

**SENATE AD HOC DIVERSITY COMMITTEE (AHDC)
FACULTY AND STAFF SUB-COMMITTEE PRELIMINARY REPORT
9/21/09**

This report is being prepared in response to the Academic Senate Resolution on the Ad Hoc Diversity Committee (AHDC) of 5/22/08 and addresses those aspects of the charge (below) which are related to faculty and staff data.

BE IT RESOLVED: That the SSU Academic Senate will immediately constitute an ad hoc committee, chaired by a faculty member, to assess Diversity on campus beginning this semester in terms of race, color, religion, national origin, sex (including sexual harassment and sexual assault), sexual orientation, marital status, pregnancy, age, disability, medical condition and covered veteran's status (as articulated in the University's Non-Discrimination Policy). The committee shall serve during the 2008-2009 academic year. Voting members of this committee will consist of a representative from each academic school, one member from the library, one SSP; non-voting members will include two students, one staff, one member from Extended Education the Vice Provost, Academic Affairs, the Vice President for SAEM, and the Director of Employee Relations and Compliance or their designees and a CFA Affirmative Action representative.

The charge to this committee will be to engage in a comprehensive review of the history and current status of Diversity at SSU at all levels, including (but not limited to): curriculum; faculty, staff and student activities for recruitment and retention and graduation or promotion; institutional programs; funding sources, and administrative support. It is also recommended that the committee expand its scope to include socio-economic status. This committee will report its findings to the Senate as part of a coherent, articulated Diversity assessment with prioritized recommendations for action. The recommendations would include targets, implementation strategies, time-lines and funding benchmarks).

We have divided this report into five (5) parts. The first deals with data collection and analysis, the second with faculty data, the third with staff data, the fourth are the results of the analysis of the data for faculty and for staff (in process), and the fifth and final one with curriculum.

As a summary, we are providing some of the major findings followed by several recommendations that we feel should be given highest priority. The recommendations represent the views of the members of the Faculty and Staff Data Subcommittee and do not necessarily represent the views of the other members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity.

MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. It is recommended that Employee Relations and Compliance consult with Faculty Affairs and Employee Services in generating the Affirmative Action Plan to ensure the accuracy and relevance of the analyses and that relevant data (including historical trends) be shared with the Cabinet, SSU Managers and the chairs of academic departments.
- B. It is recommended that relevant and accurate information about the diversity of SSU faculty and staff, as well as strategies for increasing the diversity of our workforce, be

shared with departments and search committees as searches are initiated.

- C. It is recommended that the University ensure that its Affirmative Action Plan complies with current federal regulations, as well as and state and/or system-wide guidelines, and is an accurate reflection of the current workforce.
- D. It is recommended that ERC provide accurate data to the university and recommend pro-active solutions for any issues related to diversity that are identified (and that the Division of Administration and Finance support increasing the staffing of the ERC for compliance support as soon as budgets permit).
- E. It is recommended that Faculty Affairs continue to support academic departments and tenure-track search committees including, but not limited to, researching and recommending best practices for enhancing the diversity of SSU's faculty and recommending pro-active solutions to the disparity in both the representation of ethnic minority faculty at SSU (as compared both to current availability and to other CSU campuses) and the differential in salaries of male and female full and associate professors at SSU. It is also recommended that an analysis be conducted to determine if comparable salary differences exist for ethnic minority v. non-minority faculty. It is further recommended that as that as soon as budgets permit, the Division of Academic Affairs increase the staff in Faculty Affairs available to support these functions).
- F. It is recommended that Employee Relations and Compliance, in conjunction with Faculty Affairs and Employee Services, analyze data regarding current faculty and staff with disabling conditions and recommend any necessary pro-active solutions to barriers that are identified.
- G. It is recommended that the Academic Senate follow-up on the recommendations in this report, conduct an analysis of our current curriculum in terms of diversity issues, and on an on-going basis review the University's progress in addressing diversity issues and increasing the diversity of its faculty. Such a committee might work in conjunction with EPC, Faculty Standards and Affairs, and the Student Affairs Committee (and also look at issues that affect SSU students).

