hire people of color who have completed all Ph.D. requirements but their dissertations (ABDs) and outline a follow-up program of faculty development that permits the completion of the doctoral degree.*

In October of 1993 the Diversity Committee submitted a proposal to the Budget Task Force that \$10,000 be allocated as funds for the Dean of the University to enhance offers of employment made to prospective faculty members of color, \$6,000 to cover "release time" for one class per semester to support the new faculty member to finish a Ph.D. dissertation or to pursue post-doctoral research and \$4,000 as a faculty research incentive to be used at the Dean's and the new faculty member's discretion for research, travel, and other scholarly activities. The request was approved and the funds incorporated in the 1994-95 fiscal year budget for the Academic Vice President.

Two years ago the university hired three ongoing faculty who were people of color without needing to dip into the fund. Last year, departments found no candidates eager for interviews who met the expectations for use of this fund. One person, invited with high hopes, withdrew for personal family reasons. The African American Studies search identified desirable African American candidates, but those most attractive to the committee withdrew upon being invited to campus and the search was canceled. This year one person has been hired who might be identified as eligible and another who certainly is. Neither needed special support in addition to what the Dean can manage with other funds. There were also three interview-level candidates identified who were African American. One withdrew; one proved unhirable; one was offered a position and ultimately declined. The Dean offered a portion of the special fund to support a special purpose for this third candidate; it did not seem to make much difference. None of the candidates this year, and none from previous years were ABD and likely to be influenced by released time dissertation support. In short, the University has hired five faculty who may meet diversity expectations during the last three years. None have been hired using special funds.

Goal #4: *Develop a comprehensive orientation program for new faculty and staff members, introducing them and their families to the University and to the Tacoma/Pierce County community, focusing specifically on the new faculty member's unique needs and interests.*

New faculty members participate in a number of events designed to acquaint them with the University community and orient them to faculty life at the University. Tenure line faculty attend a full-day orientation program carefully designed to introduce them to the expectations and supporting structures at the University. Visiting faculty are invited to a luncheon designed to welcome them and to orient them to University policies. All new faculty are invited to a writing across the curriculum workshop, to open houses at such places as the Center for Writing and Learning, the Faculty Club, Library, etc. In addition, many departments hold beginning-of-school-social events to welcome new faculty and their families. Finally, all faculty are invited to the annual Fall Faculty Dinner. At that time new faculty are introduced to the community.

These orientation activities are planned and implemented by the Academic Vice President's Office, the Associate Academic Vice President's Office, or by specific departments.

New staff members participate in a half-day orientation program designed to acquaint them with the University community and orient them to staff life at the University. Hiring departments are provided with a checklist to use as a guide in developing their own orientation programs for new members of the staff. These orientation activities are planned and implemented by Human Resources and University Relations. Staff members complete evaluation forms at the end of each orientation program and adjustments to the program are made based on a review of the evaluations.

Goal #5: *Convene a task force of department chairs to identify ways in which the number of people of color and women on the faculty can be increased and ways in which faculty can enhance diversity.*

This goal has been implemented in a variety of ways, including the following:

- The Academic Vice President meets annually with faculty who are chairing search committees.

- The Chair of the Faculty Senate Diversity Committee organized and sponsored a day-long faculty development workshop in May of 1993 entitled "Casting a Wide Net: A Workshop in Building Cultural Diversity on Campus." Consultants for the workshop were Dr. Barbara Leigh Smith (Academic Dean, The Evergreen State College; Director, The Washington Center; and author of "Hiring Minority Faculty) and Dr. Johnella Butler (Chair, American Ethnic Studies Department, University of Washington and author of *Transforming the Curriculum: Ethnic Studies and Women's Studies*). The focus of the morning was faculty recruitment and retention.
- In response to recommendations from the Faculty Senate Diversity Committee, what was an annual memorandum from the Academic Vice President has been expanded into faculty recruitment guidelines. The guidelines were developed in a collaborative effort on the part of the Faculty Senate Diversity Committee, the Academic Vice President's Office, and Human Resources. The guidelines include a number of references to ways in which faculty can enhance diversity and the University's commitment to a multicultural community.
- On September 10, 1996, the Academic Vice President led a one-hour workshop for academic department chairs on faculty hiring with a special emphasis on recruiting and hiring a diverse faculty. Others involved were the Associate Academic Dean, the Director of Human Resources and Affirmative Action and two academic department heads. Faculty Recruitment Guidelines (covering diversity as well as other search-related considerations and procedures) a search checklist, and sample diversity-related questions were distributed to the department heads for their comments and use. Results of the 1995/96 faculty searches were reviewed. The Dean of the School of Education and the Chair of the Politics and Government Department presented information about searches they have conducted, identified techniques they have found valuable, and raised questions for the group to consider regarding the use of affirmative action principles.
- In November of 1993 the Academic Vice President sponsored a meeting of chairs, deans, and directors at which the Faculty Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee Chair and the Director of Human Resources and Affirmative Action made presentations regarding faculty diversification.
- During the 1993/94 academic year the Chair of the Diversity Committee and the Chair of the Faculty Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee developed a questionnaire for faculty members who chaired search committees that were hiring for 1994/95 to help assess faculty practices with respect to recruitment and selection and to amend them as needed in order to meet the objective of diversifying the career faculty at Puget Sound. The way in which the University tracks the movement of applicants of color and women through the search process (see Attachment #2) was developed as a result of this exercise.

