COMMITTEE FOR A MULTICULTURAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of: November 11, 2008

Approved on: November 25, 2008


Chair Evans convened the meeting at 11:45AM.

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES
The minutes of the September 19th and October 14th meetings were approved.

DISCUSSION OF DIVERSITY SUMMIT AND REPORT
The committee agreed that the Diversity Summit was overall disappointing and did not address relevant concerns. Low faculty and student attendance hindered addressing issues and evaluating necessary measures.

Although the committee’s report was eventually distributed by SACUA, it was not distributed with the other Summit materials. The committee speculated that the report was not embraced because it did not connect with the Summit’s theme, “Outreach.” However, other presentations also strayed from the Summit’s theme. R. Holland cited the committee’s explicit recommendations as a reason for the report’s suppression. Chair Evans said that the committee could eliminate the recommendations, while still retaining its implications. C. Smith pointed out that it is important that the recommendations are implemented and suggested asking the Provost’s Office how specific recommendations are being applied.

To increase circulation of the report, R. Holland suggested sending the report to all University faculty. Through members’ access to faculty mailing lists, the committee could send the report to a many faculty members.

C. Smith suggested publishing an article in The Record. The committee agreed that releasing an article before the term’s end would be an effective way to release the report and draw attention to institutional barriers. Overall, the articles should emphasize faculty hiring as a vehicle for a diverse University, while drawing attention to the inefficiency of restricted access to data. Ideally, the article will relax accessibility to raw data and will be followed by at least one article in January.

It was noted that the report’s graphs should be clearer.
DISCUSSION OF O’NEIL LECTURE
R. O’Neil made specific recommendations about faculty hiring. The committee agreed that a strategic plan is needed to promptly implement R. O’Neil’s suggestions. There is interest in developing a project among states affected by propositions similar to Michigan’s Proposal 2. This project has been greeted with enthusiasm and administrative support. The committee agreed that the project should be headed by sitting faculty at the relevant universities, since they deal with internal issues and have ready access to campus resources.

The committee proceeded to discuss the confusion surrounding Proposal 2’s restrictions on forming pools versus hiring faculty.

ADOPTION AND AUTHORIZATION OF STUDY
The committee discussed pursuing a study on faculty hiring. Committee members remarked that institutional barriers and data timeliness have blocked past attempts. Goals of the study include:

- Obtaining information from each unit
- Eliminating institutional barriers and “update” excuses
- Determining actual number of diverse applicants, rather than diversity outreach attempts
- Determining racial and ethnic make up of interviewees and subsequent hires
- Separating domestic and international student data
- Obtaining detailed racial and ethnic breakdowns

Although the study will be an ongoing look at the University’s hiring process, the study will start with the Interdisciplinary Junior Faculty Initiative.

NEW BUSINESS
Mr. Walesby will be a guest before the term’s end.

ADJOURNMENT
Chair Evans adjourned the meeting at 12:55PM.