I. Data Collection and Analysis:

The Faculty and Staff Data Sub-Committee was charged by the Senate Ad Hoc Diversity Committee with reviewing information related to the recruitment, retention and promotion of faculty and staff at SSU. The current members of the sub-committee are:

Dr. Hee-Won Kang, Literacy Studies and Elementary Education¹
Dr. Barbara Lesch McCaffry, Hutchins School of Liberal Studies

¹ Professor Hee-Won Kang was unable to participate during the Spring 2009 semester due to a scheduling conflict.¹

Ad Hoc Diversity Committee
Faculty and Staff Sub-Committee Preliminary Report

-3-

Dr. Erma Jean Sims, Literacy Studies and Elementary Education²
Ms. Rashmi Singh, Humanities³

The Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Melinda Barnard, served as a consultant to the sub-committee on faculty data and hiring issues and Joyce Suzuki, Managing Director of Employee Relations and Compliance provided data from the University's Affirmative Action Plans.

Our intention was to begin with historical data from the University's Affirmative Action Plans that included:

- how many men versus women and minority versus non-minority faculty and staff were in each group of jobs (utilization analyses),
- a comparison of the utilization information in light of the pool of available applicants, referred to as "availability" (incumbency v. availability analyses)
- separation analyses,
- promotion analyses,
- new hires analyses, and
- salary analyses.

We also intended to look at the identification of problem areas in each of these annual reports to see what progress had been made and which areas of concern had been identified. And we intended to access the federally mandated EEO-6 reports⁴ that are done every other year to look at overall progress at diversifying the faculty and staff at SSU. The Office of Faculty Affairs and Affirmative Action had maintained the reports from 1978 to 1999 (the affirmative action function was transferred to the Division of Administration and Finance in 1999, including all files and records).

The sub-committee started discussions with the AHDC representatives from Faculty Affairs (Melinda Barnard) and Employee Relations and Compliance (Joyce Suzuki) at the beginning of the Spring 2009 semester in order to identify two representative years in the past ten for which comparable data would be available for both faculty and staff.

² During the Fall 2008 and Fall 2009 she served as the representative of the CFA Affirmative Action Committee and during the Spring 2009 served as the representative she served as the representative from the School of Education (as the replacement for Hee-Wong Kang).

³ During the Spring 2009 she served as the representative of the CFA Affirmative Action Committee (as the replacement for Erma Jean Sims) and she continued to participate during the Fall 2009 semester.

⁴ The Equal Employment Opportunity Higher Education Staff Information Report (EEO-6). A report filed biennially in odd-numbered years with the Higher Education Reporting Committee (composed of OFCCP, Department of Education/Office of Civil Rights, and EEOC) by colleges and universities. It details by job category and salary the sex and race/ethnic composition of their faculty and staffs (*Federal Contract Compliance Manual* at <http://www.dol.gov/esa/ofccp/regs/compliance/fccm/chptr1.pdf>).

Employee Relations and Compliance (ERC) reported that, in accordance with the retentions schedule of the CSU Chancellor's Office, data for the prior years was archived and then shredded. It is our understanding that data older than three years is no longer available. Without this information, any longitudinal analysis of campus-wide progress in terms of increasing the diversity of its faculty and staff is not possible.

RECOMMENDATION # 1: *It is recommended that both the Office of Faculty Affairs and ERC consult with staff in the Chancellor's Office to evaluate whether this directive precludes them from maintaining any historical analyses, Affirmative Action Plans or supporting documentation. It is further recommended that both ERC and Faculty Affairs "retain AAP reports and data . . . in order to [assess] campus-wide progress in terms of increasing the diversity of its faculty and staff."⁵*

RECOMMENDATION # 2: *Given the difficulties encountered by this sub-committee (and the one looking at student data), it is also recommended that SSU create one electronic center for SSU diversity information, efforts and programming with one individual or office charged with updating and maintaining the information. This should also include data that allows comparison of SSU with other CSU campuses.*

Although ERC provided our sub-committee with access to the University's 2007-2008 Affirmative Action Plan and data from both the 2001-2002 and 2005-2006 academic years, we have been hampered by not having access to comparable and accurate information on faculty and staff from Faculty Affairs and ERC, as well as consensus by those offices about what information could be provided that would not be a violation of the confidentiality of individuals from underrepresented groups who might be the only person in their classification or department who is a member of a specific ethnic group. We appreciate all of the efforts that went into those deliberations.

