IR Minorities

2012/214

FE 15 '88

Holley Report

STEERING COMMITTEE ON MINORITY AFFAIRS

University of Wisconsin-Madison

FINAL REPORT

November 1987

NON-CIRCULATING

STEERING COMMITTEE ON MINORITY AFFAIRS

Charles Holley, Chair
Andrea-Teresa Arenas
Amy Bowles
Kathleen Cantu
Stephen Casanova
Rory SnowArrow Fausett
Victoria Garcia
Paul Ginsberg
Al Hampton
Wendy Ho
Adee Horn
Victor Jew
Gerda Lerner
Anne MacNabb
Robert March
Rob McGinnis
Rhonda Norsetter
Hiram Puig-Lugo
Rebecca Ramirez
Joseph Renville
Delisa Scott
Linda Stitt
Mark Wenner
Craig Werner
Franklin Wilson

SUBCOMMITTEE LIST

Recruitment and Retention of Minority Students

Mark Wenner, Chair
Akbar Ally
Kathleen Cantu
Celia Colon
Claudia Edgar
Doug Johnson
Walter Lane
Dorothy Nairne
Rhonda Norsetter
Rebecca Ramirez
Joseph Renville

Recruitment and Retention of Minority Faculty and Staff

Victor Jew, Chair
Rhonda Allen
Stephen Casanova
Ethel Cormier
Rory Fausett
Benjamin Rodriguez
Franklin Wilson

Development of a Multicultural Center

Charles Holley, Chair
Paul Ginsberg
Robert March
Linda Stitt
David Wright

Ethnic Studies and Mandatory Course Requirement

Stephen Casanova, Chair
Eduardo Bonilla
Amy Bowles
Peggy Choy
Mario Compean
Wendy Ho
Chibu Lagman
Gerda Lerner
Aurene Martin
Jeff Nichols
Craig Werner

Sexism and Racism Procedures with Possible Grievance Mechanisms

Solomon Ashby, Chair
Victoria Garcia
Jerilyn Grignon
Anne MacNabb
Nellie McKay
Kristina Rasmussen
Mary Rouse
Susan Smith
Gail Snowden

Orientation for New Students

Andrea-Teresa Arenas, Chair
Amy Bowles
Alejandra Elenas
Paul Ginsberg
Edna Quinones
Delisa Scott
Linda Stitt

Community Outreach

Hiram Puig-Lugo, Chair
Roxanne Allison
Reverend Tenolian Bell
Caroline Dejoie
Kris Goodwill
Sam Gupta
Demi McGinley
Luis Pinero
Craig Werner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....1
2. RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF MINORITY STUDENTS.....5
3. RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF ETHNIC MINORITY FACULTY AND STAFF.....11
4. MULTICULTURAL CENTER.....64
5. ETHNIC STUDIES AND MANDATORY COURSE REQUIREMENT.....66
6. SEXISM AND RACISM PROCEDURES WITH POSSIBLE GRIEVANCE MECHANISMS.....70
7. ORIENTATION FOR NEW STUDENTS.....83
8. COMMUNITY OUTREACH.....88

Chapters 2-8 are the reports of the subcommittees listed on the previous page.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This report is the product of months of hard work and dedication of the Steering Committee on Minority Affairs and its component subcommittees. It culminates a process started with the initiative of the Minority Coalition to address the issue of racism on campus. This initiative led to the formation of the Steering Committee on Minority Affairs, charged by Acting Vice Chancellor Phillip Certain with the following tasks:

1. identify new procedures or programs to improve the recruitment and retention of minority students;
2. offer a proposal for the development of a multicultural center;
3. establish a committee on racism and sexism;
4. make suggestions for development of cultural pluralism courses to refine the proposal that all students be required to take courses in this area;
5. refine a proposal for the orientation of minority students;
6. recommend mechanisms for promoting and improving the involvement of the Madison community in making the University a place of comfort for people of color.

The Steering Committee on Minority Affairs first convened on July 30, 1987. It immediately appointed seven subcommittees (including an additional subcommittee on the recruitment and retention of minority faculty and staff), composed of steering committee members of the various minority student organizations and university faculty and staff. The steering committee and the subcommittee members were representative of the relevant programs, departments and minority communities. Five minority student groups--Asian Americans, Afro-Americans, Chicanos, Native Americans and Puerto Ricans--were represented on the steering committee.

Rationale

The University of Wisconsin-Madison has a national reputation as a leader in many disciplines in both teaching and research. It has been and is training leaders in the professions, politics, science, business, agriculture, and education. Its long record of outreach through the Wisconsin Idea has given it not only national but international stature.

Yet in regard to promoting a truly multi-cultural community of learning, UW-Madison has fallen far short of its stated goals and ideals. This is manifest in the low percentages of people of color among faculty, staff and students, despite decades of remedial effort; in the low retention rates of minority group students and faculty; and in the content of the UW-Madison curriculum.

The University community is at a crucial point in its history, when it has an opportunity, as we approach the decade of the 1990's, to reaffirm in positive, constructive ways its commitment to people of color, and to develop a truly pluralistic multi-cultural community. Such a community would be based not only on what we share in common but, equally importantly, on the unique contributions each cultural and ethnic group makes to the whole.

The problems listed above--minority group student and faculty recruitment, retention and leadership and curricular content--are intimately linked. Only where there is respect for the intellectual contributions and potential of multi-cultural populations manifest in every aspect of the institution's function will persons of minority cultures feel comfortable and able to develop intellectually and to fully contribute to the academic community.

The curriculum of the UW-Madison by and large reflects the traditional ethnocentric view of the United States, which focuses on the Euro-American experience. Excluded and left invisible are people of color whose labor and sacrifices have been and continue to be neglected by the majority tradition. Thus the U.S. educational system has perpetuated and reinforced the stereotypes and prejudices that have historically permeated the society by failing to include the experiences and contributions of the various ethnic minority groups (i.e. the Chicanos, Afro-Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans and Puerto Ricans) and/or by depicting minorities in a negative light.

Euro-American majority students are equally educationally deprived in a serious way. They will have to live in a world in which people of color are the vast majority, a world which has in fact become a global village. The ability to be conversant with the cultures of people different from themselves is a necessary tool for all educated persons, whether their careers be in government, business, communications or the sciences. Similarly, sensitivity to and knowledge of the contributions of the many ethnic and racial groups within our society are needed skills in all professions. Insofar as majority students are inadequately exposed to such knowledge and skill training, their education must be considered inadequate.

If this University is to continue to uphold its national reputation, it must now meet the urgent challenge to equip its students to deal with the needs of the 21st century. A strong Ethnic Studies program and curriculum will attract minority students and help make this institution truly reflect the racial, ethnic, gender and class diversity of this country. Such curriculum will not only broaden the perspectives of all students, but will offer new angles of vision to standard topics and enrich the intellectual life on campus.

It is with these objectives in mind that we propose the following recommendations for enactment and implementation.

Recommendations

The reports are the product of the individual subcommittees, but represent a comprehensive proposal to combat the problem of racism within the University system. It is important to note that the reports reflect the consensus of the Minority Coalition as well as the Steering Committee. Although the reports are a product of the individual subcommittees, the different reports are integrally related and must be considered in their entirety. Selective attention to some of the reports at the expense of others will not address the pervasive and complex problem of racism as it exists on this campus. The following points are the essence of this proposal:

I. The University needs to appoint a Vice-Chancellor of Ethnic Minority Affairs/Affirmative Action to act as an institutional officer responsible for minority and affirmative action affairs. It is the recommendation of this Committee that this Vice-Chancellor appoint an individual to have primary responsibility for ethnic minority affairs and another individual to have primary responsibility for affirmative action matters. It is imperative that the highest priority be given to the appointment of a person of color to this position of Vice-Chancellor.

II. The University must take immediate action to ameliorate the problems that plague the recruitment and retention of ethnic minority students. Implementation must include the following steps:

1. Delineate clear lines of authority that control ethnic minority support programs. Only then will the University be able to develop sound management plans and allocate adequate resources to make these programs a success.
2. Develop appropriate incentives to encourage faculty and staff commitment to, and commitment toward, the needs of minority students.

III. The Chancellor must explicitly and forcefully establish goals to recruit, hire and retain ethnic minority faculty members. These goals will be reached through the following actions:

1. All units must develop a substantial remedial affirmative action program with budgeting authority to guarantee "full utilization" of University resources by the year 2000.
2. Each college/school must develop affirmative action strategies in consultation with departmental members and the OAAC.
3. The University needs to create an Office of the Vice Chancellor of Ethnic Minority Affairs and Affirmative Action to act as an institutional ombudsman on affirmative action affairs.
4. The Office of Affirmative Action and Compliance must actively monitor the implementation of affirmative action programs and report its findings directly to the Vice Chancellor of Affirmative Action.

IV. The University must establish an investigative body--composed of faculty, minority staff and students--to conduct fact finding and to address comprehensively the concerns of minority non-instructional staff.

V. The University needs to establish a Multicultural Center to house ethnic minority student organizations, provide meeting facilities, and foster a receptive social environment supportive of ethnic minority students on this campus. The Vice Chancellor in charge of Academic Affairs and the Chairman of the Steering Committee on Minority Affairs shall appoint a Board of Directors to oversee the development, budgeting and implementation of the Center.

VI. The University must implement a mandatory six credit ethnic studies course requirement; and create and develop various Ethnic Studies Programs. These measures will recognize the contributions of ethnic minorities of American society and promote cross-cultural understanding and respect among the entire student body.

VIII. The University must initiate a multi-faceted orientation program in order to increase the level of comfort of students of color and combat racism on campus. Educational programs will be designed to reach all members of the University community.

IX. The University needs to reach out to the minority community in Madison. It should establish and support an Office of Minority Affairs housed in the Multicultural Center. This office will develop and coordinate programs to encourage interaction between the University and the minority community. Enhanced interaction and cooperation is essential for the development of a solid relationship based on mutual trust and support.

The prompt implementation of the recommendations contained in this report is considered to be a priority of the Steering Committee. In order to facilitate and monitor the progress of this report, an on-going Steering Committee on Minority Affairs should be appointed. This Steering Committee should be a smaller version of the present Steering Committee and should have approximately the same ratio of minority and majority students, faculty and staff.

MINORITY STUDENT RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Introduction

The charge of this subcommittee is to identify weaknesses in the University's minority recruitment/retention efforts and make appropriate recommendations for improved performance and goal attainment. Minority student representation at the UW-Madison campus, at least proportional to statewide minority high school population (6.5%--1981 Senate Faculty Report), and retention rates commensurate with those of majority students (60-65%) are deemed important since higher education in the United States remains the surest means of achieving upward social mobility and preparing a citizenry for the challenges of a post industrial society.

Underrepresented minority groups (Blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans) run the risk of becoming a permanent, marginalized underclass if they have limited access to an adequate education, cannot be motivated, and lack fair opportunities for advancement. As a world class university and one known for its liberal sentiments, UW-Madison cannot waver in this important social mission.

General Remarks

Through interviews, perusal of reports, and personal experiences, the subcommittee as a whole believes that minority/disadvantaged programs are not functioning as well as would be expected for the following three reasons:

First, an attitude persists on campus on the part of high level administrators, and faculty in general, that minority affairs and the performance of minority students are relatively unimportant and peripheral in the day to day operation of the university. This lack of commitment and active concern translates itself into a multitude of fragmented, underfunded, understaffed, poorly monitored minority/disadvantaged programs, designed more to appease minority constituencies and outside reviewers than to excel in their assigned missions. In the classroom and departmental committees some professors help perpetuate, in subtle ways, negative stereotypes about minorities that contribute to an uncomfortable learning/work environment, an air of mistrust, and social alienation for students and faculty of color.

Second, many of the key personnel in minority/disadvantaged programs lack a "passionate commitment" to attack perceived problems aggressively, to advocate relentlessly on the behalf of student interests, and to build strategic alliances with sympathetic administrators and influential faculty members.

Third, there are many things that should be done but remain unfeasible because of budgetary and legislative concerns. This is particularly the case in the area of financial aid, both undergraduate and graduate. The subcommittee strongly urges political lobbying and creative fund-raising to relax these budget constraints.

Recommendations

1. General

1.1 Recommend that the Chancellor communicate, in strong terms, intolerance of any form of racial bigotry toward or negative stereotyping of minority members of the university community. Furthermore, in an effort to create a better racial climate, the subcommittee urges a concerted human relations campaign involving both nationally known race relations experts and local minority faculty/staff/students designed to sensitize the majority population at the university on racism. Mandatory participation for all faculty, senior staff and officers of student organizations is suggested.

1.2 Recommend that the university administration respect, support, and embrace the various minority cultures and heritages through viable ethnic study programs, campus events, integration of minority perspectives into humanities and social science curricula, and encouragement of scholarly research in these areas. The aim should be to provide true multi-cultural awareness and universal education and not perpetuate Euro-ethnocentricity.

1.3 Recommend greater recognition, tangible incentives, and moral support for faculty and staff providing one-to-one counseling to minority students. The provision of warm, personal attention to needy students is currently not being rewarded or encouraged. One proposal would be to have each department designate one or two professors with the best teaching records and recognized interpersonal skills to serve as minority counselors. They would advise on academic and personal matters and follow-up on any course of action decided upon. In return for this service the faculty person should be provided with some appropriate form of reward and have such community service duly recognized during tenure or promotional review. Similarly, academic staff should be recognized for such service at annual performance review.

1.4 Strongly recommend that the mission and structure of the Office of Assistant Vice Chancellor be reviewed and evaluated by an independent management consultant, focusing specifically on budgetary authority and control, program management and evaluation, and advocacy role. Alternative structures or modes of organization, namely partial centralization with dual reporting lines, should be fully considered with the objective being to maximize effectiveness. Secondly, the committee recommends the formation of an advisory board to the office of Assistant Vice Chancellor, constituted of minority faculty/staff/student representatives whose task would be to set broad policy guidelines, review program progress, and actively participate in the screening and selection of the head of the office. The aim is to make the office accountable to a broader on-campus constituency.

1.5 Recommend that all future studies, reports, and programs dealing with the recruitment and retention of minority students focus on underrepresented minority groups (Blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans, and recently arrived Asian groups such as the Hmong).

2. Undergraduate Recruitment

2.1 Strongly recommend that a concerted effort be launched to increase minority faculty to serve as role models and to bolster or create ethnic study programs and courses to serve as selling points in recruitment.

2.2 Strongly recommend adequate funding and staffing for pre-college programs as well as timely resolution and notification of budget appropriations in order to facilitate long-range planning and good management.

2.3 Strongly recommend increased resources (staff and budget) for the recruitment office as well as retention of ethnic specific titles and responsibilities. The staff is hardworking but desperately needs more resources to intensify and expand its activities. Also past experience has shown that prospective students are more open to recruiters of their own racial/ethnic background.

2.4 Strongly recommend the specific targeting of high minority student concentrations in an expanding radius from Madison and the development of a master plan to reach these communities, including parents, counselors, and religious/social organizations. Populations such as the children of migrant workers should be approached and "higher risk" students, i.e. lower class rank percentiles, should be recruited contingent on more support services and in coordination with the Academic Advancement Program (AAP).

2.5 Strongly urge that in the development of a systematic, long-range recruitment plan, i.e the "master plan for the next 5 years," significant input be sought from relevant line personnel and that the plan contain yearly quantitative goals, new strategies, and monitoring components, and yet be sufficiently flexible to accommodate the unique features of the communities served and the specific strengths of the recruiters and their contacts.

2.6 Urge accountability through systematic monitoring and evaluation of the various minority support programs with the aim of determining returns, student yields, etc.

2.7 Encourage more in-depth and continued coordination of recruitment between AAP and recruiters.

2.9 Encourage more coordination and information update between the financial aid office and recruiters especially in light of the recent changes in federal financial aid programs. Specifically, urge that recruiters be trained to roughly calculate "financial need" of a prospective student under the new federal rules.

2.10 Disaggregate the ethnic codings on registration forms especially in regards to Hispanics (Cuban-American, Mexican-American/Chicano/a, Puerto Rican, Central and South American) and Asians (have to consult with Pacific Asian's Women Alliance for suggested listing) into more discreet groupings. The purpose is to assist various on-campus minority student organizations in recruitment and to get a more accurate picture of how subgroups are faring in terms of recruitment and retention.

2.11 In all outgoing, recruitment-oriented publications change the racial classification black on detachable return forms to include of African descent or Afro-American. Several black students have registered complaints that the mere color classification implies that black Americans have no ancestral home or culture compared to the listings provided for the other ethnic minorities.

2.12 Encourage the use of enrolled minority students whenever feasible (holidays) to recruit in respective communities. However, caution is urged not to overtax the enrolled student.

2.13 Encourage the use of ethnic studies conferences and minority cultural events for recruitment purposes.

3. Undergraduate Retention

3.1 Recommend that the faculty "mentor" program for all minority students who care to participate be revitalized.

3.2 Establish an information kiosk at the proposed multi-cultural center that will have a permanent display of all relevant minority/ disadvantaged support services (counselors names, phones, tutors, etc.) and condensed flyers with the same information for distribution.