Goal #6: *Develop a sister city-like relationship with an African-American university that is comparable to Puget Sound in size and focus, perhaps one that was founded by the Methodist church (see parallel goal under Increased Diversity Among Students) that would include the opportunity for faculty and staff members to transfer from one institution to the other on a temporary basis (one term or one academic year, for example).*

This goal has not been addressed by the University. In April of 1993 the chair of the subcommittee on faculty diversity and development summarized the subcommittee's spring semester deliberations and wrote in part, "Given the precarious financial predicament of most of the nation's historically black colleges, compared to realities of internal funding at U.P.S., the subcommittee questioned the readiness of this university to enter into such an arrangement. It was felt that it would be irresponsible to pursue such a relationship with any of these financially-stressed institutions at this time."

Goal #7: *Include diversity as a criterion in the selection of University speakers, performers, and honorees.*

As the information in section IV of this report indicates, a rich variety of speakers and performers has been brought to campus, largely through the work of ASUPS and the Division of Student Affairs. In addition, speakers and performers have been invited and sponsored through academic departments.

Unfortunately, a complete record of these presenters is not available. Of the eight commencement speakers presenting between 1990 and 1998, two were African-American men, one was a Hispanic-American male, and one was a woman. Of 33 honorary degrees awarded between 1990 and 1998, 4 were awarded to African-American men, nine to women, and one each to a Hispanic-American man, an Asian woman, and a Middle-Eastern woman.

Goal #8: *Establish an endowed visiting scholars program to bring to the University individuals whose teaching, scholarship and/or life experience will support the University's curricular goal of developing an informed appreciation of self and others as part of a broader humanity in the world environment.*

This goal has not been addressed by the University. In April of 1993 the chair of the subcommittee on faculty diversity and development summarized the subcommittee's spring semester deliberations and wrote in part, "With a budget of \$55,000, the subcommittee felt that this would be an unrealistic goal at the present time given the University's internal funding capabilities. However, the subcommittee believes that it is a worthwhile goal and should be placed in a 'futures' category dependent upon access to external funds by the Office of Development."

Goal #9: *Investigate the possibility of Puget Sound's being a host institution for a Kellogg or ACE fellow in higher education administration.*

This goal has not been addressed by the University. In April of 1993 the chair of the subcommittee on faculty diversity and development summarized the subcommittee's spring semester deliberations and wrote in part, "The subcommittee supports investigation of this possibility with the ACE, but, after examination of Kellogg Foundation's financial and professional responsibilities for host institutions, believes that it would be unreasonable to commit the University to such a relationship with Kellogg at this time. The subcommittee encourages the Diversity Committee to initiate application for an ACE fellowship through the Associate Dean's Office."

Goal #10: *Implement a program of hiring two to three years in advance of a known retirement or addition to complement resulting from increasing student enrollment in the department so that the University could make an offer of employment to an available candidate of color.*

This goal has not been addressed by the University. The goal is inconsistent with the University's commitment to maintaining flexibility in the placement of tenure line positions and its commitment to casting a wide net to identify the best possible candidate for the available tenure line position.

Goal #11: *Encourage faculty members to apply for external funding for ABD and/or postdoctoral research fellowships to bring people of color to campus*

See Attachment #3 for a summary of the many University Enrichment Committee faculty research grants which have been awarded since 1990. It should be noted also that the Academic Vice President has made contact with some external institutions, offering to establish minority teaching fellowships here at Puget Sound. To date there has been very little response to this overture.

Goal #12: *Revise documents used in the faculty, staff, and student evaluation process to include or to emphasize diversity as one of the evaluation criteria*

No direct assessment of a faculty member's involvement with diversity is a part of the university's evaluation criteria for tenure or promotion. Faculty are, however, encouraged through the categories of University service and community service to become involved in activities which could have an impact on campus diversity. In addition, the inclusion of the following language (implemented 1993/94) as part of departmental self-study documents in five-year curriculum reviews of each department affords the opportunity for faculty members to demonstrate the ways their coursework meets university goals regarding diversity: "In what ways does the curriculum in your department, school, or program reflect the diversity of our society?"

The Performance Appraisal Form for managers includes a provision to evaluate performance as exceptional, more than satisfactory, satisfactory, less than satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in response to the following:

Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action: The degree to which the staff member expends effort and cooperation with the letter and spirit of the University's affirmative action/equal opportunity policies.

The Performance Appraisal Form for staff who do not have supervisory responsibilities includes provisions to evaluate performance as exceptional, more than satisfactory, satisfactory, less than satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in response to the following:

Service to Constituent Groups: Ability to establish and maintain effective relationships with faculty, staff members, students, customers, applicants for employment or admission, alumni, etc., including the degree to which the staff member complies with the letter and the spirit of the University's affirmative action/equal opportunity policies by interacting inclusively with constituents.

