

April 29, 1998

To: The Faculty Senate, Grace Kirchner
From: The Faculty Diversity Committee; Carolyn Weisz, Chair
Re: The 1997-1998 Annual Report

The 1997-98 Faculty Diversity Committee (FDC) began its deliberations this academic year by focusing on issues of role definition and process. The FDC came to the conclusion that its role is not to supplant or prod other faculty committees or administrative offices but to serve the University by funneling information, carefully researched and analyzed, to the Faculty Senate. Wanting not to experience the frustration of revisiting issues addressed time and again by the FDC in prior years (without influence, authority, staff, or budget to address them), the FDC established a model for 1997-98 that was labeled the "think tank" model. The FDC planned to focus on one or two issues in depth rather than discuss many diversity-related issues superficially.

Through discussion, the committee identified three issues of high priority: curriculum reform, the composition of the faculty and the composition of the student body. FDC members met in subcommittees to identify specific questions that warranted attention in each of these areas. After each subcommittee reported, the full committee decided to focus on diversity in the curriculum, particularly issues related to U.S. pluralism/multiculturalism, as its top priority for the year. The committee felt this was a particularly timely issue in light of the Puget Sound faculty's recent and ongoing discussions of revisions to the core curriculum. The committee identified three questions it would address:

- 1) What language and definitions should be used to discuss issues of diversity, multiculturalism, and pluralism?
- 2) What models of diversity-related programs in curricula exist at other universities and how have these models been received?
- 3) What sources of support and funding exist for the development diversity-related curricular initiatives?

Subcommittees formed to address the first two questions. The full committee reached consensus on a draft of a definition of a U.S. pluralism component in education (see the committee minutes of 3/27/98) and discussed models of diversity-related programs in curricula at other universities. Based on this work, the committee worked through several drafts of a document summarizing these issues (see current draft attached as appendix 1). The FDC intends this report to be a tool to stimulate informed dialogue among the faculty about ways Puget Sound might incorporate issues of U.S. pluralism into the curriculum.

In addition to the activities above, the 1997-1998 FDC heard announcements and reports by committee members regarding faculty and staff hiring (see appendix 2), student admissions (see appendix 3), restructuring of the Division of Student Affairs to create a new Department of Diversity and Community, changes in the administrative structure of the Access to College Program, a grant proposal to the Hewlett Foundation on Pluralism and Unity, and diversity-related co-curricular events. In Fall, the FDC presented a statement to the Budget Task Force supporting a request by the Office of Admissions for increased financial aid for students of color (see appendix 4). The FDC also discussed a proposed revision to the ByLaws regarding duties of the Faculty Diversity Committee, and forwarded recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

We anticipate that our work during the early part of Fall 1998, will still concern curriculum. As part of this work, we offer the following suggestions to the Faculty Senate for the committee charges in 1998-1999:

- solicit broader faculty input by organizing one or more informal discussions with faculty about issues of diversity in the curriculum;
- investigate sources of funding for faculty development and course development to implement the possible curricular changes;

- 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 FDC's work on the curriculum.

The committee suggests that after it finishes work on the curriculum, it take up one of the other two issues identified as priorities: diversity in the faculty and diversity in the student body. Suggestions about what this work might entail appear below.

1) Focus concern on faculty diversity. This work might involve:

- developing proposals for encouraging and enhancing diversity in the Faculty;
- assisting the Dean of Faculty, the Director of Human Resources, and departments with hiring a more diverse faculty;
- working with the Faculty Senate and administrative officers in the development of policies relating to and promoting diversity.

2) Focus concern on diversity in the student body. This work might involve:

- exploring methods to recruit and retain all students of color especially African-American students;
- continuing to focus on campus climate issues;
- considering whether the University should publish a pamphlet for publicity and recruitment purposes, featuring campus diversity actions and accomplishments;
- considering whether the University should publish on-line all the events relating to diversity;
- considering strategies/activities that the Diversity Committee should promote or support, directly or in partnership with other campus groups (like the Student Life Faculty Committee), to increase faculty-student collaboration for theme year planning and implementing that would (1) increase efforts to educate the campus broadly about multiculturalism, and (2) enliven the general intellectual life of the campus.

The committee also recommends that the Faculty 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.