3.3 Design a campus wide peer counseling program for all minority students on a voluntary basis. Counselors, who should be minority students of junior, senior, or graduate classification and in good academic standing, will be screened and trained to provide limited academic help, to make referrals to appropriate university offices and programs, and provide informal social support.

3.4 The Academic Advancement Program (AAP) should be given greater institutional autonomy from the College of Letters and Science but still maintain its affiliation with the school, given its high concentration of minority students. The primary focus of the program should be to service AAP students and this can be better served if AAP were housed outside L&S. The subcommittee, nonetheless, recognizes the positive benefit of majority students being exposed to minorities in prominent positions and suggests that the college hire more minority deans to fill this role. Under the present setup, the staff is simply overtaxed. Secondly, the subcommittee recommends that AAP be assigned to larger physical quarters in order to accommodate a library and study/tutoring room. This additional space would greatly benefit students in the program. Consideration should also be given to the idea of housing AAP in the multi-cultural center.

3.5 Increase support for minority coordinators in various schools and where necessary hire more staff to improve the coordinator to student ratio. More than anything else the existence of this service needs to be publicized.

3.6 Encourage admissions committees for all upper level (junior-senior) professional/major programs to develop a policy sensitive to special cases of promising minority students.

Graduate/Professional Recruitment

4.1 Add resources and intensify current outreach efforts especially on Eastern seaboard, the Southwest and at traditionally black colleges in the South.

Graduate/Professional Retention

5.1 Academically, minority students seem to be holding their own in general but problems with continued financial support may have contributed to several dropouts and may make UW-Madison less attractive to prospective students.

Financial Aid--Undergraduate

6.1 Recommend that the number of fee remissions for out-of-state residents be increased from the current 108 and that more grant funds be made available to in-state freshmen. Fee remissions are awarded to the most needy non-residents and make a substantial difference in meeting a non-resident student's remaining unmet needs after all federal aid programs have been utilized. The fee remission also helps to reduce the substantial loan debt that many non-resident students face.

6.2 Recommend that funding be provided to the Office of Students Financial Aids to develop outreach programs and resources such as UW-Madison specific video tapes and brochures in appropriate languages to be used to "de-mystify" the financial aids process for parents of minority students, encourage these families to engage in early financial planning, and to present the full array of options available in financing college education. The target population would be parents with children in first or second year of high school.

Financial Aid--Graduate

6.3 The subcommittee realizes that the principal source of financial support for graduate minority students, the Advanced Opportunity Fellowship Program (AOF), is severely strained and recommends the following:

i. Timely notification of AOF awards to incoming students. Many students may want to attend Madison but because of late notification may have opted to attend another school solely on the basis of financial aid.

ii. Guarantee AOF for the average time that is required for the student to finish his or her program.

iii. Seek firm collaborative agreements with departments to sponsor an AOF recipient making satisfactory progress for a year or two in order to provide the student with valuable practical experience as a teaching or research assistant and at the same time provide budgetary relief to the program. Also notify continuing AOF students much earlier so that in case they are not able to renew with AOF there will still be time to apply for departmental assistance.

iv. Request an increased appropriation for AOF from the State Legislature and mount a lobbying campaign to that end.

v. Mount a major capital fund drive for both graduate and needy undergraduates. The University Foundation could be of assistance in designing and launching such a campaign. Minority alumni, Wisconsin businesses, and philanthropic foundations should be prime targets.

vi. Urge flexibility in allowing AOF recipients experiencing severe financial strain or family emergencies to seek outside employment.

D. Amendment (Approved in Full Committee on October 21, 1987)

Recommend that several of the future hires in the recruitment and admission area be bilingual in order to converse easily with parents of prospective students. This ability is seen as a definite plus in explaining the intricacies of financial aid, for example, and in making parents generally more relaxed.

References:

Clewell, B. C. and M. Ficklen, "Effective Institutional Practices for Improving Minority Retention in Higher Education," Journal of College Admissions, summer 1987.

Crist, Alan, "The Role of the Undergraduate Minority Recruiter in Selected Public Midwestern Universities," Ph.D. dissertation (unpublished), UW-Madison, 1987.

Wilson, Reginald, "Evaluation of the UW System Minority and Disadvantaged Student Programs," American Council on Education, September 1986.

University Documents:

UW-Admission Policy, Revised April 6 and May 4, 1987 (effective until 1990).

Committee on the Academic Affairs of Minority/Disadvantaged Students: Annual Report 1984-5, Faculty Doc. 632, February 3, 1986 (Cora Marrett, Chair).

Committee on the Academic Affairs of Minority/Disadvantaged Students: Annual Report 1986-7 (Truman Lowe, Chair).

Guidelines for the Undergraduate Minority Retention Grants, 1986-7.

"Implementation of Planning the Future Resolutions: Progress Report to the UW System Board of Regents," July 9, 1987.

RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF ETHNIC MINORITY FACULTY AND STAFF AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

The subcommittee on the recruitment and retention of ethnic minority faculty and staff was established on July 30, 1987 as a subcommittee of the Steering Committee on Minority Affairs. This subcommittee was charged to identify the institutional barriers to the recruitment and retention of ethnic minority faculty and staff at the University of Wisconsin-Madison as well as identify new procedures or programs to improve recruitment and retention. From July 30 through October 1987, this seven-member subcommittee conducted fact-finding in both archival documentary evidence and interviews with relevant administrators and deans. We received the cooperation of individuals from the Vice-Chancellor's office, the Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis, the Office of Affirmative Action and Compliance and from Deans John R. Palmer, Leo Walsh and E. David Cronon.[1] Our research on minority faculty was guided by three questions: What are the historical precedents for ethnic minority affirmative action policies? What is the current state of affirmative action policies regarding ethnic minority faculty? What should be done to help the recruitment and retention of ethnic minority faculty at the University of Wisconsin-Madison?

This report is divided into four sections: 1) Introduction, 2) Key Historical Precedents for Faculty Involvement in Affirmative Action, 3) The Current Situation in Ethnic Minority Faculty Affirmative Action (composed of a narrative discussion and statistical tables) and 4) The Subcommittee's Recommendations.

On April 1, 1974, the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin-Madison declared "its support for vigorous implementation of the University's

---

Endnotes begin on page 61.

program of affirmative action in hiring women and members of minority groups."[2] It has been thirteen years since that resolution on affirmative action was passed. In that time the University has not lived up to its commitment to a "vigorous implementation" of minority faculty recruitment and retention.

Ethnic minority faculty recruitment and retention presently is ineffective. The commitment to reaching affirmative action hiring goals is anemic in many departments. Anecdotal evidence from faculty and administrators indicate that affirmative action is a very low priority for many faculty search-and-screen committees. The mediocre record of actual minority faculty hirings does significant disservice to the prestigious reputation of the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

This university is not alone in its poor affirmative action track record. Other universities are not living up to their promises to minorities. According to data collected by the American Council on Education, majority persons continue to occupy 90 percent of the total number of available college teaching positions in the nation.[3] The report also noted, "[i]n contrast, black faculty representation has fallen from 4.3 percent of the [national] total in 1979 to 4.2 percent in 1981. Faculty members from other minority groups have fared only slightly better."[4]

We recognize that the University of Wisconsin-Madison has taken some small steps to deal with ethnic minority faculty recruitment problems. Just this year, "[i]n anticipation of new faculty positions recommended by the Governor, the University announced that monies would be added to the base budget of each department making an Affirmative Action teaching faculty hire before February 1, 1988, in recognition of competitive costs associated with recruiting women and minorities."[5]

Nevertheless much remains to be done and should be done. The University of Wisconsin-Madison should strive to lead in the area of faculty affirmative action, just as it sets the pace in other areas of academic endeavor. The imperative to do so must be keenly felt. According to a recent assessment by Reginald Wilson, the director of the Office of Minority Concerns of the American Council on Education, minorities constitute the majority of public school students in our major cities and by "the year 2010, one-third of the American population and the workforce, will be minority." Professor Wilson continues:

> This would, at first glance, seem to be a propitious time for institutions to move toward racial and ethnic parity. The demographics are favorable. Minorities of college-going age are increasing while the white 18 - 24-year-old population is declining. The post-WW II 'baby-boom' generation is aging, and it is estimated that, of those in the professoriate, over 50% will be replaced by the end of the century. Despite these facts, the opposite is happening; the presence of minorities in higher education is still declining.[6]

A recent University of Wisconsin System report to the Regents recognized the critical importance of minority faculty hiring: "While the matter of access to institutions in higher education has become a major issue for minority students, it has become an even more exigent concern in regard to faculty."[7]

Why are minority faculty important at the University of Wisconsin - Madison? For graduate students of color, the mentoring offered by minority faculty equips them to survive in a majority-dominated academic setting. According to a staff member of our subcommittee who also is a doctoral dissertator, minority faculty persons were able to shed light on the unique demands placed on people of color in the Academy. They told him that minority faculty members are expected to be virtuoso performers in the Academy. Beyond the usual vigorous demands of scholarship and research they frequently must be model teachers, effective and dynamic minority counselors, outstanding

community human relations directors, respected role models, and superior scholars all at the same time. These burdens are often unrecognized by their colleagues and are assumed in addition to regular committee work and research obligations. "I never received that kind of insight from my white advisers -- simply because they never had to deal with these issues. They never faced it so they were never sensitive to it so they never shared it. But the minority faculty did." For both majority and minority students, these faculty members bring different perspectives to an otherwise homogeneous environment. According to the UW System report to the Regents, "There is a need for all students to see minorities as staff, faculty and administrators."[8]

The value of minority faculty has been recognized at other institutions. At The Ohio State University,

> The entire academic enterprise has been strengthened by enlarging our repertoire of academic programs and academic support activities, by increasing the diversity of recognized academic accomplishments, and by providing academic role models for our students and junior faculty.[9]

The University of Wisconsin - Madison should not deprive its students of the cultural diversity and the unique perspective on the American experience that minority faculty bring.

The subcommittee on minority faculty and staff recruitment and retention has devoted three months of fact finding and research to this problem. We would be trivializing the issue if we were to presume to offer a complete analysis and sure-fire solutions after such a short period of time. The problem of ethnic minority faculty recruitment and retention has been with the University for many years. It cannot be solved by a committee that was asked to finish its final report after only three months of inquiry. We therefore submit this report as an interim one, strongly recommending that a permanent standing committee be established to review our recommendations and their

potential implementation, conduct further research as necessary, and monitor closely efforts at minority faculty recruitment and retention. Time constraints prevented us from adequately dealing with minority staff issues. We include a brief statement of problems faced by minority non-instructional academic staff. Their concerns are equally pressing as faculty issues and should be addressed by the standing committee just proposed. We submit this interim report calling for the recognition that affirmative action in minority faculty recruitment, hiring and retention has witnessed enough resolutions and minimal efforts. What we need now are political will, leadership, imagination and muscle.

SECTION II

KEY HISTORICAL EVENTS IN FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

The faculty's recognition of the need for and interest in achieving a balanced workforce through the formulation and implementation of an affirmative action program are of relatively recent origin. On April 1, 1974 the Faculty Senate adopted a resolution recommending a "vigorous implementation of the University's program of affirmative action, and made recommendations to department faculties, deans, and administrators regarding strategies for identifying and recruiting women and minorities for faculty positions.[10]

The faculty expanded its involvement in this campus's affirmative action programs in February, 1975 when it gave approval for the establishment of a Committee on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action in Faculty Employment (CONAFE). The stated responsibilities of CONAFE include: (1) monitoring the affirmative action activities of academic units and committees involved in areas related to faculty recruitment and retention; (2) consulting with and making suggestions to appropriate units and committees on matters of policy and procedures in the area of affirmative action; and (3) submitting to the Faculty Senate annually a report on the composition of the faculty, any new initiatives pursued by units to achieve a balanced workforce, difficulties and successes of previous initiatives, and recommendations concerning nondiscrimination and affirmative action policies and their implementation.[11] A review of CONAFE's annual reports to the Faculty Senate indicates that the Committee has been active in each of these areas.

It is relevant to note here that over the years, CONAFE has made a number of significant recommendations with the objective of increasing efforts to achieve a more integrated faculty workforce. Although we are unable to

identify a particular instance in which CONAFE's recommendations have resulted in changes in the policies, goals, and activities of a particular unit, we find that CONAFE has made a significant contribution to this campus' affirmative action efforts. CONAFE has served to increase the faculty's awareness of current achievements and failures, identified problems and areas in which efforts need to be expanded, and made recommendations or suggestions to campus units.

Yet since CONAFE's overall responsibility is that of an oversight committee, it has no implementation authority nor any authority in the area of unit accountability. The latter are the responsibilities of unit heads, including the chancellor. The inability of the Faculty Senate and its progeny, CONAFE, to implement and to hold units accountable impairs their effectiveness as policy formulating bodies. We have discovered several instances in which we can find little evidence that CONAFE's recommendations, adopted by the Faculty Senate, were consistently and regularly implemented by unit heads. The following recommendation, adopted by the Faculty Senate on September 13, 1976 is a case in point:

> That deans withhold approval of any tenure-track appointment not accompanied by specific evidence of a search in which every reasonable effort was made to identify and interest qualified women or minority candidates, and that such evidence be forwarded to the chancellor whenever a dean recommends a tenure-track appointment.[12]

Our conversations with the deans of three colleges indicate that this power has been employed sparingly. Indeed, we were informed that unit heads receive information on the affirmative action aspects of the recruitment activities of departmental units from the Office of Affirmative Action and Compliance some time after the recruitment process has been brought to a close; a point at which no corrective actions can be taken.

In September 1981, Chancellor Shain directed each college and major operating unit to establish an Equity Action Committee (EAC) to "supplement centralized affirmative action efforts, and to encourage action by individual units to do their own monitoring of equity matters." Several questions currently are being raised as to the effectiveness of these units as both monitoring authorities and advisory bodies to the deans on affirmative action matters. CONAFE, in its annual report for the 1985-86/1986-87 academic years noted considerable variations in the scope of EAC activities, organization, and level of assertiveness.[13] The Faculty Senate at its May 4, 1987 meeting adopted and recommended a new set of guidelines and composition for the EAC's.

Currently, the U.W. Affirmative Action Advising Council (AAAC) coordinates affirmative action activities on the campus. Although it was formed in October, 1982, it has not met on a regular basis and its main activities have involved providing information to units on the campus' affirmative action priorities, and providing a forum for representatives to share experiences. The AAAC is composed of the chair of each EAC, the chair of CONAFE, and the director of the Office of Affirmative Action and Compliance.

Summary: Our review of the faculty's involvement in affirmative action activities over the past decade suggests the following conclusions: 1) the faculty's efforts have not been guided by the articulation of a set of policy goals and a timetable for the attainment of an integrated workforce for the campus as a whole; 2) the faculty has yet to develop a coherent strategy for identifying and successfully recruiting minority faculty; and 3) the faculty has little or no authority to implement policies or to hold unit heads accountable for implementing policies and procedures it recommends.

SECTION III-A

THE CURRENT SITUATION OF ETHNIC MINORITY FACULTY AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

After reviewing pertinent documents and interviewing appropriate University officials who are charged with implementing affirmative action policies, this subcommittee has found that little progress has been made in hiring and promoting minorities at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Our finding is not an original discovery. This lack of progress has been documented by the Committee on Non-Discrimination and Affirmative Action (CONAFE). CONAFE addressed this lack of progress in its February, 1985 Annual Report:

> When faculty hiring is aggregated for a four-year period (1979-80 through 1982-83), 24.6% of the cumulative hires were women. The picture is less bright for hiring affected class minorities--the 1981 availability estimates for campus was 4.6% and for 1984 was 5.6%. Overall, campus hiring of affected class minorities for 1979-80 through 1982-83 was 3.6%. The conclusion of the committee, similar to that of past years, is that little affirmative action progress has been made in faculty employment.[13]

According to University administrators whom we interviewed, two of the factors contributing to this lack of progress are:

1) The emphasis of current affirmative action policy on procedural compliance versus substantive hiring accomplishments.

2) The University of Wisconsin-Madison's decentralized structure and the limits placed on centralized affirmative action implementation by faculty governance.

This section of the report concentrates on institutional barriers to centralized affirmative action implementation and monitoring.

The Emphasis Upon Procedural Compliance

The University of Wisconsin-Madison created an Affirmative Action Office that is responsible for developing annual affirmative action plans to ensure

compliance with federal, state and municipal affirmative action regulations. These annual Affirmative Action Plans contain underutilization analyses, goals and timetables as well as other suggestions to balance the workforce. The stated affirmative action policy commitment of the University is

> to promote the full realization of equal employment opportunities for minorities, women, and handicapped persons through a comprehensive affirmative action program. The affirmative action policy for women and minorities covers all aspects of the employment relationship, including recruitment, hiring, assignment of duties, on, tenure compensation, selection for training, and termination. The policy applies to all units and governs employment of all employees of the University of Wisconsin-Madison.[14]

The University's commitment to affirmative action must be judged by results. This is the standard employed by the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission:

> The most important measure of an Affirmative Action Program is its results...Extensive efforts to develop procedures, analyses, data collection systems, report forms and fine written policy statements are meaningless unless the end product will be measurable, yearly improvement in hiring, training and promotion of minorities and females in all parts of your organization.[15]

After thirteen years of developing affirmative action goals and timetables at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, we find very little progress in the hiring of ethnic minorities. (See tables and their discussion in Section III-B).