Cooperation: Ability to work harmoniously with others in the work unit toward the accomplishment of common objectives, including the degree to which the staff member complies with the letter and the spirit of the University's affirmative action/equal opportunity policies by interacting inclusively with colleagues.

Goal #13: *Develop and implement a proposal to provide release time for faculty members who are working on diversity-related projects*

No special avenue has been established for faculty application for release time to work on diversity-related projects other than the normal channel of application to the enrichment committee. It might be noted that faculty hiring has added to the faculty a number of people well trained to deal with diversity issues.

Goal #14: *Develop additional programs and opportunities for the interaction of faculty and students in research and other scholarly activities, enabling faculty to serve as mentors to students of color with the objective of encouraging students of color to consider graduate study and careers in college teaching.*

A special program of faculty mentors for students of color has not been established; however, the expansion of research opportunities for students (with faculty mentors) has been substantial in this decade. There are now grants available not only in the sciences, but also in the humanities, arts, and social sciences.

In April of 1993 the chair of the subcommittee on faculty diversity and development summarized the subcommittee's spring semester deliberations and wrote in part, "The subcommittee agreed to merge this goal with the current DOS proposal for a Mentor Program. It was felt that this proposal should be reevaluated regarding its viability as a social as well as education support program. With respect to encouraging students of color into UPS Graduate Schools in Education, Occupational and Physical Therapy, the subcommittee recommends that dialogue be promoted in the upcoming meeting on May 6, 1993, of the Committee of Chairs, Deans and Directors regarding identification and recruitment of undergraduate students of color into the University's graduate schools."

Assessment (Section II):

The University has engaged in a variety of information dissemination activities during the 1990's to raise consciousness about why recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty and staff is important to the success of Puget Sound and how a diverse faculty and staff might be achieved. However, the only area of employment targeted by the 1990 report in which the University has experienced forward movement is in the percentage of women faculty. In all other employment areas the University is in the same or a worse position than it was ten years ago.

The time has come for the University to rethink its strategies in this area and move to a new level of activity which results in structural changes in contrast with the information dissemination of the past decade. The fact that faculty are hired to teach and develop the curriculum means that the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty is inextricably tied to the curriculum and the deployment of faculty resources.

III. Increased Diversity in the Curriculum

Goal #1: *Develop a set of criteria regarding issues of diversity that will underlie the continuing evaluation of the curriculum.*

As yet, the campus community has not agreed to a firm definition of the issues surrounding diversity. Unresolved are issues such as: Should multiculturalism be considered a domestic or a global issue? Should religion be as important as race or ethnicity? Lack of agreement about these issues makes developing a set of criteria extremely challenging.

However, in 1993/94, the Curriculum Subcommittee of the Faculty Diversity Committee (FDC) recommended to the Faculty Senate that a new field be added to the course description published in the time schedule (much in the same way as the current core indications) which would indicate that, in the department's opinion, the course contained a significant component on diversity. This recommendation recognized the difficulty of developing a single set of criteria which would apply across all disciplines and identified the departments themselves as the responsible evaluators of diversity. Beginning in 1993/94, the following language was included as part of departmental self-study documents in five-year curriculum reviews of each department: "In what ways does the curriculum in your department, school, or program reflect the diversity of our society?"

In 1996/97 the FDC forwarded a resolution to the faculty calling for the inclusion of a component on pluralism in the United States in the core curriculum. Building on this commitment, in 1997/98, the FDC reviewed national research and models of curricular programs at other colleges and universities and outlined recommendations which were reported to the faculty in a document entitled, "U.S. Pluralism in College and University Curricula (Summary and Update): A Report of the Faculty Diversity Committee." This effort tried to further define the notion of multiculturalism (in domestic study).

Goal #2: *Encourage members of the faculty to submit proposals to teach courses which clearly focus on a racial/ethnic group (e.g., Asian-American History, African-American Literature) with the understanding that these courses would give faculty members and students an opportunity to study the subjects in an in-depth way and with the further understanding that the subjects would not be excluded from the related survey courses in the discipline.*

Students are able to earn academic minors in programs which coherently group courses containing "diversity/pluralistic" content in their curricula: Asian Studies; Women Studies; African American Studies (1996/97); Latin American Studies (1996/97). The study abroad program also insures that students will be exposed to diversity in a more global sense by experiencing cultures outside the United States. The existence of these programs in no way implies that these topics should be excluded from courses not a part of the programs.

Proposals have been placed before the faculty proposing a new component to the core curriculum. An example of this is the 1996 "Multicultural America: a Core Curriculum Proposal" sponsored by Michele Birnbaum, Leon Grunberg, George Guilmet, Martyn Kingston, Sunil Kukreja, Johanna Schoss, Kate Stirling and Carolyn Weisz. Jim Evans currently has forwarded a proposal to the Faculty that specifically discusses a multicultural component in a revised core.

Finally, individual faculty are welcome to submit new courses at any time to the curriculum committee. Recruitment of new faculty with diverse interests and backgrounds may add to the diversity included in the curriculum.