Appendix 1: Draft of report on U.S. Pluralism in the curriculum

Faculty Diversity Committee Report:
U.S. Pluralism in College and University Curricula
April 30, 1998

I. Purpose of this Document

In 1996-1997, the Faculty Diversity Committee forwarded the following resolution to the faculty:

We believe that it is important for our students to have courses that expose them to the diversity of cultures in the United States and that equip them to think critically about the nature of our cultural diversity and its impact on our society. A liberal arts education should enable our students to live and work in diverse, multicultural communities. Furthermore, if courses on multiculturalism meet core requirements, students who might not otherwise seek out these courses will consider seriously their value as part of a liberal arts education. Thus, we urge the faculty to include a component on multiculturalism in the core curriculum.

Building on this commitment to educating students about issues of domestic diversity, this report reviews research and discussion by members of the 1997-1998 Faculty Diversity Committee on the topic of domestic diversity in the curriculum. The purpose of the document is to inform faculty about the nature of dialogues on this topic and models of diversity-related curricular programs at other universities and colleges. These issues are particularly timely given the faculty's current discussions at Puget Sound about revising the core curriculum. The goal of this report is to facilitate informed dialogue among the faculty about options for incorporating a U.S. pluralism component into the existing or soon to be revised Puget Sound core curriculum.

The report is based primarily on discussions among members of the Faculty Diversity Committee, publications by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), reports of diversity related activities published on Diversity Web ([http://www.inform.umd.edu/Diversity Web](http://www.inform.umd.edu/Diversity%20Web)), and web searches of individual universities. The report is a joint effort produced by members of the 1997-1998 Faculty Diversity Committee: Flo Ariessohn (Fall), Kevin Barhydt, Michele Birnbaum, Peggy Firman, Rosa Beth Gibson, George Guilmet (Spring), Charles Hommel, Judith Kay, Martyn Kingston (Fall), Pat Krueger, John Lear, George Mills, Pedro Renteria, Ben Reuler, Carrie Washburn, and Carolyn Weisz (chair).

The report includes the following sections:

- relevant history;
- rationale for including a U.S. pluralism component in higher education curricula;
- models for including a U.S. pluralism focus in higher education curricula along with example of the models currently existing at specific institutions;
- assessments of specific programs;
- challenges of transforming curricula;
- conclusion;
- references for those interested in learning more about these issues.

II. Relevant History

A. Faculty Diversity Committee Curricular Initiatives

In Fall 1992, the Academic Dean's Office compiled a list of 53 courses with significant diversity content in response to President Phibb's Sept. 18, 1990 charge to the Dean of the University and the Curriculum Committee to conduct such a survey. This list was developed using the definition of "diversity" contained in the University Diversity Committee's May 1990 "Recommendation to the President." That definition included racial, religious, ethnic, socio-economic, and cultural groups. It did not include gender, sexual preference, national origin, and physical disability. The basis for selection of courses was an evaluation of syllabi on file in the Associate Deans office.

In academic year 1993-1994, at the request of the Faculty Diversity Committee Subcommittee on Curriculum the Academic Dean's Office produced a much expanded list of 209 courses in the Puget Sound curriculum which could be said to contain "diversity" or "pluralistic" content. The scope of the definition was broadened to include the concept of "pluralism," a strong suggestion from the major presenter in an FDC-sponsored curriculum workshop in Spring 1993. In addition by that year, the Faculty ByLaws for the FDC included the following definition: "'Diversity' shall include areas such as race/ethnicity, gender, national origin, religion, socio-economic class, sexual orientation, and physical ability." Courses were grouped into the following categories: American Pluralism, Europe, Asia, Latin and South America, and Other. Even though the definition included physical disability no OT/PT courses were included in the list.

In December 1993 the Curriculum Subcommittee of the Diversity Committee sent this list of "diversity/pluralism" courses to department chairs asking departments to review the list, to add or delete courses, and to provide more information on the courses and the faculty who teach them. The goal was to produce a brochure for students listing courses, which in the opinion of the department offering them, contained significant diversity/pluralism components. During Spring 1994 a total of eight out of 30 departments responded to the query. The project was passed along to the 1994-1995 Diversity Committee. It was not acted on during that year.

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. For example, faculty may add courses to the list which in their minds deal with diversity issues but which in the minds of other faculty serve only to water down the list. There may also be variation in the willingness of faculty to self-identify. Finally the same course taught by different instructors may vary enough in content such that one would qualify and another would not, rendering any list useful for only for one term.

Analysis of the activities described above suggests a need to come to some consensus about what constitutes courses studying issues of diversity and/or pluralism.