At the end of the Spring, 2009 semester the two offices agreed to work together to clarify these issues and provide both utilization and incumbency v. availability data to the sub-committee by July 1, 2009 for two specific years (with relevant information about availability, the computation of availability, and which titles were included in specific job groups for staff). We received a report from Faculty Affairs on August 6th.⁶ In late August we received some additional information from ERC and on September 8th we received a disc with additional data from the 2001-2002 and the 2005-2006 Affirmative Action Plans. All of the data we received from ERC prior to 9/8/09 was either in PDF format or duplicated copies, which meant that all of the analyses we did prior to that date involved re-entering the data we had received.

We realize that providing this data was seriously hampered by the CSU furlough mandates which affected both offices, as well as the fact that the ERC staffing was reduced by one full-time position with the departure of the prior Manager of Employee Relations and Diversity at the end

⁵ Suggested wording contained in an e-mail from Joyce Suzuki dated 9/26/09.

⁶ Faculty Diversity Data Project, prepared by Faculty Affairs (5/12/09)

of December of 2007. Since the prior incumbent was the person specifically charged with Compliance and for generation and analysis of the Affirmative Action Plan, this reduction in staffing has clearly had an impact on any pro-active efforts to identify problem areas and develop strategies for addressing them (as well as provide training for faculty, staff and students, and investigate complaints of discrimination).

RECOMMENDATION # 3: *It is recommended that as soon as budgets permit, the Division of Administration and Finance increase the staff in ERC available for compliance support in order to analyze and provide data to the university and recommend pro-active solutions.*

In response to our request for new hires, promotion, separation and salary analyses, ERC indicated that “this analysis was not done for the 07/08 AAP as it is not required and can not be generated as a report from the system. Because of these and other constraints of the system an outside vendor has been contracted to prepare our AAP and will include this additional information.”⁷ It should be noted that current federal regulations by the Department of Labor’s Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs implementing Executive Order 11246 as amended (41 CFR 60) specify the components of an Affirmative Action Plan and include:

- (2) personnel activity (applicant flow, hires, terminations, promotions, and other personnel actions) to determine whether there are selection disparities;
- (3) compensation system(s) to determine whether there are gender-, race-, or ethnicity-based disparities;
- (4) selection, recruitment, referral, and other personnel procedures to determine whether they result in disparities in the employment or advancement of minorities or women;⁸

RECOMMENDATION # 4: *It is recommended that SSU’s annual Affirmative Action Plans analyze applicant flow, new hires, separations, promotions and salaries to ensure compliance with current federal regulations.*

In conversation with those overseeing Faculty Affairs and ERC, there was discussion of the fact that there was very minimal return of applicant data forms from those applying for both faculty and staff positions at SSU. Prior to the transfer of the affirmative action function to the Division of Administration and Finance in 1999, there was sufficient response of these forms to prepare applicant flow analyses and also alert recruiting departments to insufficiently diverse pools of applicants for both faculty and staff positions.

RECOMMENDATION # 5: *It is recommended that ERC research best practices to ensure robust return of applicant data forms and implement any changes so that information is*

⁷ E-mail from Joyce Suzuki dated 9/26/09.

⁸ http://www.dol.gov/dol/allcfr/ESA/Title_41/Part_60-2/41CFR60-2.17.htm

collected about applicant pools and shared in aggregate with hiring departments and committees to support hiring goals being met.

Prior to 2000, the Affirmative Action Plan included analyses of data on faculty and staff with self-identified disabling conditions. This is a key group covered by federal, state and CSU regulations. While federal law does not specifically mandate this analysis, it is part of the University's obligation to recruit, accommodate, retain and promote those with disabling conditions.