Goal #3: *Conduct and publish a survey of the faculty to identify which courses currently in the University curriculum are designed and taught in such a way that substantial elements of the course (a significant percent of time or specific readings) are devoted to diversity*

In the fall of 1992, the Academic Dean's Office compiled a list of 53 courses with significant diversity content. This list was developed based on the definition of diversity outlined in the FDC's May 1990 "Recommendation to the President." It included racial, religious, ethnic, socio-economic and cultural groups. It did not include gender, sexual preference, national origin or physical disability as criteria.

In November 1993, at the request of the Faculty Diversity Committee, the Associate Dean's Office produced an expanded list of 209 courses which contained diversity or pluralistic content. The scope of the definition of diversity was expanded to include pluralism, a strong suggestion from the major presenter in an FDC-sponsored curriculum workshop in Spring 1993. In addition, by this year Faculty By-Laws for the FDC included the following definition of diversity: "'Diversity' shall include areas such as race/ethnicity, gender, national origin, religion, socio-economic class, sexual orientation, and physical ability." This list was organized and distributed to faculty departments. The goal was to have faculty review the list, add and delete courses, and provide more information on the courses and instructors. This information would then be organized into a brochure for students who wished to pursue multiculturalism in their studies. Only eight of thirty departments responded.

The difficulty in making any list of diversity/pluralism courses lies in what constitutes "significant" diversity in a course and who determines whether or not it fits in a list. Moreover, the same course, taught by a different instructor, may vary enough in content such that one would qualify and one would not, rendering any such list useful only for the term developed. Finally, the definition of diversity has not been determined across campus.

In 1996, Occupational Therapy added sixteen hours of programming specifically about race, ethnicity, class and sexual orientation as part of its required first semester course. This followed three years of conducting a mandatory cultural awareness workshop for all entering OT graduate and undergraduate students, similar to National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI) training.

Goal #4: *Increase cultural diversity in the University's creative endeavors--the visual and performing arts and literature*

The cultural diversity in creative endeavors at Puget Sound has not been tracked, nor is it currently being studied. It seems that there is interest and an effort to provide students with a diverse cultural experience. Examples of campus events focused cultural diversity in creative expression appear within Attachment #4. Some specific examples of this are:

Arts Venture, which takes students off campus to see various performances, including Alvin Ailey Dance Troupe;

1999 Concert of Women Composers (Music Dept.);

1999 African Sanctus (a combination of a Latin Mass with traditional African music);

Spring Awakening by Frank Wedekind (CTA);

Bienvenido Navidad (Music's Christmas Concert);

Giving up the Ghost by Cherrie Moraga (CTA presents);

My Sister in this House by Wendy Kesselman (CTA presents).

Students are also choosing to showcase diversity in their choice of plays which they select for one act presentation.

Goal #5: *Hold a faculty colloquium on curricular diversity*

In Spring 1993, the Faculty Diversity Committee sponsored a curriculum workshop entitled "Casting a Wide Net: a Workshop on Building Cultural Diversity on Campus". Issues which were to be raised included discussion of the national or international focus of diversity, current departmental efforts, the relevance of diversity across disciplines and techniques for increasing diversity in the curriculum of a dept.

In addition, on November 20, 1998, the Faculty Diversity Committee sponsored a round table discussion inviting faculty to discuss "Diversity in the Curriculum: History and Prospects at Puget Sound."

Goal #6: *Encourage faculty to submit professional development proposals with diversity as a proposal component and include diversity as a criterion in the allocation of University resources for faculty professional development*

We are unable to show any progress made in this area. The Development Office is only beginning to track proposals by such criteria.

□□□□□□□□

Assessment (Section III):

Over the past decade significant progress has been made on incorporating diversity into the curriculum at the university. Consideration of diversity is a part of regular departmental curriculum review procedures, and new courses and programs have been developed largely through faculty initiatives. Where appropriate, individual faculty have taken advantage of opportunities provided by outside speakers and performing artists to discuss relevant issues in their classes. Our curriculum clearly affords more opportunities for students to study topics and issues related to diversity than it did before the 1990 report.

This progress, however, has been less than optimal because it is largely fragmented and dependent on the voluntary efforts of individual faculty. Incorporating U.S. pluralism into the university's general education or Core requirements would publicly affirm the university's commitment to include diversity into our curriculum.

IV. Improved Campus Climate

Goal #1: *The Dean of the University, the Dean of Students, ASUPS officers and appropriate committees, faculty officers and committees will work together with the University Personnel Director to develop and implement a comprehensive ongoing program to improve campus awareness of, and sensitivity and commitment to issues of diversity.*

This initiative may employ established lectureships, concerts, cultural events, and staff or faculty development programs, but it should also sponsor some "extraordinary" programs on at least an annual basis. These events will address specific problems such as the presence of racism in the classroom, the advising session, the residence hall, or the job interview, as a means of bringing added emphasis to an ongoing comprehensive program.

Since 1990, most of the initiative for diversity-related co-curricular programming has come from the Division of Student Affairs, ASUPS, and student groups. Following the 1990 report, the funds provided to the Division of Student Affairs for diversity programming were increased from \$10,000 to \$20,000. Due to across-the-board budget increases since that time, this amount is now \$26,810 for 1998/99. Although there is not a central committee focusing on issues of diversity as proposed in the 1990 report, available reports on programming suggest that diversity-related programming has been a priority across the University. Programs reflecting the University's "commitment to issues of diversity" are summarized below.

