Cultural Diversity Committee
MINUTES
April 8, 2003
3:05-3:45 p.m.

Present: Barry Chung, Doris Derby, Paula Eubanks, Christine Gallant, LaLoria Konata, Chuck Marvin, Lois Mohr, Linda Nelson, Cora Presley, Tim Renick, Debra Snell, Susan Talburt, Maria Valeri-Gold, Tracy Van Voris, Leslie Williams.
Absent: Carol Carver, Marion Etzel, Valerie Fennell, Chip Gallagher, Tazar Gissentanner, Steve Harmon, John Peterson, Steve Rapp, Joe Rau, Fernando Reati, Mary Ann Romski, Kimberly Smith, Susan Walcott, Sally Wallace.

The minutes were approved as read.

Christine Gallant reported the action that has been taken on our past approved motions and committee reviews. Our February proposal on the wording of the questions for the administrative evaluations relating to faculty diversity has been approved by the Executive Committee, and sent to the Faculty Affairs Committee for immediate implementation. In addition, she has sent a memo to all college deans asking them to have these questions added to the forms of their chairs and directors; and all have agreed.

Our March proposal for our amendment of Article VII. Section 16 of the Senate Bylaws (committee restructuring) was approved by the Statutes and Bylaws Committee, and sent to the Executive Committee. And the draft Pilot Mentoring Program for minority faculty that we have reviewed at two meetings has been sent to the Provost. He has reviewed it, and will submit it to the Deans’ Group on April 16, and then start it through the Senate for ratification.

The annual report from the Affirmative Action Office on the 2002-2003 Affirmative Action Plan for the University was given by Chaneta Forts from that office; but first AAO Director Linda Nelson prefaced the report by updating the committee on current actions being undertaken by her office. Eight GSU employees now have pending AAO cases involving complaints of discrimination in pay and termination. This involves an investigation by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs. There will be conciliation attempts to resolve the cases, but they could go as high as the Department of Justice. The process of review will take several months at least. Christine inquired if any of the cases involved faculty, and Linda said they did not. Linda added that she will keep the Committee informed of the review’s progress.

Chaneta then reported on the 2002-2003 Affirmative Action Plan, and gave an overview of the Affirmative Office Office and how it gets its data. She also gave an overview of the minorities and women on campus. There are no underutilized job groups for the whole campus for minorities for 2002-2003. While this is true primarily for staff, faculty are more borderline. Chaneta distributed a table of underrepresented tenure-track faculty in each college according to minority as of Fall 2002 (included below). Linda reminded the committee that her office looks at other issues in diversity in addition to numbers, and holds workshops and training in diversity education.

Discussion followed about the table on minority faculty. Cora Presley said that the table needed to include the total number of faculty to be able to interpret the data on minority faculty. She added that there were also questions that needed to be addressed in relation to these figures. Is there over-utilization of women and minorities in certain rank-levels and fields? Are minorities concentrated in certain departments? As an example, she noted that the African American Studies Department accounts for six of the 25 black faculty in Arts and Sciences. She also suggested that there should be tracking of non-compliance by departments and any investigations of departments.
Susan Talburt reported on her subcommittee’s work on the Campus Attitude Survey. She said that they preferred not to use a computer survey, because 1) the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) doesn’t have the software for it ready yet and is unsure when it will be installed, 2) response rates are significantly lower with internet surveys, and 3) confidentiality may be an issue for respondents via computer. In addition, the subcommittee is concerned that OIR does not tape record focus group interviews, and is investigating other means of securing such data. Overall, at this stage, the subcommittee is leaning toward the use of a paper survey in addition to tape-recorded focus groups. The subcommittee is exploring a reputable and widely-used survey designed by Sue Rankin. Susan has contacted Dr. Rankin, who is an administrator at Pennsylvania State University, and also an outside consultant on LGBT issues. Dr. Rankin has forwarded a multi-stage proposal that includes surveys, focus group interviews, analysis, and follow-up plans based on results. The cost of all phases of her services is $36,000. The subcommittee is investigating portions of her work that could be used as well as other options.

Christine said that in conversations with John Peterson about the Provost’s financial support of the survey and the role of the OIR in conducting the survey as opposed to mailing paper surveys, OIR Director Michael Moore reported that the Rankin survey preferred by the subcommittee was 30 pages long and would cost about $10,000; and that the Provost had indicated strongly that funding for this amount would not be available during the present budget crunch. Susan replied with emphasis that her subcommittee had never made any request of OIR; and that she had only had a verbal meeting with its Director. She added that any such discussion with the Provost about the subcommittee and the survey was premature. In any case, according to OIR a computer survey is not now possible because the software for it isn’t ready yet. Considerable discussion followed.

Linda suggested that perhaps the subcommittee should consider ways of securing funding from external sources. Possibly there are local opportunities for funding such LGBT surveys. Barry Chung noted that the American Psychological Foundation has awards possible for such surveys. Susan mentioned that the Sue Rankin Foundation might have possible funding, but emphasized that all of this discussion was premature since the subcommittee had not considered the issue yet. Linda noted that before any further time is spent planning ways to run the survey, we need to know from the start about its budget and funding.

The committee agreed with this assessment, and adjourned.

**Underrepresented Faculty**
Full-time Tenure Track Instructional Faculty:
Fall 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Am. Ind.</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AYSPS</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Hum. Sci.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>