RECOMMENDATION # 6: *It is recommended that ERC research and implement best practices to ensure the University's progress in recruiting, accommodating, retaining and promoting faculty and staff with disabling conditions, analyze data for faculty and staff, as well as identify and remove any potential barriers.*

II. Faculty Data:

In the course of our discussions with Melinda Barnard, the Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, we discovered that recent information about the utilization and incumbency v. availability for faculty had not been provided by ERC to Faculty Affairs. In addition, Faculty Affairs was not consulted regarding the computation of availability for tenured and tenure-track faculty. Since the availability data is based on current recruitment patterns (including the determination of what earned degree data should be utilized), it is crucial that the office overseeing these recruitments be involved (including data relevant to tenured and tenure-track faculty, the job groups covering librarians and coaches, and any analyses of lecturers).

RECOMMENDATION # 7: *It is recommended that there be on-going consultation by ERC with Faculty Affairs regarding both incumbency v. availability analyses and the computation of availability for faculty to ensure both the accuracy and relevance of the data being utilized.*

As Melinda Barnard noted in conversations with the chair of this sub-committee regarding the tenure-track hiring process, utilization and incumbency v. availability data is not being provided to deans, department chairs and faculty hiring committees as they initiate tenure-track faculty searches (or searches for lecturer pools in their departments). Such information was provided to them prior to 2000.

RECOMMENDATION # 8: *It is recommended that annual incumbency v. availability analyses prepared by ERC be shared by Faculty Affairs with deans, department chairs and hiring committees as they initiate tenure-track faculty searches (or searches for lecturer pools in their departments).*

RECOMMENDATION # 9: *It is recommended that at the commencement of recruitments for all searches for tenure-track positions and lecturer pools, information on the current composition of the department and hiring goal and recruitment strategies be shared with search committees.*

RECOMMENDATION # 10: *It is recommended that when annual analyses of new hires, separations, promotions and salaries are available from ERC that Faculty Affairs share any trends, concerns and recommendations with the Provost, School Deans and department chairs.*

There have historically been meetings with Faculty Affairs and faculty tenure-track search committees (and with department chairs at the commencement of searches for applicant pools for lecturer positions). This should include discussion of how departments can improve the composition of their pools and the outcome of their searches.

RECOMMENDATION # 11: *It is recommended that Faculty Affairs research and share best practices with Deans, department chairs and search committees for enhancing the diversity of SSU faculty (including, but not limited to, identifying and soliciting applications from ethnic minorities, women and candidates with disabling conditions for both tenure-track hires and lecturer pools).*

It is further recommended, that Faculty Affairs continue to consult with the CFA Affirmative Action Committee in terms of that committee's work on identifying strategies to enhance the outcome of searches for faculty positions in terms of diversity.

At this point, according to Faculty Affairs, information about applicant pools is not available from ERC. Therefore, it cannot be shared with recruiting departments.

RECOMMENDATION # 12: *Once best practices to ensure a robust return of applicant data forms has been researched and implemented by ERC, it is recommended that information about applicant pools be shared in aggregate by Faculty Affairs with Deans, department chairs and search committees to support hiring goals being met.*

The availability data currently being utilized for faculty searches only includes data for doctoral degrees conferred. There are several departments for which the Master of Fine Arts (M. F.A.) degree is the appropriate terminal degree (e.g., Art Studio and Theatre Arts). In addition, the specific fields of study (and weighting of each) for each department have not currently been reviewed by Faculty Affairs (e.g., departments like Art include faculty with both a doctorate in Art History and those with M. F. A. degrees in a studio arts discipline. However, the availability data currently reported by ERC in the 2007-2008 Affirmative Action Plan for that department is only for the doctorate in Art History).

