

ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY AND EQUITY
Annual Report 2010-2011

To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

Committee on Diversity and Equity (CDE) Charge

To work towards attaining the campus goals of diversity and equity and actively pursue the goals of affirmative action.

Membership

The Committee on Diversity and Equity consists of a Chair and at least five members. The Campus Affirmative Action Officer serves ex-officio on the committee. In addition, there is one non-Senate academic representative and one undergraduate and one graduate student representative.

Summary of CDE activities over 2010-2011

The committee's primary areas of focus during the 2010-2011 term were: 1) Discussion of the application of APM 210-1-D(4) in the Committee on Academic Personnel case review process; 2) Analysis of UCSB's 2010 Salary Equity Studies Report by EVC Lucas; 3) Consulting with UCSB Administrators on Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) special concerns; and 4) Responding to proposals from UCAAD, Academic Council, and the Office of the President.

Application of APM 210-1-D in the Committee on Academic Personnel case review process

Among the policies in the UC Academic Personnel Manual (APM) is APM210-1-D, which are instructions issued to review committees which advise on actions concerning appointees in the professor series and corresponding series; APM-210-1-D discusses additional criteria for promotion, appointment and appraisal.

Section 4 of APM-210-1-D relates to CDE's purview in that it discusses the recognition given to faculty for University and Public Service in the Academic Personnel review process, including contributions to diversity:

"University and Public Service — The faculty plays an important role in the administration of the University and in the formulation of its policies. Recognition should therefore be given to scholars who prove themselves to be able administrators and who participate effectively and imaginatively in faculty government and the formulation of departmental, college, and University policies. Services by members of the faculty to the community, State, and nation, both in their special capacities as scholars and in areas beyond those special capacities when the work done is at a sufficiently high level and of sufficiently high quality, should likewise be recognized as evidence for promotion. Faculty service activities related to the improvement of elementary and secondary education represent one example of this kind of service. Similarly, contributions to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees and as advisers to student organizations should be recognized as evidence, as should contributions furthering diversity and equal opportunity within the University through participation in such activities as recruitment, retention, and mentoring of scholars and students."

CDE had an initial discussion with P. Cohen, the Chair of the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) in the fall quarter in order to understand how CAP was using the information reported by faculty under public service and contributions to diversity in personnel cases and what methods faculty are using to report it. At the systemwide level there are ongoing discussions regarding APM 210-1-D(4) and how APM 210-1-D(4) is applied in the CAP case review process. The University Committee on Affirmative Action & Diversity (UCAAD), as part of its discussions about the subject, had requested that campus representatives to the UCAAD bring examples of what model their campuses were using to report public service and contributions to diversity for the academic personnel process, and asked for discussion of what each model would look like if campuses were able to improve upon current practice. The objective of the exercise was to evaluate a best case scenario for each campus, which could then be considered for implementation by other campuses. The examples of bio-bibliographies utilized by other campuses as well as UCSB were reviewed by CDE to evaluate how UCSB's model could be improved in a significant way using the existing basic forms and procedures.

CDE had a second meeting just before the end of the spring quarter with CAP Chair P. Cohen and Vice Chair C. Gutierrez-Jones regarding APM 210-1-D(4) and how CAP could envision improving the reporting process so that there was a more consistent approach to the reporting aspect. The difficulty with assessing contributions to diversity is that each department on campus addresses contributions to diversity in the AP process in a different manner, as do chairs, and activities vary in quantity and depth so that it is unwieldy and difficult to apply APM210-1-d(4) in a standard way. Additionally, departmental chairs and divisional deans vary in their approach to the evaluation. Across UC campuses there also are differences in how this effort is valued; some campuses don't award salary for it and only add a step, others have a one-time bonus that rewards the faculty member for one year. Though a set reward does not make sense for any particular effort, there is an argument to be made for UC campuses to adopt the most effective model of reporting. After evaluating the various campus models the CDE members and CAP Chair and Vice Chair favored the UC Berkeley model. Further communication between CAP and Academic Personnel on this issue is planned for fall 2011, and CDE will maintain contact with CAP on the topic.

UCSB's 2010 Salary Equity Studies Report by EVC Lucas

CDE met with EVC Lucas to discuss the report issued by his office, "2010 Salary Equity Report 2010", a salary equity analysis for faculty at UCSB. The purpose of the report, the data itself, salary equity trends over time, and the implications of the findings were the basis for the discussion. CDE had reviewed the report to gain some understanding on how women and underrepresented groups were placed among the UCSB salary scales and as a result had some suggestions to offer to make the report format more usable and understandable. CDE recommended a more robust description of most components of the study: the data and the methods employed, data analysis, data conclusion, description of what data were used and from what source, and specification of the salary period. A trend analysis would be useful for understanding the extent to which positive change has or has not occurred over time.