In 1993-1994, Curriculum Committee added the following language to the Departmental Curriculum Review Self-Study Guide at the request from the FDC: "In what ways does the curriculum in your department, school, or program reflect the diversity of our society?"

B. Other recent initiatives

1. In 1996-1997 Minors in African American Studies and Latin American Studies were added to the curriculum. A new course was also added—LAS 100, Introduction to Latin American Studies-- as the foundation course for the LA minor. These two minors, along with the long-standing minor in Women Studies, group existing courses into coherent programs and help to make more visible the extent of "diversity/pluralistic" content in the curriculum.

2. In Spring 1998 the University submitted a proposal to the Hewlett Foundation for a three-year Pluralism and Unity grant which will, if funded, provide funding for course development.

III. Rationale for a U.S. pluralism focus in higher education curricula

A focus on U.S. pluralism serves to:

- develop within students a sense of informed, active citizenship as they enter a society of increasing diversity by focusing on contemporary and historical issues of race, ethnicity, gender, social class and religion in U.S. life;
- provide students with opportunities for studying concepts of justice and the causes and effects of structured inequalities and prejudicial exclusion in U.S. society;
- encourage students to study their own inherited and constructed traditions and identities; and
- expand students' ability to critically analyze controversial and contemporary issues that stem from the gender, race, class, ethnic, and religious differences in U.S. society.

IV. Models at Other Institutions:

Over the last five years, the Association of American Colleges and Universities, supported by grants from the Ford Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities, has engaged in a project entitled, "American Commitments: Diversity, Democracy, and Liberal Learning". A major component of this project involves working with 100 colleges and universities to develop or assess curricular initiatives related to diversity and U.S. pluralism. The AAC&U has published several documents on this project and created a web site (Diversity Web) showcasing the programs at many of these institutions. The models below represent examples of distinct approaches to incorporating a focus on U.S. pluralism in higher education curricula.

Model 1: Infusion

In this model, schools do not institute separate requirements, but attempt to infuse all departments, divisions, and general education courses with information about diversity and pluralism. AAC&U reports suggest that "the infusion model is most effective at smaller institutions that have very strong leadership on diversity, a substantial allocation of funds over time, and at which there exists a shared commitment to diversity as a core component of their institutional mission." (Humphreys, p. 32)

Advantages: ". . . attempts to avoid marginalizing diversity courses and to minimize the chance that students might view a single diversity course simply as forced sensitivity or 'tolerance' training." (Humphreys, p. 31)

Difficulties/limitations: Requires extensive faculty development and commitment. Difficult to achieve. Difficult to monitor. "(R)uns the risk of paying lip service to diversity." (Humphreys, p. 31)

Sample Institution:

•Bloomfield College in NJ: More than half of faculty engage in a semester-long interdisciplinary, faculty development seminar. There are campus-wide diversity initiatives related to curriculum, co-curriculum, service learning, and recruitment of diverse faculty, students, and administrators.

Model 2: Required Course or Courses

AAC&U reports a national trend toward including separate but important foci on both global and domestic diversity in curricula: "Instead of folding U.S. diversity into an all-encompassing global diversity requirement, institutions are beginning to opt for at least two courses: one that focuses on world cultures and another that focuses on specific issues of U.S. pluralism" (Humphreys, 1997, p. 3).

Sometimes courses are required for all students during a particular year (e.g., sophomore seminar) or multiple courses are offered in a sequence. "These sorts of requirements also

seem to be more successful if they are developed with an individual institution's mission in mind" (Humphreys, p. 33) Three models of U.S. pluralism requirements are described below.

A. Required Course Among Various Course Options

This option involves taking one U.S. pluralism course among a menu of available courses.

Advantages: Can build off existing courses and faculty expertise. All students are exposed to courses with specific learning goals. Encourages faculty and institutions to identify specific learning goals.

Difficulties/limitations: Difficult to assess how well each course meets common goals.

Sample Institutions:

- Haverford College: "Social Justice" requirement
- Temple University: Two courses required: one in "American Cultures" and one in "Studies of Race"
- Iowa State University: Requires courses in both U.S. diversity and international perspectives.
- University of California, Berkeley: Required course on "American Cultures"
- Occidental College: All first-year students participate in a year-long colloquium on U.S. pluralism. Colloquia are team taught and students also attend smaller seminars led by individual faculty members (e.g., Women of Color in the U.S., Los Angeles).

