Chair Holland convened the meeting at 12:00 noon.

**Consideration of Agenda and Minutes**

The agenda was approved as written. Minutes of November 20, 2009 were approved once typos are corrected.

**Old Business**

1. *SACMU representation on Diversity Council*

   Chair Holland talked with Crisca Bierwert, Chair of the Diversity Council (DC), and was told the DC would accept one member of SACMU as a member. Most of the members currently on the Diversity Council were appointed by their home unit. Chair Holland decided that the chair of SACMU should be the attending member of the DC. He was unable to attend the February 22 meeting due to an auto accident.

   According to the discussion between Chair Holland and C. Bierwert, the DC received, read and discussed the minority report put together by SACMU last year.

   There was a discussion regarding the fact that the university administration is not involving faculty in diversity issues. When Proposal 2 was on the ballot in the State of Michigan, the university administration did not outwardly oppose it. Faculty should have been involved in discussions around the state with various groups to dissuade people from voting yes.

   The Diversity Council website shows other organizations and committees that are related to diversity on campus.

   According to C. Smith, the outcome of the Diversity Summit held after Proposal 2 passed was that the various individuals in the university protected their own turf. No changes were made in the way the university handles diversity issues.
There was a discussion on the role that Chair Holland should take while a member of the Diversity Council. The committee agreed that he should insist on real diversity. It was agreed that there should be appropriate faculty representation on aspects of “Diversity, Inc.”, so that real diversity can be achieved on campus.

R. Iyer asked what obstacles are there to African-American and Hispanic students on campus. The discussion revolved around how those two groups, particularly African-American students, are funneled into the “Bridge Program” the summer prior to the term they begin regardless of their grades and/or SAT scores, particularly if they come from a lower income level. There was some disagreement regarding why students attending the Bridge Program fail as to whether the failure rate is higher due to the program itself or to the level of students sent there. According to C. Smith, there have been individuals, i.e. Billy Joe Evans, who have produced incredibly high achievers because the expectation of production was high and that was strongly communicated to the students.

2. Administrative Responsibility for Multiculturalism
   Chair Holland handed out an email from Lester Monts, the individual that the committee thought was responsible for multiculturalism at the university, stating that he is not the individual responsible, but that all seven vice provosts are responsible for different areas.

There was a discussion on the next step that SACMU should take. The committee determined that Chair Holland should approach the incoming Provost, Phil Hanlon, with a specific request for information.

3. Survey of the recently departed
   In order for a credible survey to be done, an outside agency working anonymously would needs to be hired. How will the survey be paid for? What agency? The agency used for the Research Policies survey or the agency used by Dearborn to survey students who had left campus. H. Abadeh will send the name of the agency to Chair Holland when it is found.

The discussion then centered around who would be surveyed – only minorities, only African-American’s, individuals who did not reach tenure?

How will the names of these individuals be uncovered? J. Lee has the data from the past ten years and can provide the names of individuals who have left. Then perhaps a student working in the SACUA office can Google the name for the individual’s current location.

4. Minority Faculty Report Update
   H. Abadeh took the report to the Dearborn SACUA chair and was told to take it to SACUA. She’s not sure whether she should take to the Ann Arbor SACUA or to the Dearborn
Faculty Senate. It was suggested that perhaps this committee could meet with the corresponding committees on both the Flint and Dearborn campus for a discussion of similarities and differences on the three campuses.

The SACUA office will obtain the data needed to update the Report.

J. Lee will send a clean copy of the report to be posted on the Faculty Governance website.

**NEW BUSINESS**

N. Mirkin announced that the Academic Women’s Caucus will present the first annual Rhetaugh G. Dumas Progress in Diversifying Award to the Dept. of Psychology this year. She would like a resolution given to SACUA to support the award. N. Mirkin will give Chair Holland the information so that it can be presented to SACUA.

K. Kearfott believes that all faculty should be thinking of new ways to recruit minority faculty either on the Ann Arbor or other campuses. What are some “broad” programs that can be used to recruit and/or retain? The ADVANCE program was discussed. There were no data to support the success of the program. K. Kearfott pointed out that it did develop different assessment tools and developed training programs for recruiting committees to use. There was a short discussion on where minority faculty come from and if there are pipelines for them to come through.

The meeting ended at 1:18 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Linda Carr, SACUA Support