Further suggestions were made to consider for future reports, a few of which include a separate analysis of the minority women and analyses of the sciences by department to make sense of the overall lack of statistically significant results. Though some of these analyses might result in very small numbers and the identification of unique cases, they might also reveal areas on which to focus in the future.

Discussions on Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Special Topics

CDE consulted with Gary White, Director of the Disabled Students Program, and Cindy Doherty, Director of Academic Personnel, regarding how faculty, students and staff who have special needs due to psychological concerns or disabilities are, or might be, handled in terms of their personal information being made available to department chairs and others who may need to know. The members of the committee were responding to anecdotal examples brought to members by other campus faculty who were unclear about what information faculty department chairs need to know, and how they might best respond to the information. Most of the concern revolved around issues of privacy and how information should be shared or not, but the members were also interested in knowing to what extent those with such disabilities are accommodated. This information was to be shared with members' departments and colleagues.

UC Proposal to Rename Tuition as Fees

CDE reviewed the "Proposal to Rename Fees as Tuition," a well-constructed proposal that offers transparency to students and parents. It is still UC's goal to provide education for as little cost involved as possible, but the proposal argued that it must be recognized that the UC does charge tuition. The public relations efforts surrounding the proposal may be challenging but CDE largely felt that overall the proposal made eminent sense.

CDE members observed that it is conceivable that when the UC fees are included in the costs of tuition the university may be inaccessible at an even lower rate than our comparison campuses. It is important that the UC continue to have an accessible institution, one that maintains the funds needed for financial aid, in particular for those in the middle class and below. To meet this goal, there should be a bench mark that acts as a guarantee that some portion of those in the middle class and below has access.

A concern raised about this proposal was that some of what may be behind it is an effort to justify a bigger act; pushing aside or dissolving the tuition-free promise of the UC's through the Organic Act. While some attention is given to this concern in the document, the proposal's authors did not directly address what will be done to get back to that tuition-free status or how they plan to deflect the criticism that they recognize will come their way. There also seemed to be a bit of legal posturing and justification in the author's reiteration that there is no legal bar to this change - that no statute prevents them from such a change. The CDE view is that if the UC wants to rename fees as tuition and begin the inevitable increases, they should do so openly and not under the guise that the UC may, on some far-off day, return to a tuition-free model.

CDE Response to Academic Council Resolution and UCLA Statement

CDE reviewed the Academic Council Resolution and UCLA Statement on near-term choices for the University and for the most part, UCLA's statement had a number of important advantages over the "narrowly approved" statement put forward by the Academic Council.

UCLA's statement was more precisely formulated, spelling out specific ways of cutting costs, when such cuts should occur, and a well-conceived rationale for the proposals. For example, they correctly note that the funding of buildings designed to house new enrollments and new programs is not appropriate at this time and addressed the oft-overlooked issue of maintenance of buildings. Finally, UCLA very reasonably noted why UC Merced should be an exception. Relevant to the charge of the Committee on Diversity and Equity, the UCLA statement makes a strong commitment to maintaining and increasing UC diversity at all levels. In the statement UCLA takes on the issue of the dis-establishment of programs that cannot be justified in the current economic climate, their recommendation being only to create a mechanism for making choices on program dis-establishment (a delaying tactic).

In similar fashion, the UCLA memo wisely suggests that commitments to new schools and institutes should be suspended for now. They propose the development of innovative curricular approaches, including on-line instruction for targeted classes. If carefully implemented, there are good possibilities for cost savings as well as for increasing the diversity of our students.

CDE's only point of disagreement concerns one of the suggestions made regarding maintaining affordability. Specifically, the UCLA proposal recommends that financial aid be given to undocumented students. It might be better to state, "We must provide adequate financial aid to UC students through Pell grants, competitive Pell grants, return-to-aid and financial aid to all students who are eligible for such assistance." This allows the eligibility issue to be decided later. A glaring omission from both statements was a discussion regarding graduate students, which CDE members found astonishing. An institution cannot be a premier university without graduate students, and it is critical to consider graduate education explicitly in this process.

2010 Annual Diversity Accountability Sub Report

CDE reviewed the Annual Diversity Accountability Sub-Report, which responds to a Regents' policy adopted in September 2007 requiring the UC President to report annually on the status of diversity at the University. It was prepared by the staff at UCOP and can be found at the following link.

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/documents/diversity-accountability-report-and-appendix-0910.pdf>

This report presents an informative set of statistics, some of which may come as a surprise to the UCSB faculty. The campus-by-campus comparisons are especially enlightening. Aside from the obvious fact that UCSB is fairly even with UCSC as the most Caucasian, what also raised concern was Chart 2 on page 8 which reports on the feelings of campus acceptance by African Americans. UCSB has the lowest rating of all the UC campuses. In addressing the results of this report CDE agreed that addressing this concern should be a starting point at UCSB.

Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs

CDE reviewed a proposed revision of the 1996 Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs and its Implementation Guidelines in order to advise the Senate. CDE was asked to review the proposed policy and provide comments within the parameters of the CDE purview. CDE's primary concern was that self-supporting degree programs have the potential to impact diversity as it seems these programs would generally not return funding for student support, and other financial support may not be made available to students in these programs.

UCSB Affirmative Action Plans

CDE evaluated the February 2011 UCSB Affirmative Action Plans (AAP) issued by the Office of Equal Opportunity and Sexual Harassment/Title IX Compliance. This was followed by a presentation given by Ricardo Alcaino, Executive Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Sexual Harassment/Title IX Compliance, on 2011 faculty demographic data and our campus' placement goals for women and minorities. This is part of on-going discussions between CDE and R. Alcaino, who serves as ex officio to the CDE.

"The Ivory Ceiling of Service Work"

CDE discussed the report, "The Ivory Ceiling of Service Work" (Service work continues to pull women associate professors away from research. What can be done?) published by the AAUP in their January-February 2011 online journal.

<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2011/JF/Feat/misr.htm?PF=1>.

Further discussion on this topic was prompted by anecdotal experiences of faculty that raised the concern as to whether associate faculty, and women in particular, were remaining at the associate level for a disproportionate amount of time in spite of operating at a higher level of competency or responsibility. The purpose for reading and discussing the report was to consider investigating what is happening to associate professors (male and female) at UCSB. CDE members endorsed adding a future action item to propose a study of service, rank and gender on this campus, especially at the associate level.

University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD)

CDE Chair Beth Schneider served as the campus representative for the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD). UCAAD met regularly in 2010-2011 and reviewed numerous system-wide policies, entertained new policy initiatives, and examined the implementation of policies related to equity, diversity, and equality across the 10 campuses. In addition at each meeting, members share updates from their campuses on diversity related activities including graduate admission, faculty recruitment and hiring, forms used for promotion and tenure review and related efforts. UCAAD meetings are attended by Academic Senate Leadership and regular consultation with the leadership is assumed and valued. A few specific topics covered by UCAAD include:

Draft 2007 UC Faculty Salary Equity Study: UCI Emerita Professor Pauline Yahr was enlisted to work with the UC Academic Personnel Office on completing the 2007 UC Faculty Salary Equity Study; distribution to campuses is planned for Fall 2011

Continuation of Discussion on Annual UC President's Report to the Regents on Diversity: The first Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity was presented to the Regents last fall 2010. Provost Pitts requested suggestions from the Academic Senate about specific actions that UC could initiate, at the campus or Systemwide level, to foster diversity and tolerance. UCAAD discussed recommendations to include more faculty/staff metrics, and the need for a dedicated survey to measure campus climate for faculty and staff.

Campus Climate in the Wake of Recent Wave of LGBTQI-related Suicides of Teens and College Students

Chancellor's Campus Committee on Climate, Culture, Inclusion

In 2010-2011, UCSB Chancellor Yang, responding to the charge for President Yudof and in the face of hate incidents at other UC campuses, organized a committee (CCCI) made up of representatives from all areas of the campus, including academic Deans, who are or should be concerned with issues of diversity. CDE Chair Beth Schneider was appointed to the committee, and is the UCSB representative to the President's Advisory Council. Some of the first actions of this committee included collecting and reporting undergraduate climate incident reports and identifying some of the most critical issues on the UCSB to address in future years. The CCCI continues its work for another two years. It was recognized that CDE members will be asked to respond to various requests from CCCI for data, comment, and participation at events.

President's Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture and Inclusion

UC President Mark Yudof appointed 17 members to an Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture and Inclusion, which works closely with a UC Board of Regents committee to address challenges in enhancing an inclusive environment on each of the university's ten campuses.

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/article/23577>

The Chair of the UCSB CDE, Beth Schneider, was named to the membership of President Yudof's Council and brought this perspective to CDE discussions. CDE heard reports on and gave feedback on the topics under discussion by the Council

Respectfully submitted,

Members, 2010-2011

Beth Schneider	Sociology	Chair
Adebisi Agboola	Math	
Shiv Chandrasekaran	Electrical/Computer Engineering	
Antonio Cortijo	Spanish and Portuguese	
Dorota Dutsch	Classics	
Gina Genova	Writing Program	Non-Senate Academic Rep
Lisa Hajjar	Sociology	
Jin Sook Lee	Education	
David Lopez-Carr	Geography	
Ricardo Alcaino	Office of Equal Opportunity & Sexual Harassment/Title IX Compliance,	Ex Officio