The Office of Affirmative Action and Compliance lacks the power to ensure compliance by underutilized departments to balance their workforce. The function and scope of the office is limited to monitoring faculty recruitment procedures for their "good faith efforts" at finding ethnic minority candidates. Departments must file Position Vacancy Listing(s) (PVL) and Recruitment Efforts Plan(s) (REP) for their job listings. The Position Vacancy Listing includes "the proposed title, salary range, percent time of

appointment, deadline for receipt of application, degree requirements or other special qualifications, description of principal duties, and geographic search area for the position."[16] The PVL is reviewed by the Academic Personnel Office

> to ensure that each position is adequately described; that proposed salary ranges are equitable; that employes [sic] on layoff are considered first; and that reasonable time is allowed for advertising, interviewing and selection.[17]

The Recruitment Efforts Plan is required of all tenure, tenure-track and Center for Health Sciences Collateral Faculty positions. The REP

> outlines methods and sources that will be used during the recruitment process. The Affirmative Action and Compliance Office reviews the proposal and, when appropriate, suggests additional efforts which might result in an increase in the numbers of qualified women or minority applicants.[18]

That the focus is primarily procedural and the process is without sanctions is implicitly stated in the Affirmative Action Plan's description of the REP approval process. The REPs are reviewed by the Affirmative Action office

> Approval is contingent upon assurance that the department is making sincere efforts to recruit women and minorities and that bona fide offers of employment will be made to such individuals possessing requisite qualifications.[19]

Beyond these verbal promises from departments, nothing is written into the policy to give the Affirmative Action Office power to intervene in the search process if inadequate pools of ethnic minority candidates are generated.

As the Acting Vice-Chancellor of the University noted, "[Affirmative action] Monitoring is all retrospective at the present time." The Office of Affirmative Action and Compliance enters the process "after all the crucial decisions" have been made. According to the Acting Vice-Chancellor there needs to be more active involvement at the point at which decisions are made, as opposed to a powerless after-the-fact review.[20]

The University established a "report back" procedure to provide the deans with an overview of the college hiring record for the past year. The Affirmative Action office provides the deans with a written summary of potential problem areas in their college. We find that this procedure could be a useful monitoring tool; however, its effectiveness is questionable since it does not monitor the hiring process while it occurs. It is another example of "after the fact" monitoring that does not ensure Affirmative Action results.

Decentralization and Faculty Governance

All the University administrators we interviewed cited UW-Madison's decentralized institutional nature and its tradition of faculty governance as key stumbling blocks to a centralized University-wide monitoring system for affirmative action.

The administration, faculty and staff are charged with the implementation of affirmative action policy. The problem with implementation lies in the lack of accountability. "Each University unit is charged" but no one is accountable for the implementation of planned results. The level of decentralization and faculty governance pose hurdles for accomplishing the University's commitment to affirmative action. The former director of the Office of Affirmative Action and Compliance observed:

> ...There are two factors that make the programming of affirmative action at this institution [the University of Wisconsin-Madison] different from affirmative action programming in higher education at a lot of other institutions. I speak from some experience; I've done affirmative action at one other institution. Those two factors are: the level of decentralization that is present here; that, coupled with the tradition of faculty governance[21]

A decentralized structure "coupled with the tradition of faculty governance" contribute to faculty autonomy, an aspect of University life that many faculty

value highly; however these twin aspects of governance at the University of Wisconsin-Madison can also hinder efforts to balance faculty workplaces. Decentralization contributes to a dispersal of accountability and a concomitant lack of top-down monitoring; faculty governance places the responsibility for actually finding ethnic minority candidates upon the departmental search-and-screen committees, a responsibility that many departments have not met.

The 1974 Faculty Senate Resolution on Affirmative Action provided oversight responsibility to department deans and administrators; nevertheless the actual recruitment of candidates occurs in the department search-and-screen committees. Unfortunately, the commitment to affirmative action and to ensuring a balanced workforce is not a priority with many departments. According to Acting Vice-Chancellor Phillip Certain:

> What tends to happen at the departmental level, however, is that the goals of Affirmative Action are not put high enough on the priority list.[22]

In 1976 CONAFE made the following observations about faculty responsibility and the need to overcome longstanding assumptions that cripple the achievement of affirmative action goals during the search-and-screen process.

> 1) Commitment is essential if progress is to be made,and departments must ask themselves exactly how high a priority they are prepared to give to the hiring of women and minorities. To say that "no qualified members of these groups applied" is to evidence either a lack of conviction or a lack of sophistication as to what it takes to find suitable candidates.
>
> 2) [Departments must exhibit] a willingness to rethink 'qualifications' and 'preference' criteria. A department should not be expected to consider a candidate it views as unqualified. But most departments recognize that several persons on any list of candidates are fully qualified for appointments; otherwise, the job would be unfilled if the first choice was unavailable. Preferential factors that go into a ranking of candidates (personality, immediate availability, experience in teaching a particular course, etc.) should not be confused with

> qualifications. The point is that every department has legitimate reasons for preferring some qualified candidates over other qualified candidates. Affirmative Action considerations can themselves be legitimate preference criteria.[23]

Faculty members should consider these cogent statements as explicit policy guidelines. Their importance is graphically shown by the statistics presented in the next section.

SECTION III-B: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION ANALYSIS

Introduction

The tables following present affirmative action data for the ethnic minority[24] legal faculty[25] at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Several of the tables present a snapshot of the present campus situation, while several other tables put the institution's affirmative action efforts into historical perspective. Data for all tables were derived from annual Affirmative Action Plans published by the campus Affirmative Action and Compliance Office.

Some general information concerning the data may be helpful. The UW-Madison campus is broken down, for affirmative action purposes, into 119 "job groups." Each academic department is considered a job group. Several schools, such as Business, Law, and Nursing, that have no formal departmental substructures, are also considered a job group.

Degree availability and placement goals for each job group are based on the percentage of degrees granted to ethnic minority persons in selected disciplines of all terminal degrees (generally PhDs) conferred in those disciplines during 1980-81 and 1982-83 academic years at 3000 schools nationally (1986-87 AAP at VII-2).

Explanations of Individual Tables

Table 1 presents a composite analysis of existing legal faculty workforce, ethnic minority placement, present and future hiring goals and timetables, and five-year ethnic minority hiring experience for the UW-Madison campus and its subordinate colleges and schools.

One school, Law, is "fully utilized"[26] in the placement of ethnic minority faculty. Three schools: Pharmacy, Allied Health, and Veterinary

Medicine, need a single ethnic minority faculty hire to bring them to "full utilization." Of the colleges/schools deficient in ethnic minority faculty representation, only one school, Allied Health, has a "full utilization" ethnic minority placement goal established with a discrete time frame for accomplishment - five years.

Of especial concern is the fact that the Madison campus, with 152 expected faculty openings in 1987-88, has an ethnic minority placement goal for the same period of only two positions - one each in Family Resources and Medicine. The obvious disparity of this annual goal and the purported "ultimate" campus-wide goal of 100 ethnic minority faculty is most disconcerting.

The same concern, but on a different strata, is reflected in the statistics for the College of Letters and Science. This college, the largest on campus, potentially has 61 openings this year for tenured track positions, and needs 34 ethnic minority faculty to reach "full utilization;" yet the college has no established goal in 1987-88 for ethnic minority hiring. Similarly, the School of Education, with a higher estimated ethnic minority availability (9.0) than either Family Resources (6.5) or Medicine (7.3), which have annual goals established for this year, has no placement goal for 1987-88 notwithstanding an expected nine new faculty hires this year; yet somehow Education is expected ultimately to increase its ethnic minority faculty from the present four to twelve FTE.

As shown in the table, several UW-Madison colleges/schools have had substantial numbers of position vacancies over the last five years, yet have not placed a single ethnic minority faculty member. While there are numerous recognized obstacles to the attainment of "full utilization," availability estimates for ethnic minority faculty candidates are not so low in several

areas as to justify the apparent lack of commitment to affirmative action reflected by several major department/schools. A further discussion of this point is set out at Table 13.

Table 2 presents, by college/school and department a composite profile of existing legal faculty workforce, ethnic minority placement, present and future hiring goals and timetables, and five-year ethnic minority hiring experience for the UW-Madison campus. Fifty-eight departments of 112 (52%) need only one ethnic minority hire to bring them up to their "ultimate" placement goal.

Table 2 is the master table from which data presented in other tables were gleaned.

Table 3 presents a compilation of 16 school/departments that presently show "full utilization" of ethnic minority faculty. Of these 16 units, only six school/departments actually hired ethnic minority faculty during the past five years. These six units alone hired a total of 11 ethnic minority faculty over the five years - nearly 58 percent of all UW-Madison ethnic minority hires during this time span. Yet this small aggregate of six units represents but five percent of the campus schools/departments. Moreover, the combined faculty workforce of the six amounts to 116.5 FTE - a mere 5.1 percent - of the current total campus faculty workforce of 2297.8 FTE. A small fraction of the campus' schools/departments obviously is carrying a disproportionately large share of the purported affirmative action commitment of this institution.

Table 4 represents a listing of 26 UW-Madison schools/departments that are deemed too small to target ethnic minority faculty goals. Some of the units represented simply are too small in workforce size - generally below 10 FTE - to place an ethnic minority goal upon them. Others have too small an availability pool - generally below four percent - to warrant a meaningful

minority goal. Still others are included here because the combined effect of workforce size and availability pool do not permit computation of a ethnic minority placement goal.

Table 5 presents a listing of 8 school/departments that have an established discrete timetable - under 6 years - for reaching their targeted "ultimate" ethnic minority faculty placement goal.

Tables 6 and 7 aggregate schools/departments by two size groups: large- greater the 40 FTE; and medium- 20 to 40 FTE. Three schools and nine departments have current workforces greater than 40 FTE; three schools and 26 departments fall into the medium-sized group. Six school/departments in these groupings presently are at "full utilization." One large school, Law, and two large departments, Music and Sociology, as well as three medium-sized departments, Plant Pathology, Art, and Computer Sciences, are at "full utilization." Of major concern are four large departments - Economics, Mathematics, Physics, and Medicine - and 19 medium-sized units that have not a single ethnic minority presently on faculty. Of these latter 23 schools/departments, only one, Family Resources, has a targeted ethnic minority hiring goal for 1987.

Table 8 presents a five year history of minority faculty hiring on the UW-Madison campus. Specifically the table sets out a comparison of campus-wide hiring of women faculty as a minority group with similar hiring of ethnic minority faculty hiring.

Table 9 reflects faculty recruitment and selection on this campus, comparing data for ethnic minority applicants with that of non-ethnic applicants.

Tables 10 and 11 reflect the progress toward affirmative action goals of the UW-Madison campus and its subordinate colleges and schools. Data for this

campus, the flagship of the state's higher education system, reflect precious little substantive commitment to affirmative action in ethnic minority faculty recruitment. Campus-wide, the UW-Madison, with 19 ethnic minority placements of 589 new hires during past five years, essentially has made only marginal gains over the faculty ethnic mix shown 12 years ago during the 1973-74 academic year.

Conclusion

> [I]t is not unreasonable to suppose that we may be able to ... achieve approximately full utilization of both women and minorities, in most departments, in about 10 years from the date of the beginning of the [affirmative action] program, in 1982.
>
> --- 1974-75 Affirmative Action Plan p. iii

This wonderfully optimistic projection was set forth in the first Affirmative Action Plan compiled by the campus Affirmative Action Office. We are nearly five years past that admirable 1982 goal, and ethnic minority faculty progress at the UW-Madison has increased a mere 0.7 percent in the 14 years since the start of affirmative action on this campus. Certainly such a gossamer record of campus-wide commitment cannot be held to reflect the ideology of "vigorous implementation" of affirmative action invoked in the 1974 Faculty Senate Resolution.

Table 1

UW-MADISON CAMPUS ETHNIC MINORITY AFFIRMATIVE ACTION
College/School Summary[1]

Department	CURRENT 1985-1986 FACULTY WORKFORCE: Total FTE	Minority n	Minority %	DEGREE AVAILABILITY AND PLACEMENT GOALS FOR ETHNIC MINORITIES: Expected Openings 1987-88	Targeted Minority Placement %	Goal [n] Minority Placement 1987	Goal [n] Minority Placement Ultimate	Years to Ultimate Goal	ETHNIC MINORITY HIRING HISTORY 1981-1986: Total Hires	Ethnic Minority Hires
UW-MADISON	**2297.8**	**52.1**	**2.3**	**152**	**5.8**	**2**	**100**		**588.7**	**19**
Ag/Life Sci	372.8	2	0.5	10	4.4	0	16	6+	81.3	0
Business	82.3	1	1.2	9	5.3	0	3	6+	28.5	0
Education	160.9	4	2.5	14	9.0	0	12	6+	29.4	2
Engineering	199.2	1	0.5	16	4.0	0	7	6+	44	0
Family Resources	37.9	0	0	1	6.5	1	2	6+	17	0
Environm Studies	4.3	0	0	0	4.2	0	0		2.2	0
Law School	47.8	4	8.4	0	7.4	OK	OK		9	1
L&S	895.3	31.1	3.5	61	5.8	0	34		199	12
Medical	373.3	8	2.1	26	7.3	1	21		89.8	3
Nursing	30.6	0	0	8	5.3	0	2	6+	14.5	0
Pharmacy	31	0	0	0	3.7	0	1	6+	8	0
Allied Health	9.4	0	0	3	5.6	0	1	5	7	0
Veterinary Med	53	1	1.9	4	3.6	0	1		59	

[1] Data taken from Table VIII-1, Affirmative Action Plan for the University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1986-1987 [hereafter 1986-87 AAP] at VIII-3.

Table 2

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLAN ANALYSIS
University of Wisconsin - Madison
Ethnic Minority Goals & Availability, 1986-87 vs. Hiring, 1981-86
Legal Faculty - Departmental Specificity[2]

Department	CURRENT 1985-1986 FACULTY WORKFORCE: Total FTE	Minority n	Minority %	DEGREE AVAILABILITY AND PLACEMENT GOALS FOR ETHNIC MINORITIES: Expected Openings 1987	Targeted Minority Placement %	Goal [n] Minority Placement 1987	Goal [n] Minority Placement Ultimate	Years to Ultimate Goal	ETHNIC MINORITY HIRING HISTORY 1981-1986: Total Hires	Ethnic Minority Hires
Ag/Life Sci	**372.8**	**2**	**0.5**	**10**	**4.4**	**0**	**16**	**6+**	**81.3**	**0**
Ag Economics	35.1	0	0	0	4.2	0	1	6+	8	0
Ag Engineering	16	0	0	0	4.0	0	1	6+	4	0
Ag Journalism	13.9	0	0	1	6.4	0	1	6+	1	0
Agronomy	22	0	0	1	4.2	0	1	6+	7	0
Bacteriology	12	0	0	3	3.3	0	0		4	0
Biochemistry	27.2	0	0	2	3.3	0	1	6+	6	0
Cont & Voc Ed	8.7	0	0	1	10.8	0	1	6+	1	0
Dairy Science	17	0	0	0	4.2	0	1	6+	5	0
Entomology	21	0	0	0	3.3	0	1	6+	2	0
Food Micro/Tox	9	0	0	0	3.4	0	0		6	0
Food Science	18	0	0	0	4.2	0	1	6+	1	0
Genetics	12.7	0	0	0	3.3	0	0		1	0
Horticulture	20.5	0	0	0	4.2	0	1	6+	5.5	0
Meat/Animal Sci	20.6	0	0	0	4.2	0	1	6+	2	0
Nutritional Sci	9.9	0	0	0	3.5	0	0		2	0

[2] Data taken from Table VIII-1, 1986-87 AAP at VIII-3.