RECOMMENDATION # 13: *It is recommended that ERC consult with Faculty Affairs regarding the appropriate disciplinary information and degree level for computing the availability goal for each academic department.*

In the 2001-2002 and the 2005-2006 Affirmative Action Plans, the data analyzed for faculty by academic department indicates that it includes only tenured and tenure-track faculty. However, as Melinda Barnard, the Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, noted in conversations with the chair of this sub-committee, these numbers seem to include lecturers as well (as they are close to

significantly greater than the actual number of tenured and tenure-track faculty). In addition, some faculty have been included in departments for which the department has no hiring responsibility (e.g., including faculty in the Bachelor's of Liberal Arts program in Ukiah—a program run through the School of Social Sciences—as part of the data reported for the Hutchins School of Liberal Studies, which is in the School of Arts and Humanities).

RECOMMENDATION # 14: *It is recommended that ERC consult with Faculty Affairs to ensure that the data being analyzed in the Affirmative Action Plan matches actual departmental assignments.*

In the 2007-2008 Affirmative Action Plan, the data analyzed for staff includes an analysis of lecturers under the EEO-6 category for Professional / Non-Faculty rather than in the category for Faculty.⁹ In addition, the availability utilized for this job family is “Census 2000 EEO Residence Data” for Sonoma, County, California and nation-wide. As Joyce Suzuki noted, “lecturers are in the professional [non-faculty] category and the residence data is used because we do not require a Ph.D. as we do for tenure/tenure track faculty.”¹⁰ Typically, availability for lecturers would be based on those holding at least a master's degree in a specific field, rather than the number of adults living in a specific geographic area.

RECOMMENDATION # 15: *It is recommended that ERC consult with Faculty Affairs and ensure that all instructional faculty are analyzed in the Affirmative Action Plan within the EEO-6 category for faculty.*

RECOMMENDATION # 16: *It is recommended that ERC consult with Faculty Affairs and ensure that the availability computation used for lecturers is reflective of the skills, knowledge and abilities required (e.g., master's degrees conferred across the disciplines in which we offer instruction).*

We are pleased that, as a result of our discussions with the Faculty Affairs and ERC, we identified key areas in which there had been a lack of consultation regarding faculty and availability data that was being generated by ERC. As a result, progress is already being made. Similarly, there is “a collaborative effort between the CFA Affirmative Action Committee and Faculty Affairs in terms of strategies for enhancing the recruitment of diverse faculty at SSU.”¹¹

III. STAFF DATA

As Joyce Suzuki confirmed, information regarding the utilization and incumbency v. availability for staff has not been provided by ERC to Employee Services (who oversee the recruitment of

⁹ SSU Affirmative Action program update: April 2008 - March 2009 (on reserve at SSU's library at [GRES0012](#))

¹⁰ E-mail from Joyce Suzuki dated 9/26/09.

¹¹ As noted in an e-mail from Erma Jean Sims dated 9/24/09.

staff) nor was Employee Services was consulted regarding the computation of availability for staff job groups (as is the case for faculty data).¹² In light of this, the following recommendations (comparable to those for faculty) are included.

RECOMMENDATION # 17: *It is recommended that there be on-going consultation by ERC with Employee Services regarding both incumbency v. availability analyses and the computation of availability for staff to ensure both the accuracy and relevance of data being utilized.*

RECOMMENDATION # 18: *It is recommended that annual incumbency v. availability analyses prepared by ERC be shared with Employee Services.*

RECOMMENDATION # 19: *It is recommended that the annual incumbency v. availability analyses prepared by ERC be shared by Employee Services with deans, managers, department chairs and hiring committees as they initiate searches for staff positions.*

RECOMMENDATION # 20: *It is recommended that at the commencement of recruitments for all searches for permanent full-time positions information on the current composition of the job group and hiring goals should be shared with the search committee and the manager of the hiring department.*

In the past there were meetings with staff in ERC and search committees at the beginning of each search process for permanent positions. This included a discussion of how to improve the composition of the pools and the outcome of the search process. If this is not currently being done, then the following recommendation (comparable to the one for faculty) is included.