B. Single Course on U.S. Pluralism

All students take a single course. Courses vary somewhat but share a common set of readings and topics. This model may involve team-teaching.

Advantages: Reaches all students. Common experience. Easier to assess courses. Interdisciplinary focus.

Difficulties/limitations: Requires extensive faculty development.

Sample Institutions:

- SUNY- Buffalo: Requires students to take course during second year: "American Pluralism and the Search for Equality". Courses are co-taught by 2-3 faculty. Individual courses vary in content but share some similar readings. Faculty development seminars held each summer.

C. Course Sequence Requirements or Infused General Education Sequence

Diversity is infused in a sequence of required general education courses offered throughout students' undergraduate years.

Advantages: Courses build off each other.

Difficulties/limitations: Extensive faculty development and commitment of resources.

Sample Institutions:

- University of California, San Diego: Requires three quarter sequence (Diversity, Justice, Imagination) studying various dimensions of culture. Multiple courses meet each requirement.
- St. Edwards University: Requires all students to take six courses related to cultural studies (Literature and Human Experience, Understanding and Appreciating the Arts, American Experience, American Dilemmas, Identity of the West, Contemporary World Issues).
- Fairleigh Dickinson University: Requires a four-semester core curriculum on American pluralism and comparative world cultures (Perspectives on the Individual, The Quest for Freedom, Global Issues, and Cross-Cultural Perspectives).

V. Assessment of Diversity Issues in the College Curriculum

Although no assessments that differentiate curricular approaches were found in the literature thus far, the following assessments on diversity issues in the curriculum are relevant and significant:

Astin (1993) used a national longitudinal study to examine effects of diversity experiences on campus upon student attitudes and behaviors, and on academic progress and values. Astin found that faculty emphasis on diversity issues in courses had a positive effect on student openness to racial understanding and overall satisfaction with college.

Other research supports Astin's findings. Tanaka (1996) found that inclusion of racial and ethnic issues in the college curriculum had positive effects on white students' sense of community, cultural understanding, and general satisfaction with college. Drawing from a variety of studies that assess diversity initiatives on the college campus, Smith (1997) notes:

There is a significant body of literature which suggests that serious engagement of diversity in the curriculum, along with linking classroom and out-of-class opportunities, positively affect students' attitudes and awareness about diversity, as well as their commitment to education, and their involvement. Research also shows connections between taking such courses and increased satisfaction with college . . . The inclusion of cultural diversity content and perspectives in coursework has positive effects on critical thinking skills and knowledge acquisition (p. 36).

VI. Challenges of Transforming Curricula

The monograph *Core Curriculum and Cultural Pluralism* (1992) by the AAC&U is an useful guide to the obstacles and successes involved in initiating core revisions with diversity/pluralism components. The Cultural Legacies Project indicated that institutions were seriously committed to using general education curriculum to increase awareness of cultural diversity, both within the U.S. and among the peoples of the world, both historically and contemporarily. However, only about 25% of the total institutions included or proposed a required course on pluralism within the U.S. as part of the core. The authors note, "It may be easier and less threatening to engage difference at a distance -- where it is expected and anticipated and where one has no permanent responsibility as a citizen -- than at home."

With regard to implementing programs, the report notes that:

- 1) An institution can not import a core program: A successful program fits the local context, reflects the institutional mission and vision of the faculty, and meets student needs.
- 2) Core design and implementation is a three- to five-year process. Along the way, there are mazes, bogs, potholes, vistas, forked roads, dead ends, and watering holes. There are no short cuts.
- 3) The process is as important as the product; a good planning and implementation process improves chances for success.

VII. Conclusion

We hope that this document will help encourage and guide the Puget Sound faculty to transform the curriculum in ways that systematically incorporate issues of pluralism and diversity. We are reluctant at this time to make a specific recommendation to the faculty of one model for achieving this goal over another, particularly if it means recommending a diversity/pluralism requirement. While many of us support such a requirement, that decision must ultimately come from an informed discussion that involves the faculty at large. All of us on the Faculty Diversity Committee believe that much more needs to be done to incorporate issues of pluralism and diversity into the curriculum than is being done now. While the "infusion" model outlined above may prove most acceptable to many faculty, and in some ways reaffirms already existing efforts and plans, we feel that any pursuit of an "infusionist" model rather than some type

of requirement must involve an explicit commitment from the faculty and the administration that goes well beyond current efforts.

