

**University Senate Diversity Committee Minutes**  
**Feb 11, 2020**

**Present:**

Dorothea Anagnostopoulos, Edith Barrett, Sandy Bushmich, Clarissa Ceglio, Casey Cobb, Alice Fairfield, Amy Howell (Chair), Christina Rivera, Margaret Rubega, Stephany Santos, Cindy Tian, Susana Ulloa.

**Minutes taken by:** Cindy Tian; **Proofread** by Amy Howell

**1. Self-introduction**

- 2. Approval of December 2019 Minutes:** moved by Margaret, seconded by Casey.  
Approved by all present.

**3. Wrap-up of Nathan Fuerst visit**

- a. Because only four at the meeting were present at Nathan's presentation, Amy gave a quick re-cap. Nathan had reported at the September Senate meeting that, among Storrs' incoming class, 41% are people of color. When further clarification was sought, the percentage for underrepresented minorities was 29%.
  - i. In discussing ways to make the full data more readily accessible in presentation, Nathan's showed a good example extracted from the University of Oregon. The committee agreed that it was important to give a more complete view to the Senate and trustees so that it is clearer where improvements need to be made.
  - ii. Another point was that the quality of the incoming class should not be judged only by SAT scores. While the admissions office does take a holistic look in the evaluation process, the University still reports SAT score prominently. What other indicators we as an institution can offer in recruiting efforts and in promoting the University? A suggestion was that we look at the unique characteristics of successful students enrolled in schools with low application rates.
- b. There was also discussion on graduation rates of minority students by the end of 4- and 6-yrs of study. It appears that minority students needed a longer time to complete the undergraduate education. Is this trend being addressed?
- c. A suggestion was made that the University build an interactive data display (Tableau, for example), so data could be easily accessed.

**4. Updates**

- a. Chief Diversity Officer (CDO) search: listening sessions are still being offered. 2-3 from the diversity committee have attended them.

- i. A question was raised if members of the CDO search committee had any special diversity/inclusion training. Amy: no special training except for the one that all search committee members attend. She noted that it was clear that CDO search committee members had broad backgrounds around issues of diversity and inclusion.
    - ii. A question was asked about the purpose of the listening sessions. There will not be public presentations by the candidates so questions are being gathered now. Amy proposed that the candidates be asked to meet with the diversity committee. The group agreed. The new CDO will start in July so “airport” interviews will likely be in April with finalists coming to campus in early May. The diversity committee should have specific questions by then.
    - iii. Another suggestion: the diversity committee should also meet with the candidates for the Provost position.
  - b. February Senate points of interest: Amy told the committee that 5 areas of faculty concerns are being analyzed by a new committee that is scheduled to be announced at the March senate meeting. These areas are:
    - 1. A Data Analysis by mutually agreed upon experts to check for systemic bias on the macro level;
    - 2. A Retention Study to analyze who leaves and why, and what incentivizes remaining;
    - 3. A Dual Career Study to analyze the impact of spousal/partner hires or failed hires on recruitment and retention;
    - 4. A Tenure and Promotion Study to gather information on tenure and promotion to associate professor and on promotion to full professor, including length of time from tenure to full professor status.
    - 5. Merit Study: to gather information on how representative departments distribute merit and the effects of those methods on salary equity.

## **5. Other business (not discussed)**

## **6. John Volin and Sarah Croucher**

- a. Showed reports of the last tenured and tenure-track faculty satisfaction survey by COACHE (2014-2015), from which no actions were taken (frequent changes of the provost was a contributing factor). The last survey had a 49% response rate, higher than peer and aspirant institutions for similar surveys. Response from faculty of color was low. The new job satisfaction survey by COACHE will include all faculty (non-tenure track included) and be benchmarked with

peers/aspirants. The results will be fully transparent. It will show areas of concerns, best/worst aspects, and if parameters have changed from 5 years ago.

- i. Question: can the data be separated by college/department?  
School/college specific questions are included. College data may be possible but not quite at the departmental level due to low numbers and protection of the identity of the responders.
- ii. There is a separate 3-year retention survey of tenured/tenure-track faculty members who left the university or who were offered jobs elsewhere but stayed. A 70% response rate is currently seen. A question was asked if this retention survey is coordinated with Human Resources (HR). They must be doing some exit interview. John: great idea, in fact a few faculty of color who left UCONN did agree to speak to the Provost. Sarah: an institutionalized exit survey should be available as a Provost process.
- iii. Sarah will send the report of the last survey to Amy.
- iv. John asked the diversity committee to send a few members to help look at the survey results over the summer.