•**Diversity Theme Year Program.** Each year since 1991/92, the cultures and experiences of selected groups are highlighted around a specific theme during the academic year. Cultural events, classroom speakers, lectures and open fora are focused around the theme for the year. The goal of the theme year is that all issues of diversity--such as religion, gender, race, age, disability--be explored through the lens of the particular theme for the year. The diversity theme year program (formerly called ethnic theme year) began with the "Year of the Native American" in 1992/93, the "Year of the Latino/Latina" in 1993/94, the "Year of the African American" in 1994/95, the "Year of the Asian and Pacific Islander" in 1995/96. After this four year cycle, the program continued

with a year focusing on gender and sexuality in 1996/97, a year focusing on cultures of Americas in 1997/98, and the current "Year of the African American." The theme year planning committee consists of students, staff, faculty, and community representatives. Faculty are involved through this program by serving on the planning committee, hosting guest speakers/performers in their classrooms, and leading *ad hoc* discussion groups about books authored by forthcoming speakers (e.g., Cornel West).

•Diversity-Related Programming. ASUPS provides ongoing funding and support for campus diversity groups such as BSU, APAC, CHisPA, Understanding Sexuality, and others. ASUPS also provides funding for diversity conferences and initiatives, and supports a student diversity committee which hosts diversity forums, among other activities. ASUPS Lectures, Cultural Events, and Showcase all offer a variety of programming designed to educate students about diversity issues. Diversity programming also occurs in the residence halls each semester. For a summary of some diversity-related programs and attendance for 1989-1998, see Attachment #4.

•Student Diversity Center. In response to student request and discussion by the FDC, in 1995, a two-year pilot project was begun with the inauguration of a Student Diversity Center. Temporarily housed in some older campus buildings, the Center included all the major campus clubs and organizations of groups historically under-represented at the University. The Center was designed to be open to all students and to promote collaboration and communication among students. The Center was subsequently reviewed by a committee of faculty, students and staff and was moved to a permanent location in a small residential house. A reorganization of the Division of Student Affairs has led to the assigning of a staff member as advisor to the Center.

•NCBI (National Coalition Building Institute). The University became an affiliate of NCBI in 1993 in order to provide workshops and events for faculty, staff, and students on understanding differences and reducing prejudice. Sixty-four people--faculty, students and staff--were trained to become campus leaders in teaching the tools of prejudice reduction and how to effectively handle divisive issues and incidents. The NCBI team has continued to meet regularly since 1993, and additional students, staff, and faculty have been trained to lead workshops by attending National and Regional NCBI train-the-trainer events.

The NCBI team has provided campus diversity training on a recurring basis to faculty, staff, and students. Prejudice reduction and skill-building workshops have been provided to orientation leaders, resident assistants, work-study students, sororities, physical plant and library staffs, residence halls, and classes by faculty request. In 1997, the first-year orientation program also included an NCBI component. An evaluation of the NCBI program, completed in 1998, suggests that from 1993-1997 the program was largely well-received, cost-effective (about \$6.00 per participant), and successful in raising awareness about diversity. Participant evaluations of NCBI workshops indicate that 85% of participants report that they anticipated using the lessons of the workshop in various ways and 77% agree/strongly agree that the workshops are a valuable experience.

The team continues to meet and conduct workshops, however the program currently faces two challenges. First, at present, there are no active student members of the NCBI team because nearly all of the students trained have graduated. Second, coordinating the program is very time-intensive and since Spring 1998 there has been no volunteer who could lead the team of members.

•Events for Staff and Faculty. Diversity-related courses have been offered each year during the January training conference for faculty and staff. The dates and number of persons who attended appear in Attachment #5. Additionally, Yvonne Tate facilitated three day-long sessions entitled "Managing Diversity" between November of 1991 and July of 1992. The sessions were targeted to academic and administrative department chairs/heads. In all, fifty-five (55) faculty and staff participated in the diversity programs.

•Mentoring Program and Minority Student Advisor. These programs, administered by the Assistant Dean of Students, were created in order to provide supportive mentoring and advising to students of color and their clubs and organizations. Students of color are given an opportunity to request a mentor through the ABC Coalition. The mentoring program began in 1991/92.

•Student Leadership Clinic. The Dean of Students has led a student leadership clinic since 1994/95 to provide additional support to students who lead campus diversity groups. Leaders of BSU, APAC, CHisPA, Understanding Sexuality, Women's Voices, and the Jewish Student Organization along with leaders of other groups have met with the Dean several times a semester in order to work on common goals, share ideas for better meeting needs of members, and learn more about each other's activities and issues.

•Staff and Faculty Workshops on Retention of Students of Color. The Dean of Students initiated and led, with assistance from Associate Academic Dean Kris Bartanen and Professor John English an all-day workshop for faculty and staff on retention of students of color in June 1995. The President and Academic Dean introduced the workshop which was well received. A second workshop was held in Fall 1996 on retention of students of color, led collaboratively by academic and student affairs staff members. Evaluations of it were also favorable. Through case studies, attendees addressed racism in the classroom, the advising session, and the residence hall.