Department	CURRENT 1985-1986 FACULTY WORKFORCE: Total FTE	Minority n	Minority %	Expected Openings 1987	DEGREE AVAILABILITY AND PLACEMENT GOALS FOR ETHNIC MINORITIES: Targeted Minority Placement %	Goal [n] Minority Placement 1987	Goal [n] Minority Placement Ultimate	Years to Ultimate Goal	ETHNIC MINORITY HIRING HISTORY 1981-1986: Total Hires	Ethnic Minority Hires
Plant Pathology	21.7	1	4.6	1	3.3	OK	OK		6.5	0
Poultry Sci	7	0	0	0	4.2	0	0		1	0
Rural Sociology	11	0	0	0	6.2	0	1	6+	4	0
Soils	23	1	4.3	0	4.2	0	1	6+	4	0
Veterinary Sci	14	0	0	1	5.3	0	1	6+	3	0
Nat Res-Forestry	13.3	0	0	0	4.3	0	1	6+	2.3	0
Nat Res-Lands Arch	13.2	0	0	0	7.9	0	1	6+	4	0
Nat Res-Wildlife	6	0	0	0	3.8	0	1	6+	1	0
Business	**82.3**	**1**	**1.2**	**9**	**5.3**	**0**	**3**	**6+**	**28.5**	**0**
Education	**160.9**	**4**	**.02**	**14**	**9.0**	**0**	**12**	**6+**	**29.4**	**2**
Art	33.7	2	5.9	2	4.0	OK	OK		8	0
Cont & Voc Ed	5.1	0	0	1	10.8	0	1	6+	2	0
Couns Psych/Ed	9	0	0	0	10.2	0	1	4	7.8	1
Curric & Instruc	38	1	2.6	0	10.8	0	3	6+	2	0
Ed Admin	11.9	1	8.4	3	10.8	0	0		3	1
Ed Policy Studies	10.2	0	0	0	10.8	0	1	5	1	0
Ed Psych	18	0	0	4	10.8	0	2	5	2	0
Phys Ed & Dance	21	0	0	4	7.9	0	2	5	3.6	0
Rehab Psych/Spec Ed	14	0	0	0	10.8	0	2	6+	0	0
Engineering	**199.2**	**1**	**.01**	**16**	**4.0**	**0**	**7**	**6+**	**44**	**0**
Chem Engineering	20	0	0	2	4.0	0	1	6+	4	0
Civil/Envt'l Eng	31	0	0	1	4.0	0	1	6+	3	0
Elec/Computer Eng	43	1	2.3	4	4.0	0	1	6+	12	0

Department	CURRENT 1985-1986 FACULTY WORKFORCE: Total FTE	Minority n	Minority %	Expected Openings 1987	DEGREE AVAILABILITY AND PLACEMENT GOALS FOR ETHNIC MINORITIES: Targeted Minority Placement %	Goal [n] Minority Placement 1987	Goal [n] Minority Placement Ultimate	Years to Ultimate Goal	ETHNIC MINORITY HIRING HISTORY 1981-1986: Total Hires	Ethnic Minority Hires
Eng Mechanics	13.8	0	0	2	4.0	0	0		0	0
Eng Pro Development	16	0	0	0	4.0	0	1	6+	6	0
Gen Engineering	8	0	0	0	4.0	0	0		8	0
Indus Engineering	11.9	0	0	4	4.0	0	0		4	0
Mech Engineering	28	0	0	2	4.0	0	1	6+	5	0
Metal/Mineral Eng	14.3	0	0	0	4.0	0	1	6+	1	0
Nucl Eng/Eng Physics	13.2	0	0	1	4.0	0	1	6+	1	0
Family Res/Consu Sci	**37.9**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**6.5**	**1**	**2**	**6+**	**17**	**0**
Environm Studies	**4.3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4.2**	**0**	**0**		**2.2**	**0**
Law School	**47.8**	**4**	**8.4**	**0**	**7.4**	**OK**	**OK**		**9**	**1**
Letters & Sciences	**895.3**	**31.1**	**.03**	**61**	**5.8**	**0**	**34**		**199**	**12**
African Language/Lit	8.7	2	23.1	0	10.4	OK	OK		0	0
Afro-Am Studies	9.1	6.1	67.0	1	10.4	OK	OK		3	2
Anthropology	19	0	0	0	6.2	0	1	6+	8	0
Art History	9	1	11.1	1	3.4	0	0		0	0
Astronomy	10	0	0	1	2.5	0	0		1	0
Botany	14.4	0	0	1	3.3	0	0		2	0
Communication Arts	18.3	0	0	4	5.1	0	1	6+	7	0
Chemistry	39	0	0	1	2.5	0	1	6+	5	0
Classics	6.5	0	0	2	6.8	0	0		2	0
Communicative DO	16.5	0	0	1	5.3	0	1	6+	2	0
Comp Lit	9	1	11.1	1	5.0	OK	OK		3	0

Department	CURRENT 1985-1986 FACULTY WORKFORCE: Total FTE	Minority n	Minority %	Expected Openings 1987	Targeted Minority Placement %	DEGREE AVAILABILITY AND PLACEMENT GOALS FOR ETHNIC MINORITIES: Goal [n] Minority Placement 1987	Goal [n] Minority Placement Ultimate	Years to Ultimate Goal	ETHNIC MINORITY HIRING HISTORY 1981-1986: Total Hires	Ethnic Minority Hires
Computer Sci	30.8	1	3.3	2	2.6	OK	OK		14	0
East Asian Lang/Lit	10.5	0	0	0	11.5	0	1	6+	2	0
Economics	40.4	0	0	4	6.2	0	3	6+	11	0
English	46.8	.3	.6	1	5.0	0	2	6+	10	0
French/Italian	25.3	0	0	1	11.5	0	3	6+	5	0
Geography	18.3	.3	1.6	0	6.2	0	1	6+	8	0
Geology/Geophysics	20	0	0	1	2.5	0	1	6+	3	0
German	16.6	0	0	0	11.5	0	2	6+	4.6	0
Hebrew/Semitic S	5	0	0	0	11.5	0	1	6+	1	0
History	48.9	2	4.1	4	6.2	0	1	4	6	1
History of Science	5	0	0	1	5.5	0	1		0	0
Journalism/Mass C	19	0	0	1	6.4	0	1	6+	8	0
Library/Info Studies	10.3	0	0	1	18.3	0	2	6+	3	0
Linguistics	6.7	0	0	0	5.0	0	0		1	0
Mathematics	61.6	0	0	2	3.6	0	2	6+	4	0
Meteorology	17	1.7	10	1	8.1	OK	OK		1	0
Music	47.2	2	4.2	3	3.8	OK	OK		14	0
Philosophy	19	0	0	3	5.0	0	1	6+	1	0
Physics	45.5	0	0	1	2.5	0	1	6+	2	0
Political Sci	38	1	2.6	6	6.2	0	1	4	13	1
Psychology	35.5	2	5.6	5	8.6	0	1	5	12	0
Scandanavian S	4	0	0	1	11.5	0	0		0	0
Slavics	9	0	0	0	11.5	0	1	6+	1	0
Social Work	20.5	2	9.8	1	15.3	0	1	6+	7	2
Sociology	40.4	2.7	6.7	2	6.2	OK	OK		12	1
South Asian S	11.5	0	0	0	6.0	0	1	6+	1	0

Department	CURRENT 1985-1986 FACULTY WORKFORCE: Total FTE	Minority n	Minority %	Expected Openings 1987	Targeted Minority Placement %	DEGREE AVAILABILITY AND PLACEMENT GOALS FOR ETHNIC MINORITIES: Goal [n] Minority Placement 1987	Goal [n] Minority Placement Ultimate	Years to Ultimate Goal	ETHNIC MINORITY HIRING HISTORY 1981-1986: Total Hires	Ethnic Minority Hires
Spanish/Portuguese	16.3	5	30.7	3	11.5	OK	OK		9.5	5
Statistics	19.9	0	0	2	3.6	0	1	6+	5.1	0
Theatre/Drama	14	1	7.1	1	3.4	OK	OK		2	0
Urban/Regional Plan	8	0	0	0	6.3	0	1	6+	2.8	0
Zoology	24.5	0	0	1	3.3	0	1	6+	2	0
Medical	**373.3**	**8**	**.02**	**26**	**7.3**	**1**	**21**		**89.8**	**3**
Anatomy	16	0	0	1	3.3	0	1	6+	2	0
Anesthesiology	7	0	0	0	7.8	0	1	6+	1	0
Family Med/Prac	7.2	0	0	0	8.8	0	1	6+	5	0
Genetics	4.6	0	0	0	3.3	0	1		0	0
Obstetrics/Gyn	8.4	4	47.6	1	19.4	OK	OK		5	1
History of Medicine	4.4	0	0	0	5.4	0	0		1	0
Human Oncology	25	1	4	5	5.0	0	0		5	0
Medicine	62.5	0	0	2	8.6	0	5	6+	20	0
Med Microbiology	8.7	0	0	1	3.3	0	0		4	0
Med Physics	6.8	0	0	2	2.5	0	0		1.5	0
Neurology	18	0	0	1	5.7	0	1	6+	7	1
Neurophysiology	11.5	0	0	1	3.3	0	0		3	0
Oncology	17.4	0	0	0	2.9	0	1	6+	4	0
Ophthalmology	15	0	0	2	7.4	0	1	6+	3	0
Pathology/Lab Med	17.2	0	0	1	4.0	0	1	6+	6	0
Pediatrics	27.8	1	3.6	4	12.6	1	3	6+	6	0
Pharmacology	7.5	0	0	0	3.3	0	0		1	0
Physiol Chem	8.3	0	0	1	3.3	0	0		1	0
Physiology	10.9	0	0	1	3.3	0	0		2	0

Department	CURRENT 1985-1986 FACULTY WORKFORCE: Total FTE	Minority n	Minority %	Expected Openings 1987	Targeted Minority Placement %	DEGREE AVAILABILITY AND PLACEMENT GOALS FOR ETHNIC MINORITIES: Goal [n] Minority Placement 1987	Goal [n] Minority Placement Ultimate	Years to Ultimate Goal	ETHNIC MINORITY HIRING HISTORY 1981-1986: Total Hires	Ethnic Minority Hires
Preventative Med	18.8	1	5.3	0	5.3	OK	OK		1	0
Psychiatry	23.3	0	0	1	10	0	2	6+	1	0
Radiology	10.1	0	0	0	7.8	0	1	6+	4.3	0
Rehab Med	4.5	1	22.2	1	8.5	OK	OK		4	1
Surgery	32.4	0	0	1	8.3	0	3	6+	2	0
Nursing	30.6	0	0	8	5.3	0	2	6+	14.5	0
Pharmacy	31	0	0	0	3.7	0	1	6+	8	0
Allied Health	9.4	0	0	3	5.6	0	1	5	7	0
Veterinary Med	53	1	.02	4	3.6	0	1			
Med Sciences	13	1	7.7	0	3.8	OK	OK			
Pathobiol Disease	13	0	0	4	3.4	0	0			
Comp Bioscience	12	0	0	0	3.4	0	0			
Surgical Science	15	0	0	0	3.8	0	1	6+		

Table 3 - 1 Schools/15 Departments Meeting Target Ethinic Minority Placement Goals[3]

UW-MADISON CAMPUS ETHNIC MINORITY AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Department	CURRENT 1985-1986 FACULTY WORKFORCE: Total FTE	Minority n	Minority %	Expected Openings 1987	Targeted Minority Placement %	DEGREE AVAILABILITY AND PLACEMENT GOALS FOR ETHNIC MINORITIES: Goal [n] Minority Placement 1987	Goal [n] Minority Placement Ultimate	Years to Ultimate Goal	ETHNIC MINORITY HIRING HISTORY 1981-1986: Total Hires	Ethnic Minority Hires
Law School	47.8	4	8.4	0	7.4	OK	OK		9	1
Plant Pathology (Ag)	21.7	1	4.6	1	3.3	OK	OK		6.5	0
Art (Ed)	33.7	2	5.9	2	4.0	OK	OK		8	0
African Lang/Lit (LS)	8.7	2	23.1	0	10.4	OK	OK		0	0
Afro-Am Studies (LS)	9.1	6.1	67.0	1	10.4	OK	OK		3	2
Comp Lit (LS)	9	1	11.1	1	5.0	OK	OK		3	0
Computer Sci (LS)	30.8	1	3.3	2	2.6	OK	OK		14	0
Meteorology (LS)	17	1.7	10	1	8.1	OK	OK		1	0
Music (LS)	47.2	2	4.2	3	3.8	OK	OK		14	0
Sociology (LS)	40.4	2.7	6.7	2	6.2	OK	OK		12	1
Spanish/Portug (LS)	6.3	5	30.7	3	11.5	OK	OK		9.5	5
Theatre/Drama (LS)	14	1	7.1	1	3.4	OK	OK		2	0
Obstetrics/Gyn (Med)	8.4	4	47.6	1	19.4	OK	OK		5	1
Preventv Med (Med)	18.8	1	5.3	0	5.3	OK	OK		1	0
Rehab Med (Med)	4.5	1	22.2	1	8.5	OK	OK		4	1
Med Sciences (Vet)	13	1	7.7	0	3.8	OK	OK			

[3] Data taken from Table VIII-1, 1986-87 AAP at VIII-3.

Table 4 - 1 School/25 Departments Deemed Too Small To Require Ethnic Minority Goals[4]

UW-MADISON CAMPUS ETHNIC MINORITY AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

	CURRENT 1985-1986 FACULTY WORKFORCE			DEGREE AVAILABILITY AND PLACEMENT GOALS FOR ETHNIC MINORITIES				ETHNIC MINORITY HIRING HISTORY 1981-1986	
Department	Total FTE	Minority n	Minority %	Expected Openings 1987	Targeted Minority Placement %	Goal [n] Minority Placement 1987	Goal [n] Minority Placement Ultimate	Years to Ultimate Goal	Total Hires	Ethnic Minority Hires
Environm Studies	4.3	0	0	0	4.2	0	0		2.2	0
Bacteriology (Ag)	12	0	0	3	3.3	0	0		4	0
Food Micro/Tox (Ag)	9	0	0	0	3.4	0	0		6	0
Genetics (Ag)	12.7	0	0	0	3.3	0	0		1	0
Nutritional Sci (Ag)	9.9	0	0	0	3.5	0	0		2	0
Poultry Sci (Ag)	7	0	0	0	4.2	0	0		1	0
Ed Admin (Ed)	11.9	1	8.4	3	10.8	0	0		3	1
Eng Mechanics (Eng)	13.8	0	0	2	4.0	0	0		0	0
Gen Engineering (Eng)	8	0	0	0	4.0	0	0		8	0
Industrial Eng (Eng)	11.9	0	0	4	4.0	0	0		4	0
Art History (LS)	9	1	11.1	1	3.4	0	0		0	0
Astronomy (LS)	10	0	0	1	2.5	0	0		1	0
Botany (LS)	14.4	0	0	1	3.3	0	0		2	0
Classics (LS)	6.5	0	0	2	6.8	0	0		2	0
Linguistics (LS)	6.7	0	0	0	5.0	0	0		1	0
Scandanavian S (LS)	4	0	0	1	11.5	0	0		0	0
History of Med (Med)	4.4	0	0	0	5.4	0	0		1	0
Human Oncology (Med)	25	1	4	5	5.0	0	0		5	0

[4] Data taken from Table VIII-1, 1986-87 AAP at VIII-3.

Med Micro (Med)	8.7	0	0	1	3.3	0	0		4	0
Med Physics (Med)	6.8	0	0	2	2.5	0	0		1.5	0
Neurophysiology (Med)	11.5	0	0	1	3.3	0	0		3	0
Pharmacology (Med)	7.5	0	0	0	3.3	0	0		1	0
Physiol Chem (Med)	8.3	0	0	1	3.3	0	0		1	0
Physiology (Med)	10.9	0	0	1	3.3	0	0		2	0
Pathobiol Disease (Vet)	13	0	0	4	3.4	0	0			
Comp Bioscience (Vet)	12	0	0	0	3.4	0	0			

Table 5 - 1 School/7 Departments with Under 6+ Years to Reach Ethnic Minority Target Placement[5]

UW-MADISON CAMPUS ETHNIC MINORITY AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

	CURRENT 1985-1986 FACULTY WORKFORCE			DEGREE AVAILABILITY AND PLACEMENT GOALS FOR ETHNIC MINORITIES					ETHNIC MINORITY HIRING HISTORY 1981-1986	
Department	Total FTE	Minority n	Minority %	Expected Openings 1987	Targeted Minority Placement %	Goal [n] Minority Placement 1987	Goal [n] Minority Placement Ultimate	Years to Ultimate Goal	Total Hires	Ethnic Minority Hires
Allied Health	9.4	0	0	3	5.6	0	1	5	7	0
Couns Psych/Ed (Ed)	9	0	0	0	10.2	0	1	4	7.8	1
Ed Policy (Ed)	10.2	0	0	0	10.8	0	1	5	1	0
Ed Psych (Ed)	18	0	0	4	10.8	0	2	5	2	0
Phys Ed & Dance (Ed)	21	0	0	4	7.9	0	2	5	3.6	0
History (LS)	48.9	2	4.1	4	6.2	0	1	4	6	1
Political Sci (LS)	38	1	2.6	6	6.2	0	1	4	13	1
Psychology (LS)	35.5	2	5.6	5	8.6	0	1	5	12	0

5 Data taken from Table VIII-1, 1986-87 AAP at VIII-3.

Table 6 - Profile of Large (GT 40 FTE) 3 Schools/9 Departments[6]

UW-MADISON CAMPUS ETHNIC MINORITY AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

	CURRENT 1985-1986 FACULTY WORKFORCE			DEGREE AVAILABILITY AND PLACEMENT GOALS FOR ETHNIC MINORITIES					ETHNIC MINORITY HIRING HISTORY 1981-1986	
Department	Total FTE	Minority n	Minority %	Expected Openings 1987	Targeted Minority Placement %	Goal [n] Minority Placement 1987	Goal [n] Minority Placement Ultimate	Years to Ultimate Goal	Total Hires	Ethnic Minority Hires
Business	82.3	1	1.2	9	5.3	0	3	6+	28.5	0
Law School	47.8	4	8.4	0	7.4	OK	OK		9	1
Veterinary Med	53	1	1.9	4	3.6	0	1		59	
Elec/Computer Eng	43	1	2.3	4	4.0	0	1	6+	12	0
Economics (LS)	40.4	0	0	4	6.2	0	3	6+	11	0
English (LS)	46.8	.3	.6	1	5.0	0	2	6+	10	0
History (LS)	48.9	2	4.1	4	6.2	0	1	4	6	1
Mathematics (LS)	61.6	0	0	2	3.6	0	2	6+	4	0
Music (LS)	47.2	2	4.2	3	3.8	OK	OK		14	0
Physics (LS)	45.5	0	0	1	2.5	0	1	6+	2	0
Sociology (LS)	40.4	2.7	6.7	2	6.2	OK	OK		12	1
Medicine (Med)	62.5	0	0	2	8.6	0	5	6+	20	0