IIV. References and Resources

Astin, A. W. 1993. Diversity and multiculturalism on campus: How are students affected? Change, 25 (2):44-49.

Friedman, E. G., Kolmar, W. K, Flint, C. B., & Rothenberg, P. Creating an inclusive college curriculum: A teaching sourcebook from the New Jersey Project. NY: Teachers College Press.

Glazer, N. (1997). We are all multicultural now. Harvard Press.

Humphreys, D. (1997). General education and American commitments. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Nash, G. B. (1992). Red, white, and black: Peoples of early North America. Prentice Hall.

Schmitz, B. (1992). Core curriculum and cultural pluralism. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Smith, D. G. 1997. Diversity works: The emerging picture of how students benefit. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Takaki, R. (1993). A different mirror: A history of multicultural America. Little, Brown, and Co.

Tanaka, G. K. 1996. The impact of multiculturalism on white students. Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. of California, Los Angeles. Abstract in Dissertation Abstracts International 57 (05): 1980A.

American Pluralism & the College Curriculum: Higher Education in a Diverse Democracy. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Web resources:

Diversity Web: <http://www.inform.umd.edu/DiversityWeb>
diversity-web@umail.umd.edu

Univ. of Maryland Diversity Datatbase: <http://www.inform.umd.edu/diversity>

Diversity Connections: <http://www.inform.umd.edu/connections>

The following Diversity newsroom address (resource for journalists) has a curriculum topical category:
<http://www.inform.umd.edu/diversitynews>
div-news@umail.umd.edu

Appendix 2

1996-97 FACULTY HIRING RESULTS**Overview**

In the eleven departments in which tenure-track searches were conducted to fill 1997-98 vacancies 47% of the total number of full-time faculty are women and 7% are people of color, in both instances greater than the proportion of women faculty and faculty of color employed full-time throughout the University. For eight of the eleven disciplines we have information on the percentage of persons nationally with the Ph.D. who are women and the percentage of persons nationally with the Ph.D. who are of color:

□

- In six of the disciplines Puget Sound has a higher percentage of women faculty than the percentage of women available nationally; in two Puget Sound's percentage of women faculty is less than the percentage of women available nationally.

- In two of the disciplines Puget Sound has a higher percentage of faculty of color than the percentage of faculty of color available nationally. In six, Puget Sound's percentage of faculty of color is less than the percentage of people of color available nationally.

Women

Tenure-track Faculty The percentage of women in the disciplines for which we have national availability data ranges from 17 to 56 with a median of approximately 41. Women who voluntarily identified themselves represented 30% of the total number of applicants for tenure-track positions (449 of 1505). Women represented 52% of the semifinalists for the tenure-track positions, 46% of the finalists, and 41% of those to whom offers were made. Fifteen tenure-track positions were offered and accepted. Six women (40% of the total) joined Puget Sound for 1997-98 in tenure-track positions.

Non-Tenure-track Faculty Women who voluntarily identified themselves represented 32% of the total number of applicants for non-tenure-track positions (114 of 351). Women represented 57% of the semifinalists for the non-tenure-track positions, 44% of the finalists, and 50% of those to whom offers were made. Seventeen non-tenure-track positions have been offered and accepted. Seven women (41% of the total) joined Puget Sound for 1997-98 in non-tenure-track positions.

People of Color

Tenure-track Faculty The percentage of people of color in the disciplines for which we have national availability data ranges from 6 to 44 with a median of approximately 10. People of color who voluntarily identified themselves represented 12% of the total number of applicants for tenure-track positions (177 of 1505). Thirteen people of color were identified as semi-finalists (25% of the total number of semi-finalists). Ten were identified as finalist candidates (23% of the total number of finalists). Three offers of employment in tenure-track positions were made to candidates of color. Fifteen tenure-track positions were offered and accepted. Three faculty of color (20% of the total) joined Puget Sound for 1997-98 in tenure-track positions.

Non-tenure-track Faculty People of color who voluntarily identified themselves represented 5% of the total number of applicants for non-tenure-track positions (17 of 351). One person of color was identified as a semi-finalist (3% of the total number of semi-finalists) and subsequently as a finalist. Seventeen non-tenure-track positions have been offered and accepted. One faculty member of color (6% of the total) joined Puget Sound for 1997-98 in a non-tenure-track position.