•Participation in National Conferences. The University sponsored the attendance of three students and one faculty member at the annual Race and Ethnicity conference in June 1996, to gather ideas for use at Puget Sound. The University also sponsored several students to attend the same conference in June 1995.

•International Club. The purpose of the International Club is to promote a better understanding of the various cultures throughout the world through social, educational, and cultural activities. The club is a homebase for international students at Puget Sound, and a place for other students to meet with and learn from the international students. The club, begun in 1997, boasts 40 members, about half consisting of international students and half consisting of American citizens. The club meets twice a month for culture sharing and sponsors activities twice a month on and off campus to celebrate and share students' cultures.

•Sexual Harassment Advisory Committee. Reports of sexual harassment educational programming from 1995-1998 are available. See Attachment #6.

•Responses to Campus Conflict over Differences. The Division of Student Affairs often takes the lead in formulating campus response to issues of discrimination. Standard operating procedures for generalized expressions of prejudice (not targeted at specific individuals) are to:

- write a letter to the student newspaper denouncing the discriminatory conduct;
- send an e-mail to the entire campus giving the details of the incident;
- send letters to student groups affected by the misconduct;
- convene open fora on issues to promote campus dialogue;
- identify action-steps.

Harassment aimed at an individual by a student is investigated and adjudicated under the *Student Integrity Code*.

•New Department of Diversity and Community. In response to a perceived need for greater unity in the Division of Student Affairs (DSA) programs on diversity awareness and a need for greater visibility for these programs, and in response to recommendations from a consultant, the DSA created a new department headed by the Chaplain. The department will have responsibility for coordinating multi-cultural programs, meeting the needs of our diverse student body, and coordinating efforts to educate the campus about diversity issues.

Goal #2: *Establish an annual community-relations event to be held during Black History Month*

The observance of Dr. Martin Luther King's Birthday has been a tradition since well before it was established as a national holiday in 1986. Prior to the current series of distinguished speakers and celebrations in Kilworth Chapel, the Black Student Union presented concerts by local performers and entertainers. In 1988, the BSU observed the newly proclaimed holiday with a celebration dance. Since 1989, the University has presented an annual event featuring presentations by students and

administrators, music by choirs from the Bethlehem Baptist Church, and highlighted with guest speakers. This annual event is directed toward the larger community as well as the campus community.

Goal #3: *Continue to insure that diversity is a focus of the Prelude and Passages freshman orientation program by including multicultural appreciation and awareness emphases through readings, discussions, and activities and by actively recruiting students of color to fill student staff positions.*

•Prelude. The Prelude Committee has thought a great deal about diversity over the years and, as a result, has chosen several readings for the anthology by women and people of color. The focus of Prelude is on methodology and not on content *per se*, with readings chosen for the challenge they pose to students working with them in practicing strategies for engaging college-level material. Nevertheless the current anthology presents much greater diversity, both in theme and among authors, than was available in the 1990 Anthology. For example, the single short story by Hemingway has been traded for two stories, both by women and with one dealing with race and class. Initially a piece by Richard Wright was paired with a selection by Eudora Welty, but the Wright piece is now paired with a selection from Cornel West's Race Matters. Originally the Prelude Anthology had two poems by white men; there are now two poems, both by African-American women.

A snapshot of the current Anthology presents a diverse group of writers: Richard Wright, Cornel West, Rita Dove, Audre Lorde - - all African Americans; Nadine Gordimer, Frima Fox Hofrichter, Ursula LeGuin - - women authors. Several of the pieces deal with issues surrounding diversity: "The Train from Rhodesia" (Gordimer) deals with race and class; "The Japanese Quince" (Galsworthy) deals with class issues in Britain; "She Unnames Them" (LeGuin) deals with questions of gender; "Coal" (Lorde) deals with race; both the West and Wright selections deal with race relations in the U.S., the social science readings (which change from year to year) have dealt fairly consistently with race, class, gender, and attendant social issues.

•Passages. Respect for cultural heritage and differences was incorporated into passages from the beginning in 1985. The indigenous cultures of the Northwest were the primary focus of cultural diversity, including later addition of day trips to the Suquamish Tribal Museum near Bainbridge Island and the Makah Tribal Museum at Neah Bay. Native American leaders Roy Wilson, Dayton Edmonds, and Al Zantua were invited to speak at Passages campfire programs and to offer workshops to new students on Native American storytelling and legends. In addition, in 1997, workshops were offered on Hawaiian dance and Cuban dance.

Goal # 4: *Continue to include appreciation of and commitment to diversity as a job requirement for resident hall staff, advising associates, and orientation counselors, and train these student staff members in issues of diversity and in mediation.*

•Orientation Leaders. The percentage of orientation leaders who are ethnic or sexual minorities over the past ten years is approximately 5%. From 1994 to 1997, orientation leaders for Passages and Perspectives participated in NCBI workshops as part of their training. Prior to '94, leaders participated in a variety of programs that touched on diversity such as BaFa BaFa.

