The University of Michigan
Committee for a Multicultural University
Minutes of January 9, 1997

Present: Y. Kuniyuki, C. Smith (Chair), J. Salazar, J. Su, P. Wilhelm (Secretary), Y. Wulff, W. Yang

Absent: D. Deskins (SACUA Liaison), R. Megginson, A. Nadasen, S. Pandit

Items Distributed:

1. Minutes of December 12, 1996
2. Agenda of January 9, 1997
3. Letter to DPSS Task Force from CMU, November 8, 1996
4. U of M News and Information Services release: "Minority faculty numbers continue to rise."
5. J. Su's diversity definition
6. Y. Wulff's diversity definition

C. Smith called the meeting to order at 5:11pm.

Announcements.

1. Smith announced that three members of the committee and he would meet with the Task Force to Review DPSS tomorrow, January 10, 1997, from 2:00 to 3:30pm.

2. Su reported on the meeting of COMU. The committee received a letter from Interim President Neal which contained a charge to COMU with instructions to develop a long-term project dealing with retention issues for minority faculty and students.

Smith commented saying that retention is a big problem at this University. A series of task forces, he said, have been studying this since about 1970. Smith said that the University must commit resources to this problem, in agreement with comments at earlier CMU meetings by Vice Provost Lester Monts. Su added that the COMU was still primarily made up of deans and administrators.

Approval of Minutes of December 12, 1996. The minutes were approved without revision.

University Report on Minority Faculty - January 7, 1997 & Data for Annual Report. C. Smith referred the committee to the distributed press release by the University from January 7. He noted that the release was very accurate. Smith also
commented that the University's report differs from that which the CMU will produce. The University's data includes all faculty, while the CMU report focused on faculty with full-time appointments. Smith noted that a substantial proportion of the faculty at the University have 0% appointments. Also, he noted that some minorities that the University still counts as faculty have been gone from the University for substantial periods of time, often many years.

W. Yang pointed out that in the College of Engineering research scientists are counted as faculty. It was noted that Asians are the only minority group represented on the faculty in proportions greater than in the population of the state or the nation.

Smith also suggested that in its report the CMU should focus on several areas that do not often get published; namely, salaries, gender, rates of progress, retention rates, and turnover rates.

**Report on SACUA developments.**

1. **Formation of a new committee.** Smith reported that last Monday SACUA decided they will directly attack the "problem of affirmative action and diversity." The idea has emerged for a new committee with representatives from Senate Assembly, SACUA, and the CMU with the charge of finding a definition of diversity which is acceptable to a broader proportion of the University community. Smith noted that this was originally the task that the CMU had been asked to carry out.

2. **SACUA Chair Dunn's statement on affirmative action.** Smith explained that SACUA chair Thomas Dunn is preparing a statement on affirmative action which will be his personal statement. He will present this to SACUA by Monday, January 13. Smith said that he would be sure the committee gets a copy of Dunn's statement.

**Meeting with the DPSS Task Force.** The three representatives from CMU that will attend the meeting along with Chair Smith, Y. Kuniyuki, J. Su, and Y. Wulff, were all present. Smith noted that all three representatives would have a chance to speak at tomorrow's meeting. Smith then asked the committee to refer to the letter to the DPSS Task Force from November 8, 1996. Y. Kuniyuki brought up a few points that he wished to use in his address to the Task Force.

1. To whom does DPSS report?

2. How is the organization set up?

3. What are the parameters of their involvement in campus safety; what is their formal relationship with the Ann Arbor Police and with the Washtenaw County Sheriff?

4. What is their overall function and mission?
Underscoring the need for better public relations, Kuniyuki stressed that this kind of information about DPSS is not easily accessible, but that it ought to be accessible. Kuniyuki also said he was concerned about how the DPSS deals with racial issues. He asked if they have any kind of internal review process. Smith answered saying that a University oversight committee, chaired by Law Professor Gross, was required by law. Wulff added that the oversight committee seemed not to have an active function at this University.

Wulff then shared with the committee her ideas that she would bring before the Task Force:

1. Community relations. Wulff said she was considering bringing up reports of complaints from students of color that some of their events on campus are over-policed. Also, she noted reports of general aggressive monitoring of students of color disproportionate to the rest of the student population. Wulff, however, stated that she may not be a good person to bring these examples before the Task Force because the information was not from a close source.

2. Issues of training. Wulff suggested asking the Task Force how DPSS deals with training their officers to deal with different kinds of people, such as the homeless and members of different racial groups.

J. Su said that the entirety of his questioning would center around the question: "How does DPSS ascertain the community concerns?"

Wulff said in connection with Kuniyuki's concerns about DPSS involvement with other police forces that when DPSS was set up there was a lot of effort made to the end that the Sheriff's Department would never have to set foot on this campus. Yang added that the sheriff's department did not set up the organization of DPSS; rather, the regents did so. Wulff also added in agreement with Kuniyuki that public relations is a very important issue that the DPSS should address.

After some more discussion, the CMU decided to align their questions to the Task Force with the five questions listed in the November 8 letter in the interest of conciseness and clarity. J. Su would address question two. Y. Kuniyuki would address questions one and five. Y. Wulff would address questions three and four.

Statement on diversity. Wulff and Su each distributed their drafts of a definition for diversity. The committee took time to read each statement. Su explained his definition, saying that the first step he took was to define diversity as a value. In doing so he would separate diversity from affirmative action. Having defined it as a value, his statement would propose that the University take steps toward diversity. Wulff here asked what the purpose of this statement was. She said she understood that it was to be put before SACUA and the Senate Assembly in order to have a public statement that the faculty endorses.
Smith said that this had been the case, but it now appears that Dunn is working with SACUA to develop their own definition of diversity. Smith explained that the CMU statement will be included as part of the committee's report. Wulff added that if the Assembly accepts a report, that action does not publicly commit the faculty as a whole to a statement can be shared more widely. Smith explained that he would hope it is a report that is not just received, but adopted by Senate Assembly. He added that the CMU's next step would be to take this statement beyond Senate Assembly and put it before the divisions and units of the University. Smith stressed that the new president might find valuable statements like those drafted by Su and Wulff.

Regarding her statement, Wulff explained that she had read J. Su's statement and tried to narrow down his ideas into a more concise statement. Kuniyuki added that there must be a clear interpretation of this statement. The two statements are very different and are aimed at different audiences, Kuniyuki said. Smith added that he liked both statements. He suggested that Su and Wulff meet to draft a single statement. Wulff asked who the audience would be and what the purpose of the statement would be. Smith responded that the audience would be this institution. He said that the CMU needs to convince them that change is necessary and direct the University in a vision for that change. Smith stressed that as a University we need to achieve more than the current popular ideals of academic excellence, scholarship, and the cutting edge.

Salazar asked if the statement would be used as an introduction to the CMU report. Smith responded saying that the statement would be in the report as a sort of foreword telling what the CMU is about.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:33pm.

The next meeting was set for January 23 at 5:00 pm in 6065 Fleming.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Paul A. Wilhelm
Secretary to the committee