6 Data taken from Table VIII-1, 1986-87 AAP at VIII-3.

Table 7 - Profile of Medium (40 to 60) FTE 3 Schools/26 Departments[7]

UW-MADISON CAMPUS ETHNIC MINORITY AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

	CURRENT 1985-1986 FACULTY WORKFORCE			DEGREE AVAILABILITY AND PLACEMENT GOALS FOR ETHNIC MINORITIES					ETHNIC MINORITY HIRING HISTORY 1981-1986	
Department	Total FTE	Minority n	Minority %	Expected Openings 1987	Targeted Minority Placement %	Goal [n] Minority Placement 1987	Goal [n] Minority Placement Ultimate	Years to Ultimate Goal	Total Hires	Ethnic Minority Hires
Family Resources	37.9	0	0	1	6.5	1	2	6+	17	0
Nursing	30.6	0	0	8	5.3	0	2	6+	14.5	0
Pharmacy	31	0	0	0	3.7	0	1	6+	8	0
Ag Economics (Ag)	35.1	0	0	0	4.2	0	1	6+	8	0
Agronomy (Ag)	22	0	0	1	4.2	0	1	6+	7	0
Biochemistry (Ag)	27.2	0	0	2	3.3	0	1	6+	6	0
Entomology (Ag)	21	0	0	0	3.3	0	1	6+	2	0
Horticulture (Ag)	20.5	0	0	0	4.2	0	1	6+	5.5	0
Meat/Animal Sci (Ag)	20.6	0	0	0	4.2	0	1	6+	2	0
Plant Pathology (Ag)	21.7	1	4.6	1	3.3	OK	OK		6.5	0
Soils (Ag)	23	1	4.3	0	4.2	0	1	6+	4	0
Art (Ed)	33.7	2	5.9	2	4.0	OK	OK		8	0
Curric & Instruc (Ed)	38	1	2.6	0	10.8	0	3	6+	2	0
Phys Ed & Dance (Ed)	21	0	0	4	7.9	0	2	5	3.6	0
Chem Engineering (Eng)	20	0	0	2	4.0	0	1	6+	4	0
Civil/Envt'l Eng (Eng)	31	0	0	1	4.0	0	1	6+	3	0
Mech Engineering (Eng)	28	0	0	2	4.0	0	1	6+	5	0
Chemistry (LS)	39	0	0	1	2.5	0	1	6+	5	0
Computer Sci (LS)	30.8	1	3.3	2	2.6	OK	OK		14	0
French/Italian (LS)	25.3	0	0	1	11.5	0	3	6+	5	0
Geology/Geophys (LS)	20	0	0	1	2.5	0	1	6+	3	0
Political Sci (LS)	38	1	2.6	6	6.2	0	1	4	13	1
Psychology (LS)	35.5	2	5.6	5	8.6	0	1	5	12	0
Social Work (LS)	20.5	2	9.8	1	15.3	0	1	6+	7	2
Zoology (LS)	24.5	0	0	1	3.3	0	1	6+	2	0
Human Oncology (Med)	25	1	4	5	5.0	0	0		5	0
Pediatrics (Med)	27.8	1	3.6	4	12.6	1	3	6+	6	0
Psychiatry (Med)	23.3	0	0	1	10	0	2	6+	1	0
Surgery (Med)	32.4	0	0	1	8.3	0	3	6+	2	0

[7] Data taken from Table VIII-1, 1986-87 AAP at VIII-3.

Table 8 - Women and Ethnic Minority Legal Faculty Hiring, 1986-1977[8]

HIRING PERIOD	TOTAL HIRES	WOMEN HIRES n	WOMEN HIRES %	ETHNIC MINORITY HIRES n	ETHNIC MINORITY HIRES %
1986-85	86	24	27.9	6	6.7
1985-84	132	37	28.0	9	6.8
1984-83	124	33	26.6	14	11.3
1983-82	99	23	23.2	10	10.1
1982-81	90	24	26.7	8	8.9
1981-80	82	20	24.4	7	8.5
1980-79	104	30	28.9	10	9.6
1979-78	101	31	30.7	2	2.0
1978-77	113	44	38.9	9	8.0
1977-76	** Data not available to Subcommittee **				
1976-75	97	35	36.1	2	2.2
1975-74	167	46	27.2	10	6.1
1974-73	132	27	20.5	6	4.5
12-YR TOTALS	**1327**	**374**	**28.2**	**93**	**7.0**

8 Data for 1986-85 to 1982-81 taken from Table IX-2, 1986-1987 AAP at IX-6. Data for 1981-80 to 1978-77 taken from Table IX-2, 1982-1983 AAP at IX-6. Data for 1976-75 to 1974-73 taken from 1975 Report on Affirmative Action in Faculty Hiring 1 (2 Jan 1976).

Table 9 - Recruitment and Selection Analysis

YEAR	TOTAL	ETHNIC MINORITY n	ETHNIC MINORITY %	NON MINORITY n	NON MINORITY %	UNKNOWN
1985-86[9]						
Applications Received	3238	187	6.7	1116	34.5	1935
Applications Selected	80	5	6.2	75	93.8	0
1984-85[10]	** Data unavailable to Subcommittee **					
1983-84[11]						
Applications Received	4872	299	6.1	2130	43.7	2443
Applications Selected	133	15	11.2	118	88.7	0
1982-83[12]						
Applications Received	5426	346	6.4	2184	40.3	2896
Applications Selected	115	11	9.6	104	90.4	0
1981-82[13]						
Applications Received	3563	188	5.3	1537	43.1	1838
Applications Selected	91	8	8.8	83	91.2	0

9 Data taken from Table IX-1, 1986-87 AAP at IX-4.
10 Data unavailable to Subcommittee
11 Data taken from Table IX-1, 1984-85 AAP at IX-4.
12 Data taken from Table IX-1, 1983-84 AAP at IX-4.
13 Data taken from Table IX-1, 1982-83 AAP at IX-4.

Table 10 - Progress Toward Affirmative Action Ethnic Minority Goals, 1986-83[14]

Department	1986 FACULTY WORKFORCE Total FTE	1986 FACULTY WORKFORCE Minority n	1985 FACULTY WORKFORCE Total FTE	1985 FACULTY WORKFORCE Minority n	1984 FACULTY WORKFORCE Total FTE	1984 FACULTY WORKFORCE Minority n	1983 FACULTY WORKFORCE Total FTE	1983 FACULTY WORKFORCE Minority n
UW-MADISON	**2297.8**	**52.1**	**2281.5**	**47.3**	**2214.1**	**47**	**2262.2**	**45**
Ag/Life Sci	372.8	2	364.2	3	362.9	3	372.8	3
Business	82.3	1	78.8	1	75.4	1	71.8	1
Education	160.9	4	162	4	158	4.5	169.3	4.5
Engineering	199.2	1	185.9	1	187.3	1	187.7	1
Family Resources	37.9	0	35.9	0	35.9	0	34.9	1
Environm Studies	4.3	0	4.8	0	3.9	0	3.8	0
Law School	47.8	4	47.8	3	49.8	2	48	2
L&S	895.3	31.1	906.5	30.3	897.3	27.5	958.8	25.5
Medical	373.3	8	363.7	3	339.1	7	341.1	6
Nursing	30.6	0	30.6	0	32.2	1	28.7	1
Pharmacy	31	0	32.3	0	27.3	0	28.3	0
Allied Health	9.4	0	11	0	18	0	15	0
Veterinary Med	53	1	58	2	27	0	6	0

[14] Data taken from Tables VIII-1 of respective annual AAPs.

Table 11 - UW-Madison 12-year progress toward Affirmative Action Ethnic Minority Goals[15]

YEAR	FACULTY WORKFORCE Total FTE	Minority n	Minority %
1986-87	2297.8	52.1	2.3
1985-86	2281.5	47.3	2.1
1984-85	2214.1	47	2.1
1975-76	2228	36	1.6
1974-75	2246	36	1.6
1973-74	2240	26	1.2

[15] Data for years 1986-85 to 1984-83 taken from Tables VIII-1 of respective AAPs. Data for years 1976-75 to 1974-73 taken from 1975 Report on Affirmative Action in Faculty Hiring 1 (2 Jan 1976).

MINORITY NON-INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF ISSUES

Although non-instructional academic staff comprise the largest number of employees at UW-Madison, affirmative action policies and procedures are lacking to insure that recruitment, promotion and retention of minority academic staff are administered in an equitable and non-discriminatory basis.

Because of the time constraints imposed upon us, the subcommittee was unable to evaluate and make appropriate recommendations regarding the affirmative action status of minority non-instructional academic staff. Nevertheless, we were able to ascertain during our investigation that serious problems exist that merit a thorough investigation by a joint review committee consisting of senior administrative staff, appointed non-instructional academic staff, faculty and students.

Among the problems we note are the following:

1. Minority non-instructional academic staff are concentrated in "minority programs." They are not adequately represented in access job categories across the campus. It is the perception among administrators that minority non-instructional academic staff are only qualified for positions in "minority programs." This results in employment "ghettoization" for minority non-instructional academic staff.

2. There are few or no opportunities for promotions for minority non-instructional academic staff.

3. Minorities are not adequately represented in the higher managerial job categories.

4. We have encountered various instances where minorities have been overlooked for promotion even in those minority programs where they are highly concentrated.

These problems merit investigation and redress. Again we call for an investigative body that will conduct fact-finding and thoroughly address the concerns of minority non-instructional academic staff.

SECTION IV

Recommendations of the Subcommittee

I. University-Wide Commitment to Ethnic Minority Faculty Recruitment and Retention.

1. The Affirmative Action Plan, 1986-87 declares that "[t]he primary responsibility and accountability for implementing the Affirmative Action program at the UW-Madison rests with the Chancellor."[27] In light of this established policy we recommend that the chancellor declare, explicitly and forcefully, to deans, faculty and administrators that ethnic minority recruitment, hiring and retention are major priority goals for the entire University.

2. In light of this commitment we recommend that an office of Vice Chancellor for Affirmative Action be established. The Vice Chancellor for Affirmative Action will serve as an ombudsman for affirmative action issues. The Vice Chancellor will expedite University procedures and provide information for departments making ethnic minority recruitment, hiring and retention efforts.

We recommend that a central repository of continuously updated affirmative action information be established under the direction of the proposed Vice Chancellor of Affirmative Action. This repository will be a clearinghouse of information on minority graduate programs and promising minority candidates. This office will serve as the central information resource center for the deans' affirmative action administrators as well as search-and-screen chairpersons.

So that the academic community understands fully the institutional commitment to affirmative action, we recommend that the Office of Affirmative

Action and Compliance report directly to the proposed Vice-Chancellor for Affirmative Action.

3. Given the realities of "decentralization and faculty governance" at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, namely that top-down administrative mandates are interpreted as infringements upon departmental autonomy, this subcommittee recommends that the commitment to affirmative action be developed into specific strategies by each college after consultations with faculty members in their departments. The latter would consult with the Office of Affirmative Action and Compliance on developing their strategies. These strategies would then be approved by the Vice Chancellor for Affirmative Action and the Chancellor.

Since the faculty play pivotal roles in recruiting, screening and selecting candidates, we call upon the faculty to vigorously implement affirmative action policies during the search and screen process. We call upon search and screen committee members and department chairpersons to take the initiative in reporting affirmative action efforts to their deans and actively seek assistance if such efforts are unsatisfactory. In essence, we ask that the faculty practice at the search and screen level what they passed as a Resolution of the Faculty on April 1, 1974: "The Faculty Senate hereby declares its support for vigorous implementation of the University's program of affirmative action in hiring women and members of minority groups."

4. In addition to advertising its job vacancies in professional journals, we recommend that all search and screen committees advertise in The Chronicle of Higher Education and minority professional journals.

II. <u>Monitoring and Accountability of Affirmative Action Policies</u>

1. We recommend that on-going affirmative action advocacy be lodged with the deans. The Faculty Senate approved the following resolution on

September 13, 1976: "That deans withhold approval of any tenure-track appointment not accompanied by specific evidence of a search in which every reasonable effort was made to identify and interest qualified women or minority candidates, and that such evidence be forwarded to the chancellor whenever a dean recommends a tenure-track appointment." We recommend that all deans be re-apprised of this authority and its passage by the Faculty Senate. We recommend that deans communicate explicitly and forcefully to all department and search-and-screen chairpersons of the deans' commitment to employing this authority, emphasizing the priority given to affirmative action recruitment efforts by the deans.

We recommend that the deans monitor faculty search-and- screen efforts for ethnic minority recruitment and intervene in the search process if the candidate pool does not reflect "every reasonable effort" to be made to identify and interest minority candidates. The deans should appoint their designees (for example, associate deans or equity action committees) to carry out the on-going, day-to-day tasks of the affirmative action plans developed by the colleges and schools.

2. We recommend that the pursuit of an integrated work force be given high priority and be used as a criterion in the annual evaluation of the performance of all unit heads with budgeting authority.

3. We also recommend that the faculty hiring reports sent to the Deans by the Office of Affirmative Action and Compliance be used as an evaluating tool in the aforementioned annual evaluation.

4. Methods for measuring the effectiveness of Recruitment Efforts Plan(s) to generate minority candidate pools do not exist, partially because of insufficient data and lack of coordination among monitoring units. We recommend that such an analysis take place.

III. Faculty Recruitment and Retention Recommendations

1. We recommend that a substantive affirmative action plan be developed at the college and departmental levels, utilizing the ethnic minority placement goals set out in the 1986-1987 Affirmative Action Plan for the University of Wisconsin-Madison to bring the University of Wisconsin-Madison campus to "full utilization" by the year 2000.

2. We recommend that deans and departments arrive at a policy consensus to provide the necessary salary compensation to retain minority faculty -- in essence to keep the University competitive in a price market that is very competitive.

3. We recommend that all departments implement the Faculty Mentor Program, especially for junior minority faculty. According to one dean, this program is unevenly implemented.

4. We recommend a minority post-doctoral program that carries with it consideration for full-time faculty employment at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. We recommend that the University investigate such minority post-doctoral programs at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill and the University of California System. Another good example of a minority post-doctoral program is the University of Wisconsin Law School's William H. Hastie Fellowship, which has proven very successful in attracting minority legal scholars to the UW-Madison to complete their L.L.M.

5. We recommend a Summer Visiting Scholars program to invite minority Ph.D.s to the University of Wisconsin-Madison for a summer of teaching and research support. This program could provide a means whereby minority candidates for faculty positions can expose departments to their scholarship and professional contributions as well as for the candidates to experience the environment of the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

6. We recommend that deans assign additional Full Time Equivalent (FTE) positions to departments that succeed in identifying outstanding minority candidates. This strategy requires a Dean to reserve at least one FTE position for a discretionary grant to the successful department.

7. We recommend that a more accurate method of identifying ethnic minority faculty be investigated and implemented. Alternatives to the present system should be investigated. While it is true that the present system follows Federal government guidelines, this does not preclude the University from further disaggregating ethnic heritage information in its own data collection. Members of the various Latino communities desire greater precision in the self-identification options available to University employees. The existing system provides limited choices for people to self-identify their ethnic heritage (presently only four broad categories are available to University of Wisconsin-Madison employees). As a result, this system forces people to fit themselves into categories for which they may not be appropriate.

In addition, these broad ethnic heritage categories are so inclusive that they skew minority utilization figures upward. The present system does not distinguish between members of ethnic minority groups that historically experienced discrimination in the United States and international scholars who share, in a remote sense, ethnicity by national origin with these United States minorities. Enhancing ethnic minority faculty statistics works to the detriment of all minorities by painting a picture of minority faculty utilization that is too sanguine. Latinos and Asian Americans are especially interested in preventing inflated statistics.

8. The problem of dual career couples should be addressed. Finding employment for spouses or significant others of highly recruited ethnic

minority faculty is important for both recruitment and retention concerns. The subcommittee did not have time to adequately examine this issue. We recommend investigation of this problem, especially as it relates to minority faculty hires.

9. Minority noninstructional academic staff issues need to be addressed. We recommend serious consideration by the University Administration of minority noninstructional academic staff concerns and implementation of policies to meet those concerns.

10. In the light of "supply side" complaints that "not enough" minority candidates are available for faculty positions, the administration should recognize that minority staff represent a potential untapped pool of such candidates. Presently minority staff receive no benefits (such as tuition remission) to pursue advanced degrees at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Such assistance would enable full-time ethnic minority employees in noninstructional academic staff positions to earn their graduate degrees. We recommend that a continuing education assistance program for ethnic minority noninstructional staff be designed and implemented.