RECOMMENDATION # 21: *It is recommended that ERC and/or Employee Services research and share best practices with department chairs and search committees for enhancing the diversity of SSU staff (including, but not limited to, identifying and soliciting applications from ethnic minorities and women).*

It is our understanding that information about applicant pools is not available from ERC. Therefore, it cannot be shared with recruiting departments. If this is accurate, then the following recommendation (comparable to one for faculty) is included.

RECOMMENDATION # 22: *Once best practices to ensure a robust return of applicant data forms has been researched and implemented by ERC, it is recommended that information about applicant pools be shared in aggregate by Employee Services with managers, deans, department chairs and search committees to support hiring goals being met.*

The data we reviewed from the 2001-2002 and 2005-2006 Affirmative Action Plans included analyses by job groups. According to the Department of Labor, “federal contractors are required to establish AAP job groups and compare their employment of minorities and women within

¹² E-mail from Joyce Suzuki dated 9/26/09.

those job groups to the availability of minorities and women who are "available" for employment. Job groups are jobs that are grouped based on three factors: 1) similar wages; 2) similar job duties and responsibilities; and 3) similar opportunities for training, promotion, transfer, and other employment benefits. Each job title in an establishment should be placed into a job group. These are called 'AAP Job Groups.' ¹³

The data we received for 2007-2008 included analyses by job families (or the seven broad EEO-6 categories) rather than by job groups. The EEO-6 categories are:

1. Executive/Administrative/Managerial
2. Faculty
3. Professional/Non-Faculty
4. Secretarial/Clerical
5. Technical/Paraprofessional
6. Skilled Craft Workers
7. Service Maintenance ¹⁴

¹³ <http://www.dol.gov/esa/ofccp/scaap.htm>

¹⁴ HIGHER EDUCATION (EEO-6) DESCRIPTIONS OF JOB CATEGORIES

1. Executive, Administrative and Managerial

Include all persons whose assignments require primary (and major) responsibility for management of the institution or a customarily recognized department or subdivision thereof. Assignments require the performance of work directly related to management policies or general business operations of the institution department or subdivision, etc. It is assumed that assignments in this category customarily and regularly require the incumbent to exercise discretion and independent judgment and to direct the work of others. Report in this category all officers holding such as President, Vice President, Dean, Director, or the equivalents, as well as officers subordinate to any of these administrators with such titles as Associate Dean, Assistant Dean, executive officers of academic departments (chairmen, heads, or the equivalent) if their principal activity is administrative. Note: Supervisory personnel of the technical, clerical, craft, and service/maintenance force will be reported within the specific categories.

2. Faculty:

Include all persons whose specific assignments customarily are made for the purpose of conducting instruction, research, or public service as a principal activity (or activities), and who hold academic-rank titles of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, lecturer, or the equivalent of any one of these academic ranks. Report in this category Deans, Directors, or the equivalent, as well as Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, and executive officers of academic departments (chairmen, heads, or the equivalent) if their principal activity is instructional. Do not include student teaching or research assistants.

3. Professional Non Faculty:

Include in this category persons whose assignments would require either college graduation or experience of such kind and amount as to provide a comparable background. Include would be all staff members with assignments requiring specialized professional training who should not be reported under Activity 1 (executive) or Activity 2 (faculty), and who should not be classified under any of the four "non professional" categories of activities.

4. Clerical and Secretarial:

Include all persons whose assignments typically are associated with clerical activities or are specifically of a secretarial nature. Include personnel who are responsible for internal and external communications, recording and retrieval of data (other than computer programmers) and/or information and other paper work required in an office, such as book keepers, stenographers, clerk typist, office machine operators, statistical clerks, payroll clerks, etc.

It is our understanding that given the size of our current workforce (greater than 150 employees) we are required to analyze patterns for smaller groupings.¹⁵ This is especially relevant for the professional and technical job families for which employees may have very different skills (e.g., the skills and academic training for student services professionals, librarians and coaches is generally significantly different than for those providing less specialized professional support).