•Student Residential Staff. Diversity training has regularly been included as part of fall training and/or InService sessions.

•Peer Advisors. Because Peer Advisor (PA) training is primarily an intensive five-day introduction to academic policy, curriculum, resources, and advising, there is not much room available for "soft skills" instruction, though Academic and Career Advising (ACA) does spend some time on communication skills and cultural awareness. In addressing cultural awareness, ACA staff use the Bafa-Bafa exercise, which is designed to sensitize PA's to how cultural assumptions can complicate the communication process. In addressing communication skills, they spend some time talking about "Working with Special Populations," with the intention of improving PA skills in dialogue with fellow students with differing backgrounds. Finally, they spend some time discussing disabilities, ADA and Puget Sound policy, with the intention of preparing PA's to work with that special population. In sum, though there is relatively little explicit diversity training included in our program, diversity issues are touched on in a few of their training components.

Assessment (Section IV):

Evidence suggests that extensive programming reflecting cultural diversity is occurring. Support for such diversity-related programming through the theme year and ASUPS should continue.

Since volunteers can not be found to maintain and lead the NCBI program, staff in the Division of Student Affairs, in conversation with the faculty and senior administration, need to determine the interest in providing diversity awareness programs for student staff, entering freshmen and continuing students. Students should be active in implementing any program to be developed.

A major survey of the campus climate was administered in the fall of 1995 and the results were analyzed by the Residential Life Task Force and presented to the campus community in an open forum and in printed form and on the University Web. Key measures used in the survey included: a) perception that oneself was treated respectfully; b) perception that others different from oneself were treated respectfully; and c) perceptions about which programs and activities were most conducive to learning about different others.

The survey found overwhelming evidence that most students feel treated respectfully and are satisfied with the campus climate. Over the range of academic and co-curricular programs offered by the University, most students report learning about a wide variety of differences, such as gender, religion, sexual orientation, and race/ethnicity. Generally speaking, women reported greater satisfaction and more respectful treatment than men. Generally speaking, more Greek students said that they had been the target of discriminatory behavior than independent students by a variety of campus groups. Fraternity men perceived more discrimination than sorority women.

Information relevant to staff persons' perceptions of campus climate may also become available. In March of 1999 the staff at Puget Sound were invited to complete the Campbell Organizational Survey. This survey project, led by a committee of the Staff Senate and funded by the University, provides results which compare Puget Sound staff members' responses to normative data for seventeen scoring components, one of which is diversity.

The quality of the campus climate should continue to be measured periodically in order to develop and improve cooperative programs to promote meaningful campus dialogue that bridges differences and to measure the effectiveness of programs in this area. To this end, the Division of Student Affairs made the following specific recommendations as part of the recent University accreditation report:

- a) In order to build on the existing campus climate benchmark data established in 1995, resources should be allocated to develop and administer a shorter, improved instrument based on what was learned.
- b) While overall students feel treated respectfully on campus, there are small pockets of minority students that do not. Increased attention to the needs of these students and follow-up to ascertain the effectiveness of our efforts should be coordinated by the DSA, working in conjunction with Academic and Career Advising, faculty and other offices.
- c) The new Department of Diversity and Community will be responsible for determining student satisfaction with and utilization of the new Student Diversity Center. The Center's contribution to students' appreciation of community and diversity needs to be ascertained.
- d) The mentoring program needs to be assessed thoroughly by the Assistant Dean of Students. Does mentoring improve the retention of participants? Their academic success? Focus groups should be used to ascertain student interest in and suggestions about the program.
- e) Continued attention needs to be focused on ways to address the retention of students of color and educate staff and faculty about the effectiveness of existing programs and efforts.
- f) Ongoing efforts to improve the relations between Greek and independent students should be assessed in five years to ascertain their effectiveness.

g) "Hate crimes" should be tabulated annually by Security Services.

V. Governance, Publicity, Monitoring, Accountability, etc.

Goal #1: *Develop and implement procedures for a University-wide self-audit on diversity issues to include action plans.*

A summary of the University's diversity initiatives was requested by President Susan Resneck Pierce and prepared by the University Relations researcher Cecelia Hogan in May of 1995 (see Attachment #7).

The 1999 UPS reaccreditation self-study addresses diversity in its first chapter, Institutional Mission, Goals, Planning, and Effectiveness. A section titled Other Significant Planning Initiatives discusses the University's commitment to "a rich knowledge of self and others and an appreciation of commonality and difference." In addition, initiatives, issues, and assessments with respect to diversity and community are discussed in Chapter 3, and information on faculty and staff diversity is available in Chapter 6.

Goal #2: *Establish an on-going research process to evaluate diversity efforts.*

The Faculty Diversity Committee prepares a report annually for the Faculty Senate. Annual reports for the years prior to 1998-99 may be inspected by contacting the Academic Vice President's Office (Source: Records and Computing Specialist, Allen Bagwell).