Race and Sex by Occupational Category: □ University of Puget Sound, Fall 1997

The University currently employs 650 persons in full-time faculty positions and in both full- and part-time staff positions. The total faculty/staff population is distributed by race and sex as follows:

| | Female | Male | Total |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| All Faculty and Staff | | | |
| White | 316 | 253 | 569 (87.5%) |
| African American | 15 | 16 | 31 (4.75%) |
| Asian American | 27 | 11 | 38 (6%) |
| Native American | 3 | 2 | 5 (.75%) |
| Hispanic | 3 | 4 | 7 (1%) |
| | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| | 364 (56%) | 286 (44%) | 650 |

People of color comprise 12.5% of the total faculty/staff population, an increase from the 1987 percentage of 8.8.

Members of the faculty are distributed as follows:

| Faculty | | Female | Male | Total |
|---------|------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| | White | 81 | 133 | 214 (95%) |
| | African American | 0 | 2 | 2 (1%) |
| | Asian American | 4 | 4 | 8 (3%) |
| | Native American | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Hispanic | 1 | 1 | 2 (1%) |
| | | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| | | 86 (38%) | 140 (62%) | 226 |

People of color comprise 5% of the total faculty population, an increase from 4.1% in 1987.

Executives and managers are distributed as follows:

| | | Female | Male | Total |
|------------|------------------|------------|------------|----------|
| Managerial | White | 29 | 32 | 61 (94%) |
| | African American | 0 | 1 | 1 (1.5%) |
| | Asian American | 1 | 2 | 3 (4.5%) |
| | Native American | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Hispanic | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| | | 30 (46.5%) | 35 (53.5%) | 65 |

People of color comprise 6% of the total population of executives and managers, an increase from the 1987 percentage of 5.3%.

Professional staff members are distributed as follows:

| | | Female | Male | Total |
|--------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|
| Professional | White | 27 | 23 | 50 (93%) |
| | African American | 2 | 0 | 2 (3.7%) |
| | Asian American | 1 | 1 | 2 (3.3%) |
| | Native American | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Hispanic | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| | | 30 (65.35%) | 24 (44.65%) | 54 |

People of color comprise 7% of the total population of executives and managers, an increase from the 1987 percentage of 5.7%.

Secretarial/clerical staff members are distributed as follows:

| | | Female | Male | Total |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------|---------|-------------|
| Secretarial/Clerical | White | 110 | 8 | 118 (89.5%) |
| | African American | 5 | 1 | 6 (4.5%) |
| | Asian American | 4 | 0 | 4 (3%) |
| | Native American | 1 | 0 | 1 (.75) |
| | Hispanic | 2 | 1 | 3 (2.25%) |
| | | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| | | 122 (92%) | 10 (8%) | 132 |

People of color comprise 10.5% of the total population of executives and managers, an increase from the 1987 percentage of 7.9%.

Technical para-professional staff members are distributed as follows:

| | | Female | Male | Total |
|-----------------------------|------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Technical Para-Professional | White | 27 | 13 | 40 (85%) |
| | African American | 1 | 1 | 2 (4%) |
| | Asian American | 4 | 0 | 4 (9%) |
| | Native American | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Hispanic | 0 | 1 | 1 (2%) |
| | | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| | | 32 (68%) | 15 (32%) | 47 |

People of color comprise 15% of the total population of executives and managers, an increase from the 1987 percentage of 9%.

Skilled craft staff members are distributed as follows:

| | | Female | Male | Total |
|---------------|------------------|---------|----------|----------|
| Skilled Craft | White | 5 | 20 | 25 (84%) |
| | African American | 0 | 2 | 2 (7%) |
| | Asian American | 0 | 1 | 1 (3%) |
| | Native American | 0 | 1 | 1 (3%) |
| | Hispanic | 0 | 1 | 1 (3%) |
| | | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| | | 5 (17%) | 25 (83%) | 30 |

People of color comprise 16% of the total population of executives and managers, an increase from the 1987 percentage of 3.6%.

Service and maintenance staff members are distributed as follows:

| | | Female | Male | Total |
|---------------------|------------------|----------|----------|-------------|
| Service/Maintenance | White | 37 | 24 | 61 (63.5%) |
| | African American | 7 | 9 | 16 (16.67%) |
| | Asian American | 13 | 3 | 16 (16.67%) |
| | Native American | 2 | 1 | 3 (3.16%) |
| | Hispanic | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| | | 59 (62%) | 37 (38%) | 96 |

People of color comprise 36.5% of the total population of executives and managers, an increase from the 1987 percentage of 29.1%.