RECOMMENDATION # 23: *It is recommended that SSU's annual Affirmative Action Plans analyze staff utilizing job groups rather than job families (or EEO-6 categories) to ensure compliance with current federal regulations.*¹⁶

As noted in the section on Faculty Data, in the 2007-2008 Affirmative Action Plan, the data analyzed for staff includes an analysis of lecturers under the EEO-6 category for Professional / Non-Faculty rather than in the category for Faculty.¹⁷ In addition as noted previously, the

Include also sales clerks such as those employed full time in the bookstore, and library clerks who are not recognized as librarians.

5. Technical and Paraprofessionals:

Include all persons whose assignments require specialized knowledge or skills which may be acquired through experience or academic work such as is offered in many 2-year technical institutes, junior colleges or through equivalent on the job training. Include computer programmers and operators, draftsmen, engineering aides, junior engineers, mathematical aides, licensed, practical or vocational nurses, dietitians, photographers, radio operators, scientific assistants, technical illustrators, technicians (medical, dental, electronic-physical sciences) and similar occupations not properly classifiable in other occupational-activity categories but which are institutionally defined as technical assignments. Include persons who perform some of the duties of a professional or technician in a supportive role, which usually require less formal training and/or experience normally required for professional or technical status. Such positions may fall within as identified pattern of staff development and promotion under a "New Careers" concept.

6. Skilled Crafts:

Include all persons whose assignments typically require special manual skills and a thorough and comprehensive knowledge of the processes involved in the work, acquired through on-the-job training and experience or through apprenticeship or other formal training programs. Include mechanics and repairmen, electricians, stationary engineers, skilled machinists, carpenters, compositors and type-setters.

7. Service/Maintenance:

Include persons whose assignments require limited degrees of previously acquired skills and knowledge and in which workers perform duties which result in or contribute to the comfort, convenience and hygiene of personnel and the student body or which contribute to the upkeep and care of buildings, facilities or grounds of the institutional property. Include chauffeurs, laundry and dry cleaning operatives, cafeteria and restaurant workers, truck drivers, bus drivers, garage laborers, custodial personnel, gardeners and groundskeepers, refuse collectors, construction laborers, and security personnel (www.dop.wa.gov).

¹⁵ Smaller contractors (contractors with fewer than 150 employees), however, may formulate their AAP job groups according to EEO-1 job categories (<http://www.dol.gov/esa/ofccp/scaap.htm>).

¹⁶ *Federal Contract Compliance Manual* at <http://www.dol.gov/esa/ofccp/regs/compliance/fccm/chptr1.pdf> and as required by 41 CFR 60-2.11(b).

¹⁷ SSU Affirmative Action program update: April 2008 - March 2009 (on reserve at SSU's library at [GRES0012](#))

availability utilized for this job family is “Census 2000 EEO Residence Data” for Sonoma, County, California, and nation-wide. Typically, availability for lecturers would be based on those holding at least a master’s degree in a specific field, rather than the number of adults living in a specific geographic area (see **Recommendations # 15 and 16**).

In addition, in the 2007-2008 Affirmative Action Plan, the data utilized for availability for staff is “Census 2000 EEO Residence Data” for Sonoma, County, California and nation-wide¹⁸ rather than those with the requisite skill, knowledge and abilities (as was the case in the 2001-2002 and 2005-2006 plans). There are guidelines provided by the Department of Labor clarify this requirement to assess “those qualified for employment.”¹⁹

¹⁸ SSU Affirmative Action program update: April 2008 - March 2009 (on reserve at SSU’s library at [GRES0012](#))

¹⁹ In order to make the job group-availability comparison, federal contractors must conduct availability analyses to determine the percentage of women and minorities who have the skills required to perform the jobs within the each job group. The purpose of the availability analyses is to estimate the percentage of minorities and women among those qualified for employment for each job group. Availability involves calculation of minorities and women who are "available" to work in the job from both external sources (i.e., hired from outside the company) and internal sources (e.g., transfer or promotion of existing employee in the company).

