Chair Holland convened the meeting at 1:12pm

**Consideration of Minutes**
Minutes of October 15th were approved.

**Old Business**

1. SACMU representation on Diversity Council
   To integrate the activities of the Committee into the university diversity community Dr. Lester Monts had suggested, earlier in the year, that the Committee be represented on the Diversity Council. This suggestion had been accepted by consensus. It was agreed that the current Chair and one other volunteer member of the Committee should be nominated. K. Downing volunteered to represent SACMU on the Council. This was accepted by acclamation.

2. Oversight of minority affairs/multiculturalism
   Chair Holland was charged with finding out which senior UM administrator is responsible for multiculturalism. He found a website: [http://www.diversity.umich.edu/about/](http://www.diversity.umich.edu/about/). The person indicated on the website is L. Monts. Chair Holland said that L. Monts was a member of the committee and used to come to all the meetings. The original committee charge stated that SACMU reported to him, and the committee thought they were advisory to him. Chair Holland asked if other committee members would browse the website to see if his reading is correct. He will write to the Provost for clarification.

3. Report on Minority Faculty Participation
   Chair Holland began the discussion on the report on minority faculty hiring. He felt the most disturbing result that the report described was that African-American faculty numbers have not increased since 1994. The report contains some concrete recommendations intended to help remedy this situation. C. Smith reminded the committee that the report had been sent to SACUA and apparently discussed with the Provost though there has been no perceptible outcome. C. Smith suggested that the committee look through old minutes, because he thinks somebody came back with the message that the Provost was in agreement with the recommendations made by the report.
Chair Holland wrote a letter to SACUA as discussed in the last meeting, but he could not remember if he sent it. The letter asked SACUA what their response was to the report. He did not write a letter to the Provost because there is a quandary there. Consumed by remorse the chair undertook to remedy these two omissions.

4. Implementation of faculty diversity report recommendations

There was a lengthy and insightful discussion of strategies for increasing diversity on campus with the conclusion that the Committee should continue to work for greater diversity in the faculty.

Although the faculty diversity report documents the static status of the population of African-American faculty, it does not reveal the causes. The pattern seems to be that retention rather than recruitment leads to this situation. A suggestion had been made at the last meeting of the Committee that a survey of recently departed minority faculty be made to determine the reason for their moving elsewhere. C. Smith thought the committee should get somebody from ISR to conduct the survey. He felt that since we know the names of the people who left the UM and where they are now, it should not be hard. He suggested that it could be a questionnaire with telephone follow up.

Chair Holland said that when A. Walesby visited the Committee, he reported that the most common answers that individuals gave were better pay or better job. N. Mirkin brought up the fact that people might not tell the real reason they were leaving, in case they would at some point want to come back to UM. C. Smith felt that if the committee accepted this point of view, they would not be able to do anything about these issues. He felt that all would answer honestly if the committee marketed the survey as anonymous. Chair Holland felt that any survey done would have to be done anonymously. J. Lee suggested that the committee not do the survey through ISR, but through a third party company outside of the university. This way, participants could be assured that the survey would remain anonymous.

B. Frost said that when he was on the Research Policy Committee a few years ago looking at job titles for research track people, that committee identified a firm here locally that interfaced with ISR, meaning ISR helped with the survey instrument, but it was actually delivered by the third party contractor. C. Smith noted that SACUA would have to be able to come up with the money for such a process.

The committee then discussed how anonymous the surveys could actually be. C. Smith felt that the committee would need to know units, but Chair Holland did not know if we really needed that information. C. Smith believes that the situation is very different from unit to unit. B. Frost suggested that the survey could identify a unit but not the lowest level unit, i.e. not the department but the 20 or so units.

N. Mirkin added that if the committee wanted to continue planning the survey, it is necessary to find out if SACUA will support it. B. Frost said he would find that out.

Chair Holland said that the committee can write a formal letter later. What is needed is a draft of the survey itself. The committee needs to get somebody who knows about surveys to
help. The test population would be faculty or individuals who left UM to go to another institution over the last 10 years. C. Smith suggested not going over 10 years because it would become more difficult for tracking purposes. K. Downing asked if this would take into consideration all faculty that left or just the ones of color. J. Lee said the survey should get everybody’s impression of what the climate was like when they were here. B. Frost asked if those who did not get tenure would be left out, and Chair Holland, C. Smith, and N. Mirkin all agreed that everyone should be included. C. Smith suggested adding some mentoring questions to ask whether or not they were mentored adequately.

B. Frost felt that this was getting expensive. He felt that if the focus on minority faculty, it would not be that expensive and we could get a much richer portrait than the cold numbers of just a survey. Chair Holland explained that if it was limited to minority faculty, there would be no controls. There would be no way to compare levels of mentoring, etc. C. Smith said that if numbers needed to be kept down, the survey could have an age-gender matched control group. Chair Holland felt that if it was very important to reduce number, it should be done by time (# of years back), but the problem with that would be that it would get harder to find minorities.

J. Lee felt that before the committee gets too far involved in the whole survey idea, they need to talk about what they would do with the results. He stressed that they did not have to get into another situation where nobody looks at the results. C. Smith said that the survey results should definitely be published. J. Lee thought that it goes back to the questions that when there are concerns about diversity in faculty, who in the administration actually cares about it and will follow up? C. Smith then suggested the committee start looking for somebody to put the survey together.

**ACTION:** Committee decided on going through with the survey. Check into the private firm that B. Frost mentioned. B. Frost said he would contact Toni Antonucci from his previous committee and find out what that third party was.

**NEW BUSINESS**

1. **Publishing of Report on Minority Faculty Participation**

Chair Holland then turned the discussion to considering ways of publishing the report that the committee already has. C. Smith reminded the committee that there were two articles on the report already published, at least that he knows of. One was in the Chronicle of Higher Education, about a year ago. Also, J. Lee gave a presentation in Houston at the Sigma Xi meeting, and he had a good audience. J. Lee thought that an avenue to go with this report could be to look at what has happened since the release of the report in April 2008. So, the committee could examine what the hiring class looked like in the last two years. J. Lee proposed doing an update and then republishing the whole report. Once the information is obtained from HR, it would be relatively easy to do. J. Lee also added that he would be willing to do this.

The meeting ended at 2:15.
Respectfully submitted,
Namita Joseph, SACUA Student Support