Several summary conclusions can be drawn from these data:

- Our greatest charge continues to be the employment and promotion of people of color in the faculty, executive/managerial, and professional staff categories.
- People of color are concentrated in service/maintenance positions.
- Women are well represented in the ranks of executives, managers, and professional staff members.
- The proportion of women faculty members has increased from 31.4% ten years ago to 38% today.
- The proportion of faculty and staff members who are people of color is increasing, though slowly.

It should be noted that the 1987 data include the School of Law.

Appendix 3: Report by Office of Admissions on Diversity Initiatives

The Enrollment Division is responsible for developing and carrying out programs designed to recruit, enroll and retain ethnic minority students. These activities are conducted through a series of admission and financial aid programs. The Office of Academic Advising works with all students in retention efforts and the Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships responds to the changing financial circumstances of students, among them ethnic minority students.

ADMISSION

This year 9 initiatives provide the basic structure for the admission efforts. As a one time only program the University participated with a consortium of colleges which flew a group of inner city students from Los Angeles to the Northwest to investigate colleges.

These 9 initiatives are:

1. 24 Hours of College: the Office of Admission sponsors two programs each year (this year Feb. 26-27 and March 26-27) for students of color from the greater Seattle/Tacoma area. High school counselors are solicited for names of bright, motivated high school juniors of color; after a list is accumulated, we send the students invitations. Twenty-five to thirty- five students spend 24 hours on campus, stay with our current students, participate in cocurricular activities and visit classes. A keynote speaker is asked to talk about education at the second day luncheon. Last year between the two programs, we had 41 participants (23 in February, 18 in March). Of those 41, 9 applied to Puget Sound. As of today, 6 have been admitted.
2. Diversity Admission Assistant: a current student of color is paid to work with our 24 Hour organizers to plan activities during the high schoolers stay, line up overnight hosts, and class visits.
3. Campus visit program: students of color lead tours and overnight prospective student visitors; of the 79 students who serve as tourguides or overnight hosts, 14 are students of color (6 tourguides, 2 male hosts, 6 female hosts).
4. Phoning: Over the past two years, staff have coordinated current African American students calling African American admitted applicants.
5. Selective Searches: An African American search, a national search for African-American students who have taken the SAT. We also do a special mailing to Hispanic Scholars.
6. High School Visits: Admission counselors visit racially diverse high schools in Seattle/Tacoma, Portland, Denver, Hawaii and regions/sections of California.
7. Spring Middle School Visits: Admission counselors visit diverse local middle schools, upon request, during the spring. The purpose of these visits is to encourage students to set their sights high.
8. Student of Color Organization (ABC Coalition) Liaisons: Admission Counselor liaisons are assigned to each of the three organizations.
9. Academic Challenge: Annually, an Office of Admission counselor talks to AC participants and their parents about preparing for college, college admission and financial aid and scholarships.

FINANCIAL AID

The Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships administers a program of grant funds for ethnic minority students. The attached chart details the development of this grant program to its current mature level.

Special Puget Sound Grant Funds for Students of Color 1991-1997

This chart provides information on special University grants awarded to African American, Hispanic American, Native American, and Asian American students on the basis of exceptional financial need, academic ability, and other financial aid awarded. These students also receive other grants, scholarships, loans and student employment based upon their need levels and academic ability.

The 1991-92 year was the first year of these special need-based grant awards, with awards only being offered to new freshmen and transfer students at that time. The 1994-95 year was the first year where funds were available to assist all four classes of students (freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors).

| <u>Year</u> | <u>Funds Spent</u> | <u>Fresh.</u> | <u>Trans.</u> | <u>Continuing</u> | <u>Total</u> | <u>Aver. Award</u> |
|-------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| 91-92 | \$117,370 | 37 | 10 | 0 | 47 | \$2,497 |
| 92-93 | \$261,435 | 45 | 8 | 39 | 92 | \$2,841 |
| 93-94 | \$390,975 | 50 | 9 | 68 | 127 | \$3,078 |
| 94-95 | \$625,010 | 63 | 9 | 107 | 179 | \$3,491 |
| 95-96 | \$649,459 | 42 | 12 | 126 | 180 | \$3,608 |
| 96-97 | \$831,700 | 55 | 12 | 136 | 203 | \$4,097 |
| +Merit • | 28,000 | 4 | | | 4 | \$7,000 |
| Total | \$859,700 | 59 | 12 | 136 | 207 | \$4,153 |
| 97-98 | \$867,052 | 46 | 5 | 151 | 202 | \$4,292 |
| +Merit | 56,000 | 4 | | 4 | 8 | \$7,000 |
| Total | \$923,052 | 50 | 5 | 155 | 210 | \$4,395 |

•The Will and Susanna Thomas Scholarship program was added this year. The purpose is to provide scholarship assistance to minority students who demonstrate academic merit and financial need. This program will be expanded over four years so that during the 1999-2000 year, there will be four classes of Thomas Scholars, with a total of 16 students receiving these scholarships.