11. As stated in the Introduction we strongly recommend the establishment of a permanent standing committee on minority issues to monitor the implementation of these proposals.

APPENDIX I

List of Sources

University of Wisconsin-Madison. Affirmative Action Plan 1986-1987.

University of Wisconsin System. Annual Report to the Regents on 1984-85 Progress and Achievement of Goals for American Racial and Ethnic Minority Students, September, 1986.

Faculty Senate Documents:

University Committee Proposal for Faculty Senate Resolution on Affirmative Action, April 1, 1974.

University Committee Proposal for Establishment of Standing Committee on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action in Faculty Employment. February 3, 1975. Faculty Document 202.

Faculty Senate Meeting. Monday, February 3, 1975. Minutes.

Report and Recommendations of the Committee on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action in Faculty Employment. May 3, 1976. Faculty Document 251.

Report and Recommendations of the Committee on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action in Faculty Employment. September 13, 1976. Faculty Doc. 257.

Faculty Senate Meeting. Monday, September 13, 1976.

Committee on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action in Faculty Employment. Report to the Faculty. December 3, 1979. Faculty Document 372.

Annual Report of the Committee on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action in Faculty Employment, 1980-81. November 2, 1981. Faculty Document 457.

Faculty Senate Meeting. Monday, November 2, 1981.

Committee on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action in Faculty Employment, Annual Report for 1981-82. February 7, 1983. Faculty Document 508.

Annual Report of the Committee on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action in Faculty Employment, 1982-83. December 5, 1983. Faculty Document 544.

Faculty Senate Meeting. Monday, December 5, 1983.

Committee on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action in Faculty Employment. 1983-84 Annual Report. February 4, 1985. Faculty Document 595.

Annual Report of the Committee on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action in Faculty Employment, 1985-86, 1986-1987. May 4, 1987. Faculty Document 701.

Report to the Faculty by U.W. Madison Administration on Affirmative Action in Faculty Hiring. n.d. approximately 1974.

Report to the Faculty on Affirmative Action in Faculty Hiring. U.W. Madison Administration. 1975.

4. Subcommittee-generated documents

Record of subcommittee interview with Carla Raatz, Associate Vice Chancellor, August 12, 1987.

Record of subcommittee interview with Bonnie Ortiz, Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis, August 14, 1987.

Record of subcommittee interview with Diane Rausch, Office Affirmative Action and Compliance, August 14, 1987.

Record of subcommittee interview with Phillip R. Certain, Acting Vice Chancellor, August 31, 1987

Secondary sources:

Wilson, Reginald. "Recruitment and Retention of Minority Faculty and Staff." AAHE Bulletin n.d.

Sudarkasa, Niara, "Affirmative Action or Affirmation of the Status Quo?" AAHE Bulletin February 1987.

APPENDIX II

A note regarding Asian Americans

Asian Americans face a problematic situation in minority faculty recruitment and retention. The purpose of this note is to point out these difficulties, a necessary assignment since University policy appears to be insufficiently sensitive to the complexities of the issue.

Asian Americans are not counted as "affected class minorities" -- meaning they are not included in the numerical analysis used to compute availability of minorities and departmental goals for hiring ethnic minorities. The rationale for excluding Asians from affected class status rests on two arguments: 1) "Asians are not underutilized in instructional staff positions" and 2) including Asians in the affected class status would alter "utilization patterns for other minorities" -- Afro-Americans, Hispanics and Native Americans. The first argument will be addressed later in this note. Regarding the second argument, we concur that the University of Wisconsin-Madison needs aggressively to recruit and retain more Afro-American, Latino and Native American faculty; yet, in pursuing its current policy of excluding Asian American data from the establishment of ethnic minority placement goals, the University has effectively implemented a policy of discrimination against Asian Americans and in favor of other ethnic groups. The University's policy apparently was designed to balance the trends in ethnic minority participation in higher education: the Asian and Asian American presence in academia is rising, while that of Afro-Americans, Latinos and Native Americans is falling. We agree that the declining trend needs to be arrested and reversed to the benefit of Afro-Americans, Latinos and Native Americans; we question however the trade-off as well as the validity of the basis for such a judgment.

Perhaps the University is being realistic when it acknowledges that counting Asians as affected class minorities would give some departments an excuse not to recruit and retain other minorities--in essence they would count their Asians and say utilization is accomplished. The counterpoint, however is that by excluding all Asians from affected class, the Academy also excludes their data from disciplines where Asian Americans are under represented, for example the Humanities and the Social Sciences. A possible compromise is to include Asian Americans in affected class status in those disciplines where Asian Americans are under represented. It is even conceivable that counting Asian Americans as affected class minorities in those departments would actually force them to increase their minority hiring goals since including Asian Americans would increase the availability pool. Since the schools' hiring goals are established in direct relation to supply, a larger pool of available candidates would act to readjust departmental goals upward.

The University has argued that Asians are not underutilized; however this data is not without its interpretative problems. There are subtleties in the data that work against Asian Americans.

The aggregate figure of Asian utilization shows that they are "not underutilized"; however, this figure hides complexities that lead to potentially harmful policies for Asian Americans. The utilization statistic can lead to a problematic interpretation, which can be traced to the data gathering. Employees of the University of Wisconsin-Madison identify their ethnic heritage through a self-classification procedure whereby they mark one of four choices (codes 1 through 4). The "Asian" category is all-inclusive for those who can trace their heritage to Asian nations. Therein lies the problem. The Asian category retains a plasticity that makes it amenable to questionable conclusions. If one looks at the statistic uncritically it

appears that Asians are not underutilized; the category "Asians" lumps together a large mixture of different constituencies: U.S.-born Asian Americans, naturalized Asian Americans, and foreign-born permanent residents. If all one desired was a headcount of those who self-identify as Asian then this statistic would suffice; however it is invalid to employ this simple count to measure Asian American minority representation. United States ethnic minority status has historically acquired such connotations as "traditionally under represented" and "historically discriminated against in the United States." To conclude from a count of all Asians that Asian Americans as a minority group are no longer underutilized is problematic. To move from this conclusion to a policy that excludes Asian Americans from official affirmative action efforts is all the more enigmatic. There is little question that Asian American scholars will be victimized by policies built upon such a problem-ridden edifice. They may be excluded, for example, from proposed minority post-doctoral programs. They are, with one category exception (former Southeast Asian refugees), excluded from the "grow your own" minority faculty program established at the University of Wisconsin System level.

While Asians and Asian Americans are being hired at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, they nevertheless face many of the same problems shared by minorities in the affected class. One tenured Asian American professor said he had to work twice as hard--publish twice as much--as his white colleagues in order to achieve the same rewards. This is a common plight for minority scholars, the reward structure often demands more from them to achieve the same goals as majority peers. It is important for University policymakers to realize that even though there are more Asian hires than other minorities, this is not a validation of the myth of the Asian "model minority." That outlook caricatures all Asian Americans and Asians as uniformly successful and no

longer in need of affirmative action. That this is a myth has been shown by the United States Civil Rights Commission in a 1980 Report on Asian and Pacific Islanders in the United States. That report stated:

> Asian Americans as a group are not the successful minority that the prevailing stereotype suggests. Individual cases of success should not imply that the diverse peoples who make up the Asian American communities are uniformly successful. Moreover, despite their relatively high educational attainment, Asian Americans earn far less than majority Americans with comparable education and are reported to have been victims of discriminatory employment practices. Despite the problems Asian Americans encounter, the success stereotype appears to have led policymakers to ignore those truly in need.[28]

Dealing with the Asian American issue involves a careful and sensitive negotiation between competing demands within a complex social reality.[29] Sensitivity and flexibility both are necessary in establishing these policy guidelines. Again we strongly state our demands that current affected class minorities--Afro-Americans, Latinos and Native Americans--be actively recruited and retained. Nevertheless Asian Americans should not be cut wholesale from protected status. Asian American communities across the United States are concerned that the opportunities of the Academy are closing against Asian Americans. They are rightly concerned that major institutions appear to be moving towards restrictive Asian quotas and that national minority fellowship programs are subtly telling Asian Americans not to apply. Other universities (such as the University of California) still count Asian Americans as protected minorities, with allowances for under representation in certain disciplines. Recognizing Asian Americans as a minority reflects the reality of their situation in United States society; allowing them this status in certain disciplines acknowledges the fact that Asian Americans are under represented in the Humanities and Social Sciences. A solution such as this is preferable to the current policy.

ENDNOTES

1. The interviews were conducted on the following dates: Carla Raatz, Acting Associate Vice Chancellor, August 12, 1987; Bonnie Ortiz, Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis, August 14, 1987; Diane Rausch, Office of Affirmative Action and Compliance, August 14, 1987; Phillip R. Certain, Acting Vice Chancellor, August 31, 1987; Dean John R. Palmer, September 18, 1987; Dean Leo Walsh, September 21, 1987 and Dean E. David Cronon, September 25, 1987.

2. University of Wisconsin-Madison Faculty Senate Minutes, April 1, 1974.

3. University of Wisconsin System. Annual Report to the Regents on 1984-85 Progress and Achievement of Goals for American Racial and Ethnic Minority Students. September, 1986. The Status of Minorities as Students and Faculty in the University of Wisconsin System., p. 1 of "Status of Minority Faculty in the University of Wisconsin System. September, 1986" [Hereafter referred to as the "Status of Minority Faculty".] It is unclear from the data whether the aggregate 90 percent figure given includes both majority person males and females. If the number given incorporates only majority male faculty members, then the addition of data on non-ethnic minority female faculty will reduce further the percentage of ethnic minority faculty representation.

4. "Status of Minority Faculty in the University of Wisconsin System" , p. 1. Source for the data is from American Council on Education, Minorities in Higher Education - 4th Annual Status Report 1985, p. 17.

5. University of Wisconsin-Madison. Affirmative Action Plan for the University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1986-1987., p. XI-1. The Affirmative Action Plan continues: "Deans of the individual colleges are responsible for the allocations to departments."

6. Reginald Wilson, "Recruitment and Retention of Minority Faculty and Staff" AAHE Bulletin, February 1987.

7. "Status of Minority Faculty in the University of Wisconsin System", p. 1.

8. "Status of Minority Faculty in the University of Wisconsin System" September 1986, p. 2.

9. The Ohio State University. Handbook for Faculty Searches with Special Reference to Affirmative Action. 1987, p. ii.

10. University of Wisconsin-Madison Faculty Senate Minutes, April 1, 1974.

11. University of Wisconsin-Madison Faculty Senate Minutes, February 3, 1975 and University of Wisconsin-Madison, Faculty Document 202, February 3, 1975, "University Committee Proposal for Establishment of Standing Committee on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action in Faculty Employment."

12. University of Wisconsin-Madison Faculty Document 257 and Faculty Senate Minutes, September 13, 1976.

13. University of Wisconsin-Madison Faculty Document 701, May 4, 1987, "Annual Report of the Committee on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action in Faculty Employment, 1985-86, 1986-87."

14. University of Wisconsin-Madison. Faculty Document No. 595, February 4, 1985, Committee on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action in Faculty Employment, 1983-1984 Annual Report.

15. University of Wisconsin-Madison. Affirmative Action Plan for the University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1986-1987. "Statement of Equal Employment Opportunity"

16. United States. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity. Washington D.C. January, 1974, p. 3.

17. University of Wisconsin-Madison. Affirmative Action Plan for the University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1986-1987, p. IX-2.

18. Ibid.

19. Ibid.

20. Ibid.

21. Interview with Acting Vice-Chancellor Phillip R. Certain, August 31, 1987.

22. Interview with Director of the Office of Affirmative Action and Compliance, Diane Rausch [On leave as of August 1987], August 14, 1987.

23. Interview with Acting Vice-Chancellor Phillip R. Certain, August 31, 1987.

24. University of Wisconsin-Madison. Faculty Document 257, September 13, 1976. Report and Recommendations of the Committee on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action in Faculty Employment.

25. These tables use the term "ethnic minority" in the same context as the bulkier term "affected class minority" used in the University's Affirmative Action Plans (AAP). The latter term as used in the institution's analyses includes only Black, Hispanic, and Native American ethnic groups. See 1986-87 AAP at VII-3. The UW-Madison AAP, as a matter of Affirmative Action & Compliance Office (AACO) policy, reflects placement goals and year-end analyses only for those ethnic groups that are underrepresented on the campus' faculty. 1986-87 AAP at VII-3. While Asian Americans are a federally-recognized ethnic minority, "no [affirmative action] goals were established for Asians or Pacific Islanders, since [faculty placement of these groups] is significantly greater than population figures would predict" 1975-76 AAP at 1; 1974-75 AAP at 7. Moreover, "since the faculty is already representative of the population with respect to Orientals, that group is not counted toward fulfillment of [affirmative action] goals" 1974-75 AAP at 7.

Data on Asian American faculty representation were last reviewed by the Affirmative Action Plan in 1980. "Interview with Diane Rausch," August 14, 1987. While the Subcommittee cannot agree with the AACO's sweeping policy exclusion of Asian Americans as an affected minority class, we use the term "ethnic minority" in this report in full comport with the AACO policy to include only Black, Hispanic, and Native American racial heritages.

Data in the Subcommittee tables also has been recast from the AAP tables to exclude data on women as minority faculty. The decision of Subcommittee to exclude data on women as a minority group stems from our understanding of our charge to assess the issues surrounding ethnic minority faculty and staff recruitment and retention.

26. "Legal faculty" are defined as tenure and tenure-track position faculty. Affirmative Action Plan for the University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1986-1987 [hereafter 1986-87 AAP] at VI-1. As discussed elsewhere in this Subcommittee report, time constraints and the limited availability of data for non-faculty positions, permitted only an in-depth analysis of legal faculty.

27. A job group is considered "fully utilized" when the percentage of minority faculty in that unit is within 0.5 FTE of meeting the availability estimate for that discipline. Some job groups, such as Pharmacy and Allied Health, with a small unit size or a low availability statistic for ethnic minorities, or both, may need only a single ethnic minority faculty placement to become fully utilized.

28. University of Wisconsin-Madison, Affirmative Action Plan for the University of Wisconsin-Madison 1986-1987, p. V-1.

29. United States Commission on Civil Rights. "Success of Asian Americans: Fact or Fiction?" September 1980, p.24. Also see U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Civil Rights Digest: Asian and Pacific Americans, Vol 9, No. 1, Fall 1976. Washington D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

30. Many foreign-born Asians also suffer discrimination and racism in the United States, thus revealing the complexity of the issue.

MULTI-CULTURAL CENTER SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Introduction

In the early 1970's, a group of minority students and staff issued a statement on Multi-Culturalism. They wrote that "we, as a human collection of different cultures and people, have always promoted, practiced, and encouraged the process of authentic multi-cultural interaction. We view," the statement continues, "authentic multi-culturalism as a necessary means to an end--the 'end', of course, being a racially equal and integrated American society. The beginnings and characteristics of each of our respective struggles (from Watts to Wounded Knee) are deeply rooted and reflective of a sincere belief in the principles of mutual respect, cultural pride and interaction, and racial and/or group integrity.

The statement continues in its emphasis of the principle that "multi-cultural programs should be perceived as a means to an end, not an end, per se. Its function is to facilitate, not terminate the cultural growth and awareness of people".

As we now face the end of this decade and approach the decade of the 1990's, many of the needs and aspirations expressed in the early 1970's have still not been realized. The University community is perhaps at a crucial point in its history--a point at which it has an opportunity to reaffirm, in positive constructive ways, its commitment to people of color and an opportunity to develop a truly pluralistic multi-cultural community based not only on our commonalities but also, and equally important, on our cultural and ethnic uniqueness.

It is within that context and that hope that we are recommending the establishment of a Multi-Cultural Center on the campus of the University of Wisconsin-Madison. We have outlined below the functions of the proposed center, its structure and funding, a plan of implementation and a proposed timetable for its implementation.

We urge the University to proceed with the implementation of a Multi-Cultural Center with all deliberate speed.

Functions of the Center

The Center will serve as a locale for formal meetings, informal gatherings, casual contacts, and organized events. These may be sponsored by the Center itself, or by its affiliated organizations. Some activities will be aimed at the minority students themselves, while others will provide outreach to the campus and community at large. The Center should provide meeting rooms, lounges, and libraries. Kitchen facilities would be desirable.

In addition, the Center should provide office space, permanent mail addresses, and telephone service for minority student organizations. It may also serve as a point of contact between these organizations and minority communities outside the campus. For the latter reason, it would be desirable to have some involvement by community organizations from Madison, and possible statewide and national organizations as well.

Sharing a central facility such as this will facilitate cooperation among individuals and groups that face common problems, but have little opportunity at present to meet and coordinate their efforts.

A position of director should be established. To provide a nucleus of additional staff and a focal point, some of the existing student services aimed at minority students should be housed in the Center. Additional staff could be recruited as Project Assistants from departments and programs concerned with minority affairs. The continuity provided by this staff would help to strengthen minority student organizations, and help them to better serve both their members and campus community.

To fulfill these functions, the Center should be housed in a fairly central location on or near campus. A University-owned building would be preferable to rented space.