Goal #3: *Amend the University's mission statement to include the following formal statement on diversity: Liberal education attempts to discover truth in all its forms and to liberate from ignorance. Part of the University's mission is to promote cultural pluralism, cross-cultural and inter-racial understanding, and equal opportunity for everyone. Further, the University's curriculum depends upon investigating subjects from a variety of perspectives. Therefore, the University of Puget Sound affirms the value of pluralism and is committed to diversity. The University recognizes the importance of pluralism and diversity by actively recruiting students, faculty members, administrators, and staff members from a wide range of ethnic, racial, religious, and cultural backgrounds; and by supporting co-curricular programs, student programs, and community relations. The University is dedicated to creating a climate on the campus that fosters respect for diversity of peoples and cultures within a world in which appreciation of pluralism is essential.*

In October of 1990, the Board of Trustees approved verbatim language proposed by the Diversity Committee (different from the language above) under the "Special Programs and Activities" section of the mission statement. This included the addition of Women's Studies to the list of examples of "special efforts to capitalize on the institution's strengths and unique characteristics."

The University's statement on equal opportunity was amended in December of 1992 to include sexual orientation.

In September of 1995, President Susan Resneck Pierce issued a statement on affirmative action in anticipation of the media inquiries following the passage of California's Proposition 209:

"Recognizing the many ways a multicultural student body, faculty and staff enrich its community and the academic enterprise in general, the University of Puget Sound reaffirms its commitment to the principles of affirmative action in its admission and employment programs. In the spirit of free and open inquiry, we view the current debate over affirmative action as a healthy and productive exercise. At the same time we remain steadfast in the conviction that our own program serves the liberal arts mission of the University."

The University's current mission statement follows, with applicable language highlighted:

The University of Puget Sound is an independent predominantly residential undergraduate liberal arts college with selected graduate programs building effectively on a liberal arts foundation. The University, as a community of learning, maintains a strong

commitment to teaching excellence, scholarly engagement, and fruitful student-faculty interaction.

The mission of the University is to develop in its students capacities for critical analysis, aesthetic appreciation, sound judgment, and apt expression that will sustain a lifetime of intellectual curiosity, active inquiry, and reasoned independence. A Puget Sound education, both academic and co-curricular, **encourages a rich knowledge of self and others, an appreciation of commonality and difference, the full, open, and civil discussion of ideas**, thoughtful moral discourse, and the integration of learning, preparing the University's graduates to meet the highest tests of democratic citizenship. Such an education seeks to liberate each person's fullest intellectual and human potential to assist in the unfolding of creative and useful lives.

Goal #4: *Once the mission statement has been amended to include a statement on diversity, print the statement in all of the regular publications of the University--Bulletin, Viewbook, etc.*

The University's statement on equal opportunity appears in all such publications.

Goal #5: *Study the need to amend the Student Honor Code to include a harassment policy.*

The Faculty Student Life Committee considered this charge in 1995/96, finding that student-to-student harassment and faculty-to-student sexual harassment was adequately covered in existing student integrity code language. They recommended that the Professional Standards Committee be charged with developing step-by-step procedures for dealing with non-sexual harassment of students by faculty, specifically including racial, ethnic, religious, and disability harassment.

The current Student Integrity Code specifically prohibits sexual harassment as part of Standard One, with reference to "the University Sexual Harassment Policy and with other University policies and procedures contained in the Faculty Code and the Staff Policies and Procedures Manual."

Goal #6: *Study the need for and the feasibility of appointing an ombudsperson or a group of ombudspersons to receive informal complaints and concerns from faculty, staff, and students about non-compliance with the University's statement and policies on diversity and to refer formal complaints to the appropriate administrative officer.*

The University's policy prohibiting sexual harassment was amended in 1995 to provide for a faculty ombudsperson to receive informal complaints and concerns from faculty, staff and students.

Staff policies and procedures were amended in 1997 to provide for mediation as an option when complaints of any kind, including complaints and concerns about non-compliance with the University's statement and policies on diversity, arise. Twenty members of the staff have completed a weeklong mediation certification program.

Goal #7: *Give diversity as a general topic; alumni of color; recruitment of faculty, staff, and students of color; etc., a higher profile in University publications.*

Occasional articles on diversity have appeared in *Arches* over the past few year, and Mike Oman states that the University Relations Office tries "to display through pictures and in the text that UPS is a welcoming place for minorities."

Assessment (Section V):

Language regarding diversity has been added to several University documents since 1990, and occasional public statements have affirmed the University's dedication to increased diversity. However, no regular, coordinated efforts are in place to assure implementation of diversity initiatives or evaluate the University's progress with regard to diversity-related issues. The University's policy on diversity appears to

be reactive, rather than proactive, driven by external stimuli such as reaccreditation needs and adverse publicity or student perceptions.

The only ongoing formal assessment of the University's performance in this area is the annual report of the Faculty Diversity Committee to the Faculty Senate. The role of the Faculty Diversity Committee itself is uncertain and has been debated by the Faculty Senate several times in the past decade. The committee originated as an advisory committee to the President Phibbs and became a standing committee reporting to the Senate early in the administration of President Pierce. As the Faculty Diversity Committee is the sole evaluator of the University's overall performance in this realm, a clearer definition of the committee's responsibilities would be prudent.