Also attached is a report that analyzes the minority enrollment effect of these financial aid funds.

Enrolled Freshmen by Ethnicity and Those Receiving Additional Puget Sound Need-Based Grants 1986-1997

| <u>*Minority Group*</u> | <u>1986</u> | <u>1987</u> | <u>1988</u> | <u>1989</u> | <u>1990</u> | <u>1991</u> | <u>1992</u> | <u>1993</u> | <u>1994</u> | <u>1995</u> | <u>1997</u> | <u>1997</u> |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Asian Amer. | 30 | 29 | 41 | 38 | 33 | 68 | 71 | 71 | 85 | 64 | 80 | 86 |
| Hispanic Amer. | 4 | 3 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 26 | 9 | 16 | 36 | 19 | 19 |
| African Amer. | 9 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 6 | 16 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 7 | 14 | 11 |
| Native Amer. | 7 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 7 |
| **Total of Above**50 | | 43 | 62 | 63 | 50 | 99 | 117 | 99 | 123 | 119 | 125 | 123 |
| No. of Additional Awards | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 45 | 50 | 63 | 42 | 54 | 46 |
| Est. Minority Fresh. Enroll. If These Funds Were Not Available | | | | | | 62 | 72 | 49 | 60 | 77 | 71 | 77 |

Additional Puget Sound Grant Assistance=Special grants, awarded to exceptionally needy minority students to secure their enrollment at the University.

1991 was the first year of this additional special grant assistance for high need minority students.

Average freshman minority student enrollment 1986-1990 (prior to these special programs) = 54

Average freshman minority student enrollment 1991-1997 (with these special programs) = 115

Average number of minority student special grant enrollees 1991-1997 = 48

Estimated average freshman minority student enrollment 1991-1998 if these special programs had not been available) = 67

Finally, the Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships reports that the Academic Challenge Program is directly responsible for the current enrollment of two African-American students.

Current Picture for Freshmen

The current freshman admission picture is mixed when compared to that of last year. Admitted African-American and Native-American numbers are up. Asian numbers are down slightly and Hispanic numbers are off moreso.

This is the data:

ADMITTED STUDENTS BY ETHNIC CATEGORY

| | <u>1998</u> | <u>1997</u> |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|
| Asian | 297 | 300 |
| Black | 58 | 48 |
| Hispanic | 103 | 120 |
| Native American | 77 | 64 |
| Other | 30 | 31 |
| Unknown | 244 | 232 |
| White | 2301 | 2330 |

Appendix 4

DATE: October 26, 1997
TO: Budget Review Task Force
FROM: Faculty Diversity Committee
Contact: Carolyn Weisz, Co-chair (1997-1998)
RE: Diversity Committee Requests or Suggestions

The Faculty Diversity Committee makes the following recommendations and suggestions:

1) The Diversity Committee strongly supports requests by the Office of Admissions for increases to the scholarship budget equal to the percentage increase in tuition. This will enable the University to continue the need-based and Will and Susanna Thomas Scholarships. We also suggest that new endowed funds be used to increase financial aid for students of color, particularly African American students; this recommendation is based on our recognition of the importance of pursuing objectives stated in the 1990 recommendation to the President from the University Diversity Committee regarding specific goals for enrollment of students of color.

2) We would like to indicate our continued support for monies designated for efforts to increase the diversity of the faculty, staff, and student body, and to create a campus environment that welcomes diversity and fosters intellectual exchange across group boundaries. These programs include:

- a) the Access to College Initiative including Academic Challenge;
- b) the Diversity Center;
- c) the Diversity Theme Year;
- d) the mentoring program;
- e) annual funding (\$10,000) to facilitate hiring faculty members of color;
- f) programs supporting travel by faculty and students to national and regional conferences on diversity and multiculturalism.