Structure and Funding

For administrative purposes, the Center needs a "home" within the University structure, and the office of Dean of Students seems the most appropriate place. It does not seem desirable, however, that it be wholly a creature of the University administration. Accordingly, it should have an independent governing board with representation from students, faculty, administrations, and the community.

Initial funding should be provided by some mixture of University budget and segregated fees. The University contribution should consist at least of the salaries of the Director, student services staff, and Project Assistants, as well as the maintenance of the building. It may be possible to persuade the State to provide supplemental funding to enable the Center to begin operation in the second year of the current biennium. Segregated fees are most appropriately used for student-run activities.

As the Center matures, it could seek gifts and grants from extramural sources, including governmental agencies, foundation, community organizations, and alumni. It would be appropriate to utilize existing University structures, including the UW Foundation, to facilitate these efforts. Special events may also generate some revenue, but this is unlikely to provide a significant share of the budget.

Implementation and Schedule

An ad hoc committee comprised of minority and majority students, faculty, and staff should be created to formulate plans, draw up a charter and bylaws. As soon as the governing Board has been appointed, this committee would go out of existence. Administrative support for this effort could come from the offices of either the Dean of Students or the Chancellor. It might also be appropriate to make some arrangement for legislative liaison.

The committee could be appointed by consultation between the Vice Chancellor and the Chair of the Steering committee on Minority Affairs as soon as possible after this report. It could negotiate with the University administration for space and staff by the end of the 1988 academic year. If the bylaws are drawn up by April 1, it should be possible to appoint the Board in time to begin operations at the start of the academic year 1989.

ETHNIC STUDIES AND MANDATORY COURSE REQUIREMENT SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Justification for Ethnic Studies and Mandatory Course Requirement

Education in this country has traditionally ignored the history, contributions and cultural traditions of people of color. The mainstream curriculum has a very narrow view of what is American and what should be included in American education. Too often this ethnocentric view of America is restricted to the Euro-American experience. Excluded and left invisible are people of color whose labor and sacrifices have been and continue to be neglected in traditional U.S. history accounts.

Instead of promoting cross-cultural understanding and respect by including the experiences and contributions of the various ethnic minority groups (i.e., Chicanos, Afro Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans and Puerto Ricans), the American educational system has perpetuated and reinforced the stereotypes and prejudices that have historically permeated the greater American society. American educational curriculum has typically ignored the minority experience or has depicted minorities in a negative light. Nevertheless, education offers one of the best vehicles for promoting cross-cultural harmony and understanding.

The University of Wisconsin-Madison has a national reputation as a leader in many of the major disciplines in both teaching and research. Yet, the curriculum does not offer a single course on the history and culture of Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, Native Americans and Asian Americans. Only recently has a provision been made for a one-semester replacement appointment for history by a Native American faculty member. If Wisconsin is to continue its national reputation as a major institution of higher learning, it must now meet the urgent challenge to build a university that meets the needs of the 21st century. A strong Ethnic Studies Program and curriculum will attract minority students and will help make this University truly reflect the racial, ethnic, gender and class diversity of this country.

Euro-American majority students are equally educationally deprived in a serious way. They will have to live in a world in which people of color are the vast majority, a world which is constantly shrinking and which has in fact become a global village. The ability to be conversant with the cultures of people different from themselves is a necessary tool for all educated persons, whether their careers be in government, business, communications or the sciences. Similarly, for those whose careers are confined within national boundaries, sensitivity to and knowledge of the contributions of the many ethnic and racial groups within our society are needed skills, regardless of the nature of their professional careers. Insofar as majority students are inadequately exposed to such knowledge their education must be considered inadequate.

Increased attention to diverse strands of America's multi-ethnic culture will not only broaden students' perspectives, but will offer new angles of vision to standard topics. To cite a few examples: the Chicano and Native American perspectives on westward expansion challenge hegemonic interpretations of the common past; the Native American values and ecological concepts offer solutions to pressing contemporary problems; the economic and

cultural contributions of Asian Americans add a new dimension to our understanding of the nation's past and future; and the colonial status of Puerto Rico forces a reinterpretation of the situation of Puerto Ricans in the United States.

As the number of racist incidents spread throughout the nation's campuses, the University of Wisconsin-Madison can take a lead role in combatting bigotry and racism by instituting an Ethnic Studies Program. We believe that to demonstrate concretely this commitment to the Ethnic Studies Program, the Administration must move forthrightly to implement the following action program. The following proposal represents a consensus of the Minority Coalition incorporating all of those represented within the Coalition and the Ethnic Studies subcommittee.

Recommendations

It is our intent that the University adopt all aspects of this proposal since they are integrally linked. Increases in minority student and faculty representation and Ethnic Studies courses are essential. The Ethnic Studies requirement should have a substantial focus on the histories and cultures of the different minority groups from the minority perspective. This is, after all, the educational purpose of our proposal--to make the minority experience and perspective an integral aspect of the content of our learning.

We realize at the outset that there are not sufficient Ethnic Studies courses being offered to fulfill this requirement, but we expect that there will be an increasing number of courses taught from minority points of view. As the first step toward the implementation of this proposal the University should begin the process of hiring minority faculty by Spring of 1988. As a second step, we ask that the process of adopting a university-wide six credit requirement in Ethnic Studies be initiated by the various units of the University. We think that the participation of minority faculty in that process is crucial. We recommend that for students outside Letters & Science, required Ethnic Studies courses should be applied toward fulfillment of the breadth requirements. Thirdly, we suggest that Ethnic Studies courses be offered immediately from currently available offerings. These Ethnic Studies courses shall consist of the following:

I. As an immediate minimum an Ethnic Studies mandatory course requirement of six (6) credits:

   A. Basic introductory course in the various appropriate disciplines which covers the cultural experience and history of minority groups with a fair allotment of time and readings to be given to each group and due attention to questions of gender and class. These courses should reflect the minority experience and the minority point of view.

   B. Intermediate or advanced course in a given discipline either topically focused on one minority group or comparative and/or cross-cultural. We suggest that the courses integrate issues of gender and class as reflected in the minority experiences. These

courses should reflect the minority experience and the minority point of view.

II. That within a reasonable timetable, the University commit the following additional resources to develop strong Ethnic Studies Programs, i.e., Afro-American Studies, Native American Studies, Asian American Studies, Puerto Rican Studies, and Chicano Studies. Newly hired faculty should be given joint appointments between these programs and existing departments in their disciplinary specialty. Because the development of effective programs will require aggressive faculty recruitment, it is our goal that searches begin immediately and be concluded in a reasonable period. It is our intent that each program be established at full faculty complement by 1993. In addition, we strongly urge the organization of a coordinating body comprised of faculty and student representatives from each of the various Ethnic Studies programs to coordinate activities, course offerings and development.

A. New Programs

1. Asian American Studies

a. The establishment of an Asian American advisory committee composed of Asian American students and UW faculty. The purpose of this committee is to develop an Asian American Studies program. The immediate task of this committee would be to begin the process of hiring an Asian American Studies Director by the spring of 1988.

b. Additional Asian American faculty should be hired within a reasonable period of time.

2. Puerto Rican Studies

a. The establishment of a Puerto Rican advisory committee composed of Puerto Rican students and UW faculty. The purpose of this committee is to develop an Puerto Rican Studies program. The immediate task of this committee would be to begin the process of hiring a Puerto Rican Studies Director by the spring of 1988.

b. Additional Puerto Rican faculty should be hired within a reasonable period of time.

B. Existing Programs

1. Afro-American Studies

a. Afro-American Studies Department should be provided with sufficient resources to insure the continued growth and development of this outstanding department (easily ranks within the top ten nationally).

b. The high enrollments in Afro-American courses require immediate funding for additional TA positions.

c. The hiring of additional faculty within a reasonable period of time is also necessary for the continued development of this department.

2. Chicano Studies

a. To add one faculty position to the already promised Chicano Studies Director, a total of two positions for the 1988-89 academic year.

b. To hire additional faculty within a reasonable period of time.

3. Native American Studies

a. To add two faculty positions for the 1988-89 academic year.

b. To hire additional faculty within a reasonable period of time.

C. That each Program be provided with adequate support for TA's, administrative staff, graduate assistants, supplies, etc. as enrollments warrant.

SEXISM AND RACISM PROCEDURES WITH POSSIBLE GRIEVANCE MECHANISMS SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Statement of Purpose

The original charge of this committee was to look at racism and sexism after questions were raised by the Wisconsin Student Association. It is the belief of this subcommittee that the university has already established sexual harassment procedures. The recommendations that are presented by this subcommittee, although they improve the sexual harassment policies already established, are for the benefit of the racially harassed. This subcommittee has therefore adapted the sexual harassment procedures where present and developed others where needed.

Philosophy

It is the belief of this subcommittee that racial harassment is a grievous act with undetermined, severely damaging effects on the psyche and in some cases the human body. When interpreting the following definitions and rules as well as judging the actual act of harassment in order to determine what actions must be taken, it is necessary to become subjective and not objective.

Racial harassment is untested ground for disciplinary action but that does not make it an unjust cause for disciplinary action. Everyone involved in the judgment process presented must act under the premise that something is prejudicial or discriminatory if it is perceived as such by the person affected and a person with average sensibilities of that certain color, race, or ethnic group. In order to conform with this idea and properly assess the situation, it is necessary to empathize with the minority student upon which the act most directly impacted. Only then can the decision makers fairly determine the severity of disciplinary action needed and/or the educational process that is needed to prevent a recurrence.

"Whatever may be the limitations which trammel inquiry elsewhere, we believe that the great state University of Wisconsin-Madison should ever encourage that continual and fearless sifting and winnowing by which the truth can be found." This inscription is laid in upon a tablet outside this University's citadel of power, Bascom Hall. In the translation of this picturesque language, the tablet expresses that the University of Wisconsin-Madison is permanently dedicated to the principle of academic freedom. By no means do we wish to violate this sentiment in our proposal to the Faculty Senate. These procedures are designed to eliminate the reckless abuse of the minority that has long suffered at the hand of majority society. Accurate factual statements concerning minority individuals are not the target of these procedures but the unfounded remarks reflecting stereotypes and racial insensitivity of this society are. These procedures are designed to prevent the unjustifiable mockery of humanity, be it for pleasure or malice against a vital part of our society.

Any belief that these procedures will open a way for professors, staff and employees to become "harassed" is unfounded. These procedures mean to eradicate the senseless abuse of minorities within the educational community

of the University of Wisconsin-Madison and make it consciously aware the proper placement of minorities as first class participants in our society.

Preamble

Racial harassment is insulting or demeaning behavior toward others because of their color, cultural, or ethnic background. The sources of such behavior may be general ignorance of and insensitivity to human differences or they may be intentional efforts to intimidate others because of their differences. The effects of racial harassment not only insult the dignity of the individual but it is antithetical to and destructive of a climate in which each individual can achieve his or her full educational potential. Racial harassment may seriously interfere with learning performance and may make the learning environment intimidating, hostile or demeaning. Racial harassment is an insult to the person at whom it is directed and to the University community as a whole.

Persons who believe they have been harassed on the basis of their color, cultural or ethnic background should promptly bring their complaints to the attention of the Dean of Students, the Office of Affirmative Action and Compliance, Office of the Dean of the college in which the behavior occurred. Whether the incident arose out of ignorance and insensitivity or out of an intentional desire to intimidate, prompt review of the matter is a key component in the efforts to eliminate racial harassment and to make the University an institution at which persons of all colors, cultures and ethnic backgrounds can enjoy the full benefits of education.

Recommendations

We the Committee on Grievance Procedures recommend that the Vice Chancellor take it upon himself to do the following:

1. Convey to the minority student population that they should contact respective student organizations, faulty and staff members, the Dean of Students' Office, Office of Affirmative Action, UW Police and Security, and personnel directly involved in minority affairs when racially harassed. They should contact those persons or organizations they feel will properly assist them and advocate on their behalf in order to correct the situation.

2. Develop an "act of harassment" form in order to properly report all acts of harassment be they racial or sexual to the Dean of Students Office.

3. Insist that the aforementioned persons and organizations fill out these harassment forms when approached by a student and send a copy to the Dean of Students' Office and keep one copy for their personal records.

4. Require the designation of responsibility to a grievance advisor for each department and for the entire school or college.

5. Take proper steps in order to implement the following grievance procedure in every school and college on the University of Wisconsin-Madison campus (see appendix 1).

6. Require the Dean of Students' Office to put its racial harassment policy in writing and establish a schedule of reporting progress to the student and recording incidents.

7. See that racial harassment definitions and rules be implemented in the Faculty Legislation (see appendix 2).

8. See that sexual harassment definitions and rules continue to be implemented in the Faculty Legislation (see appendix 3).

Appendix 1

RECOMMENDED SCHOOL/COLLEGE AND DEPARTMENT
RACIAL HARASSMENT PROCEDURE

1. The student should first contact one of the following organizations or persons:

   Student organizations, faculty member, staff member, Dean of Students' Office, Affirmative Action Office, UW Police and Security, personnel involved with minority affairs.

2. The student should talk with the person at whom the grievance is directed. If the student chooses, he or she should be accompanied by another person of the student's choice.

3. If unsatisfied, the student should contact the department's grievance advisor. The grievance advisor will attempt to resolve the problem informally. If this cannot be done to the student's satisfaction, the student can submit the grievance to the grievance advisor in writing. This must be done within 60 (sixty) calendar days of the alleged discrimination. If the complaint does not involve a department, the procedure in step 5 below should be followed.

4. On receipt of a written complaint, the grievance advisor will refer the matter to a department committee(s) which will obtain a written response from the person at whom the complaint is directed. This response shall be shared with the person filing the grievance. The grievance advisor will provide a written decision to the student on the action taken by the committee within 15 (fifteen) working days from the date of the receipt of the written complaint. Either party has 10 (ten) working days to file a written appeal of this decision to the Dean's level.

5. If either party is not satisfied with the decision of the department, he or she can contact the school/college grievance advisor. If the complaint does not involve one of the academic departments in the school/college, the student can contact one of the school grievance advisors within 60 (sixty) calendar days of the alleged discrimination. In either case, the school/college advisor shall attempt to resolve the issue informally. If this cannot be done, the complaint can be filed in writing. School/college grievance advisor, on receipt of such a complaint, will convene a subcommittee of the School's Equity Action Committee or a quorum of individual departments' grievance advisors. This subcommittee may ask for additional information from the parties involved and may hold a hearing. The subcommittee will then make a written recommendation to the Dean of the School or College who will render a decision. This decision shall be made within 20 (twenty) working days from the date when the written grievance was filed with the school/college grievance advisor.

6. If these procedures do not bring satisfaction, you may wish to consult the Dean of Students' Office.

7. We recommend that the Vice Chancellor of Affirmative Action be responsible for all such grievances. Until such time, Dean of Students' Office shall handle grievances involving other students and the Office of the Vice Chancellor shall handle matters concerning staff and faculty while assisting students through the usual channels and monitoring its outcome.

Appendix 2

RACIAL HARRASSMENT:
DEFINITIONS AND RULES GOVERNING THE CONDUCT OF UW-MADISON FACULTY

Part I: Flagrant or Repeated Racial Harassment Harmful to Another's Work or Study Performance or to the Work or Study Environment.

I. A University employe is subject to discipline if he or she engages in racial harassment toward another University employe or student in any of the following ways:

In a work- or learning-related setting to insult or demean a student or employe because of his/her racial, cultural or ethnic background where:

1. The conduct is perceived as demeaning by the person to whom it is directed, and

   a. The actor knew or a reasonable person could have clearly understood that the conduct would be perceived as demeaning, or

   b. Because of its flagrant or repetitious nature, the conduct either

      i. seriously interferes with work or learning performance of the person(s) to whom the conduct was directed, or

      ii. makes the University work or learning environment intimidating or hostile, or demeaning to a person of average sensibilities of the color, racial or ethnic group.

Part II. Repeated Demeaning Verbal and Other Expressive Behavior in Noninstructional Settings that is Harmful to Another's Work or Study Performance or to the Work or Study Environment.

II. A University employe is subject to discipline if, in a noninstructional but work- or learning-related setting, including but not limited to counseling or advising, he or she:

A. Repeatedly addresses or directs explicit racial, cultural or ethnic gestures, comments or related epithets concerning a specific person(s) or groups to a University employe or student if

   1. The gestures, comments or epithets are commonly considered by people of a specific color, race or ethnic group to be demeaning to persons of that color, race or ethnic group and

   2. The conduct or repetition of the conduct either

      a. seriously interferes with the work or study performance of the person(s) to whom the conduct is addressed or directed, or

b. makes the work or study environment hostile or intimidating, or demeaning to persons of average sensibilities of that color, race or ethnic group.

B. Display visual materials, alter visual materials displayed by others, or make statements, if

1. The intent of the actor is to interfere with the work or study performance of a University employe or student or to make the work or study environment hostile, intimidating, or demeaning to persons of a particular color, race or ethnic group and

2. Such displays, alterations, or statements are commonly considered by persons of average sensibilities of a particular color, race or ethnic group to be demeaning and

3. The person making the display, alteration, or statement had previously been asked not to engage in such conduct or conduct of substantially the same kind, and the display, alteration or statement either

a. seriously interferes with the work or study performance of a University employe or student, or

b. makes the work or study environment hostile or intimidating, or demeaning to persons of average sensibilities of a particular color, race or ethnic group

Part III: Demeaning Verbal and Other Expressive Behavior in Instructional Settings.