For calculating "external" availability, you want to consider who is qualified for the job within "the reasonable recruitment area" for that job. The "reasonable recruitment area" represents the area from which a contractor usually seeks or reasonably could seek workers for a particular job group. The reasonable recruitment area availability may be determined using the Total Civilian Labor Force data (residence geography data) reported in the Census 2000 Data Tool on the Census Bureau website. We provide detailed instructions below on how to obtain this Census data.

Please note that the regulation [41 CFR 60-2.14\(d\)](#) require contractors to use the most current and discrete statistical data available in determining availability estimates. Census data is one example of an appropriate source of statistical information. Other sources include data from local job service offices and data from colleges or other training institutions.

Internal availability involves the percentage of minorities and women **inside a contractor's workforce** who are considered promotable, transferable and trainable for a particular job group. This means the percentage of minorities and women who are in "feeder" jobs or job groups who are (at the start of the AAP year), or who will become (during the AAP year) promotable or transferable from a current job or job group into another job group. This factor also requires an assessment of the number of employees who could, with appropriate training (that a contractor is reasonably able to provide), become promotable or transferable during the AAP year.

OFCCP recommends weighting the external percentage factor and the internal percentage factor by historical usage patterns to reflect the proportion of incumbents hired or to be hired from external sources and the proportion from internal sources. For example, in entry job groups, you may always hire from outside. The external factor will therefore become the entire availability. For other job groups, you may have hired from the outside 10% of the time over the last several years, but promoted from the inside 90% of the time. Each of your availability factors should then be weighted accordingly i.e., in our example the external percentage is multiplied by 10% and added to the internal percentage after it has been multiplied by 90% to come up with a final availability percentage (<http://www.dol.gov/esa/ofccp/scaap.htm>).

RECOMMENDATION # 24: *It is recommended that ERC consult with Employee Services and ensure that the availability computation used for staff job groups is reflective of the skills, knowledge and abilities required rather than general census data.*

IV. RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS OF DATA RECEIVED TO DATE

Normally one could utilize data from the University's Affirmative Action Plans over a several year span to note progress, or the lack thereof, as well as identify any areas needing additional attention. However due to the problems noted above with the data gathered and concerns regarding the appropriateness of the availability data, this was not feasible.

At this time, the members of the sub-committee are still gathering system-wide comparative data and analyzing the SSU data that we recently received. We believe it would be premature to release these further analyses until such time as the full sub-committee has an opportunity to review and discuss both the findings and the recommendations.

V. CURRICULUM:

While there has been insufficient time for the Ad Hoc Diversity Committee to fulfill the charge to complete "a comprehensive review of the history and current status of Diversity at SSU at all levels, including (but not limited to): curriculum," the Sub-Committee on Faculty and Staff Data has several general recommendations to make and urges that an analysis of this issue be done by the Senate in the future. Some of these recommendations may overlap those made by the other two sub-committees of the AHDC.

RECOMMENDATION # 25: *It is recommended that SSU provide on-going training for faculty and departments on curriculum integration on issues of diversity and "difficult dialogues."*

RECOMMENDATION # 26: *It is recommended that SSU prioritize funding for classes that address our campus' stated priorities (diversity, sustainability, community engagement, inter-disciplinary).*

RECOMMENDATION # 27: *It is recommended that SSU and the Educational Policies Committee (EPC) of the Academic Senate integrate and strengthen the diversity component of departmental Program Reviews and strengthen the integration of diversity into all aspects of Program Review.*

RECOMMENDATION # 28: *It is recommended that Schools might want to consider adding diversity (in terms of faculty, students and curriculum) as a regular agenda item in the meetings of its Chairs.*

It is further recommended that academic departments consider including a discussion of diversity in their department meetings or special retreats or workshops. For example, can issues of diversity be incorporated into ongoing activities like lecture series and student projects? How

is advising organized to help all students, especially those with special needs? What can faculty do to introduce diversity into their curriculum?

RECOMMENDATION # 29: *It is recommended that the Provost's Office survey academic departments and find out what is currently being done to help attract more diverse students to the majors and to recruit more diverse faculty, both tenure-track and lecturer, and staff.*