III. Discipline of University employes because of expressive behavior in an instructional setting shall be governed by the following definitions and rules:

A. Definitions. For purposes of Part IV:

1. An "instructional setting" is a situation in which a University employe is communicating with a student(s) concerning matters the employe is responsible for teaching to the student(s). These situations include, but are not limited to, such communication in a classroom, in a laboratory, during a field trip, and in an employe's office; advising and counseling situations are not included.

2. "Expressive behavior" is conduct in an instructional setting through which an employe seeks to communicate with students. It includes, but is not limited to, the use of visual materials, oral or written statements, and assignment of visual, recorded, or written materials.

B. Protected Expressive Behavior

1. Expressive behavior related to subject matter.

a. An employe's selection of instructional materials shall not be a basis for discipline unless an authorized hearing body finds that the employe's claim that the materials are germane to the subject of the course is clearly unreasonable.

b. If an employe claims that expressive behavior constituted an opinion or statement germane to the subject matter of the course in which the behavior occurred, the behavior shall not be a basis for disciplinary action unless an authorized hearing body finds that the employe's claim is clearly unreasonable. Expressive behavior that falls within the prohibition of subsection C.2 below shall not be considered an opinion or statement germane to the subject matter of the course.

2. Teaching techniques are not protected under IV.B.1. An employe's choice of techniques to accomplish an educational objective shall not be a basis for discipline unless an authorized hearing body finds clearly unreasonable the employe's claim that the objective cannot be accomplished as effectively by techniques less likely to cause harm of the kind described in C.1.(c) below. If a technique falls within the prohibition of C.2 below, the employe's claim shall be found to be clearly unreasonable.

C. Unprotected Expressive Behavior Subject to Discipline

1. An employe's expressive behavior in an instructional setting may be the basis for discipline if any claims that the behavior is protected under subsections B.1 or B.2 have been rejected and

a. the behavior is commonly considered by persons of average sensibilities of a particular color, race or ethnic group to be demeaning, and

b. the person engaging in such conduct has previously been asked not to engage in such conduct or conduct of substantially the same kind, and

c. the conduct either

i. seriously interferes with the academic work of a student in the course, or

ii. makes the instructional setting hostile or intimidating or demeaning to students of

average sensibilities of a particular color, race or ethnic group.

2. In addition, an employe is subject to discipline if, in addressing a student(s) in an instructional setting, he or she repeatedly uses explicit racial, cultural or ethnic gestures, comments or epithets to refer to a student(s) in the course or the groups to which the students belong and if the gestures, comments or epithets

   a. are commonly considered by people of a specific racial, cultural or ethnic group to be demeaning to that racial, cultural or ethnic group and

   b. repetition of such conduct either

      i. seriously interferes with the learning or other academic performance of the student(s) to whom the faculty member referred, or

      ii. makes the instructional setting hostile or intimidating or demeaning to persons of average sensibilities of that racial, cultural or ethnic group.

Appendix 3

II-303
SEXUAL HARASSMENT: DEFINITIONS AND RULES GOVERNING THE CONDUCT OF UW-MADISON FACULTY

Part I: Sexual Favors as a Basis for Actions Affecting an Individual's Welfare as a Student or Employee.

I. A member of the University faculty is subject to discipline if he or she behaves toward another University employee or student in any of the following ways:

   A. Make or threaten to make submission to or rejection of requests for sexual favors a basis for use of one's status as a member of the University faculty to bring about decisions or assessments affecting an individual's welfare as an employee or student.

   B. Agree to, or offer to trade sexual favors for use of one's status as a member of the University faculty to bring about favorable decisions or assessments affecting an individual's welfare as a student or employee.

Part II: Flagrant or Repeated Sexual Advances, Requests for Sexual Favors, and Physical Contacts Harmful to Another's Work or Study Performance or to the Work or Study Environment.

II. A member of the University faculty is subject to discipline if he or she behaves toward another University employee or student in any of the following ways:

   In a work- or learning-related setting, make sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or physical contacts commonly understood to be of a sexual nature, if

   1. the conduct is unwanted by the person(s) to whom it is directed, and

   2. the actor knew or a reasonable person could clearly have understood that the conduct was unwanted, and

   3. because of its flagrant or repetitious nature, the conduct either

      a. seriously interferes with work or learning performance of the person(s) to whom the conduct was directed, or

      b. makes the University work or learning environment intimidating or hostile, or demeaning to a person of average sensibilities.

Part III: Repeated Demeaning Verbal and Other Expressive Behavior in Noninstructional Settings that is Harmful to Another's Work or Study Performance or to the Work or Study Environment.

III. A member of the University faculty is subject to discipline if, in a noninstructional but work- or learning-related setting, he or she:

A. Repeatedly addresses or directs sexual gestures, or sexually explicit comments or gender-related epithets concerning a specific person(s) to a University employee(s) or student(s), if

1. the gestures, comments, or epithets are commonly considered by people of a specific sex or sexual preference to be demeaning to that sex or sexual preference, and

2. repetition of such conduct either

a. seriously interferes with the work or study performance of the person(s) to whom the conduct is addressed or directed, or

b. makes the work or study environment hostile or intimidating, or demeaning to persons of average sensibilities of that sex or sexual preference.

B. Display visual materials, alter visual materials displayed by others, or make statements, if

1. the intent of the actor is to interfere with the work or study performance of a University employee or student or to make the work or study environment hostile, intimidating, or demeaning to persons of a particular sex or sexual preference, and

2. such displays, alterations, or statements are commonly considered by persons of a particular sex or sexual preference and of average sensibilities to be demeaning to members of that group, and

3. the person making the display, alteration, or statement had previously been asked not to engage in such conduct or conduct of substantially the same kind, and

4. the display, alteration, or statement either

a. seriously interferes with the work or study performance of a University employee or student, or

b. makes the work or study environment hostile or intimidating, or demeaning to persons of average sensibilities of a particular sex or sexual preference.

Part IV: Demeaning Verbal and Other Expressive Behavior in Instructional Settings.

IV. Discipline of faculty members because of expressive behavior in an instructional setting shall be governed by the following definitions and rules:

A. Definitions. For purposes of Part IV:

1. An "instructional setting" is a situation in which a member of the faculty is communicating with a student(s) concerning matters the faculty member is responsible for teaching to the student(s). These situations include, but are not limited to, such communication in a classroom, in a laboratory, during a field trip, and in a faculty member's office; advising and counseling situations are not included.

2. "Expressive behavior" is conduct in an instructional setting through which a faculty member seeks to communicate with students. It includes, but is not limited to, the use of visual materials, oral or written statements, and assignment of visual, recorded, or written materials.

B. Protected Expressive Behavior.

1. Expressive behavior related to subject matter.

a. A faculty member's selection of instructional materials shall not be a basis for discipline unless an authorized hearing body finds that the faculty member's claim that the materials are germane to the subject of the course is clearly unreasonable.

b. If a faculty member claims that expressive behavior constituted an opinion or statement germane to the subject matter of the course in which the behavior occurred, the behavior shall not be a basis for disciplinary action unless an authorized hearing body finds that the faculty member's claim is clearly unreasonable. Expressive behavior that falls within the prohibition of subsection C.2 below shall not be considered an opinion or statement germane to the subject matter of the course.

2. Teaching techniques are not protected under IV.B.1. A faculty member's choice of techniques to accomplish an educational objective shall not be a basis for discipline unless an authorized hearing body finds clearly unreasonable the faculty member's claim that the objective cannot be accomplished as effectively by techniques less likely to cause harm of the kind described in C.1.(c.) below. If a technique falls within the prohibition of C.2 below, the faculty member's claim shall be found to be clearly unreasonable.

C. Unprotected Expressive Behavior Subject to Discipline.

1. A faculty member's expressive behavior in an instructional setting may be the basis for discipline if any claims that the behavior is protected under subsections B.1 or B.2 have been rejected, and

   a. the behavior is commonly considered by persons of a particular sex or sexual preference and of average sensibilities to be demeaning to members of that group, and

   b. the person engaging in such conduct has previously been asked not to engage in such conduct or conduct of substantially the same kind, and

   c. the conduct either

      (i) seriously interferes with the academic work of a student(s) in the course, or

      (ii) makes the instructional setting hostile or intimidating, or demeaning to students of a particular sex or sexual preference and of average sensibilities.

2. In addition, a faculty member is subject to discipline if, in addressing a student(s) in an instructional setting, he or she repeatedly uses sexual gestures, sexually explicit comments, or gender-related epithets to refer to a student(s) in the course, and if the gestures, comments, or epithets

   a. are commonly considered by people of a specific sex or sexual preference to be demeaning to that sex or sexual preference, and

   b. repetition of such conduct either

      (i) seriously interferes with the learning or other academic performance of the student(s) to whom the faculty member referred, or

      (ii) makes the instructional setting hostile or intimidating, or demeaning to persons of average sensibilities of that sex or sexual preference.

[UW-Madison Faculty Document 458A, 2 November 1981]

ORIENTATION SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Statement of Purpose

According to our understanding of the charge of the Orientation Subcommittee of the Steering Committee on Minority Affairs, our committee was to examine the type of orientation necessary for students of color who are new to the UW-Madison campus in the hope of increasing the comfort level of these students, and introducing them to available services. However, at our first meeting, it was unanimously agreed that if students of color are going to feel comfortable at this campus, the orientation had to be expanded to include faculty, staff, administration and majority culture students. If the students of color were the only group on campus to participate in anti-racism orientation workshops, this was a "blaming the victim approach". Hence, the Orientation Subcommittee has designed a multi-faceted approach to orienting the campus to the insidious nature of racism as exhibited on the UW-Madison and other campuses.

It is important to note that the programming suggested within this report can only succeed under the condition that all the components herein are funded as line items in an appropriate administrative office within UW-Madison.

Recommendations

1. Initiate a multi-faceted approach addressing the issue of racism within the university, designed to ensure the participation and to effectively reach the entire university community (including faculty, staff, administration). Appropriate creative strategies should be considered by the university to maximize participation by each of the respective university communities named above.

2. In order to reach all incoming students we suggest instituting an anti-racism workshop within an orientation program each semester for both majority and students of color. Content will address racism issues and an overview of academic services and campus facilities. It is suggested that this program be offered continually throughout the semester. Participation in this orientation should be mandatory. Continuing majority students and students of color should participate in anti-racism workshops as proposed on p.3 (See Item # 1).

3. To ensure workshop content reflects the current students of color experience on the UW-Madison campus each year the Dean of Students Office, housing, racism hotline, etc., should compile a list of racial incidents/complaints to be shared with workshop facilitators.

4. Design and offer a summer six week, one credit modular course (possible in conjunction with the Multi-Cultural Center) designed to reach high-risk students of color. This course would give students an in-depth awareness of academic survival skills (study skills), campus facilities and support services and of the campus administration hierarchy. This course may involve the expansion and enhancement of existing programs which provide orientation-type activities, e.g., Summer Collegiate Experience, Academic Advancement Program, etc. It is recommended that scholarships be provided for participants.

5. Initiate a "Pals" program which would: 1) help new students of color during registration week, as well as 2) provide minority students/staff visibility, and 3) serve as tour guides to visiting junior and high school students of color with training from the recruitment office. "Pals" will be students selected by the Minority Coalition.

6. Direct special attention and services to the Eagle Heights student housing facilities (to include Eagle Heights Assembly Association, and UW administrative staff) since a large number of students of color reside in this complex and have expressed the need for anti-racism workshops.

7. Ethnic/racial background of students of color should be made available to facilitate outreach by the appropriate student of color organizations, and other interested units within the university, similar to the current proposal being considered by the M/D Committee. For example, Latino must be broken down to Chicano, Puerto Rican, Latin, Central and South American. Asian students have expressed a similar need.

Item # 1

Anti-Racism Workshop Content

Workshop content for majority culture students, faculty and staff:

Levels of racism
Typical responses to charges of racism
Interpersonal styles of people of color
Group discussion.

Workshop content for "Addressing Racism on a Predominantly White Campus"

Levels of racism
Typical responses to charges of racism
Learning how to choose your battles and win
interpersonal styles of people of color.

Anti-Racism Activities

Audience	Method of Outreach	Target date of Implementation
Faculty	- New faculty orientation	1987
	- Target each school and college	1988
	- Departmental meetings	1988
	- Letter from Chancellor	immediate
	- Employe Assistance Prog.	1988
Majority Students Continuing	- Residency Halls	1988
	- Eagle Heights	1988
	- Fraternities and Sororities	1988
	- Student Gov.	1988
	- Student Organizations	1988
	- SOAR Program	1988
New Students	- Orientation Days	1988
Academic Staff	- New staff orientation	1988
	- SPA	1988
	- Annual anti-racism academic staff meetings	1989
	- Employe Assistance Prog.	1988
Administration	- Management Dev. Prog.	1987
	- Staff Meetings	1988
	- SPA	1988
	- Dean/Chancellor Mtgs.	1988
	- Employe Assistance Prog.	1988

Audience	Method of Outreach	Target date of Implementation
Police and Security	- New staff orientation	1988
	- annually for all	1988
Students of Color	- AAP	1988
Continuing	- Student of Color Orgs.	1988
	- Residence Halls	1988
	- Workshops "Addressing Racism on a Predominantly White Campus"	1987
new and cont.	- Orientation Days	1988
Classified Staff	- Staff Orientation	1988
	- Annual Anti-Racism meetings	1988
	- Employe Assistance Prog.	1988
Other	- Teaching Assistants	1989

Item # 2

Orientation Budget Items

Academic Staff Person (full time) to be working out of the Multi-Cultural Center. The salaries should be commensurate with job description and applicants qualifications.

2. Appropriate staffing of Graduate Assistants will probably involve the following:

At least 10 GA positions (to equal at least 5 FTEs)
Training materials
Films/Texts
Publicity
Consultant/trainer fees

3. As programming and job descriptions are designed, budgets figures will be clarified.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

The attempt to improve contact between the University of Wisconsin and the minority communities of Madison will require both immediate and long-term action. The attempt will be organized around a community outreach office, perhaps located in a campus Multi-Cultural Center. Recognizing that such an office, and such a center, may require an extended period of development, the Subcommittee on Community Outreach has divided its recommendations into several categories.

Our first group of recommendations is directed towards increasing student awareness of, and contact with, the Madison community. These recommendations would require relatively little new funding and could be realized in the near future by expanding existing programs.

A second set of recommendations seeks to increase community involvement with the University. Centered around the proposed "community outreach office," these recommendations focus on increasing the dispersal of information concerning campus programs and on improving communication between the University and community-based organizations.

A third set of recommendations, intended both to increase the comfort of minority students at the University and to aid in long-term recruitment efforts, involves the establishment of new programs over a period of several years.

Recommendations for Immediate Action

1. Update the School of Social Work's "Resource Guide for Minority Students" and incorporate it within the "Ethnic Minorities" section of Wheat and Chaff. This will serve both to increase minority students' awareness of community resources and to increase majority students' awareness of minority concerns.

2. Make an active effort to alert community organizations to the availability of work-study funds for student employees.

3. Use state educational radio and television systems for the development of programming oriented toward establishing ties between the University and the minority communities of Madison.

Recommendations for Outreach Office and Related Programs

1. Establish a Community Outreach/Minority Services Office with its own budget and staff. Ideally located in a Multi-Cultural Center, this office would coordinate support services offered to minority students and strengthen contacts between the University and Madison's minority communities. Among the duties of the Office would be:

   a. To disseminate information on existing University programs;
   b. To establish a formal liaison with Madison's minority communities, perhaps involving a regularly staffed office located on the South Side.

c. To act as a clearinghouse connecting University students seeking to increase their community involvement with appropriate programs and organizations.
d. To aid in the development of community-based scholarship programs aimed specifically at minority students.

2. As a first step toward realization of this proposal, we recommend the establishment of a Planning Committee, under the auspices of the Chancellor's Office. Charged with establishing the basic duties and procedures of the Community Outreach Office, this Committee would include representatives of UW students, staff, faculty, administration and of community organizations.

Recommendations for Long-Term Action

1. Establish a "host-family" program, similar to that currently serving the needs of foreign students, matching minority students with families in the Madison community. This program could be realized with the aid of community organizations such as the Masons, Eastern Stars, Links, the Urban League, the N.A.A.C.P. and various churches.

2. Develop a tutoring program for minority elementary and high school students in Madison under the auspices of the Departments of Elementary and Secondary Education. The logistics (but not the content and direction) of such a program could be coordinated by a graduate student, who could help organize volunteers from the student body in all colleges.

3. Revitalize the mentor program in all campus colleges. Drawing on the model of the Chancellor's Scholars program, each incoming minority student could be assigned a faculty or staff mentor in his or her chosen field of study. The mentors, who should receive formal training and granted release time for their duties, would be assigned to students for the duration of their stay at the University.

4. Seek grants for the establishment of an Upward Bound program with year-round follow-up. The preparation of grant applications should follow the model of those developed by Carter and Tardola for the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.