ACADEMIC SENATE
COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY & EQUITY

September 22, 2015

To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

Annual Report 2014-15

Committee Charge
The charge of the Committee on Diversity & Equity (CDE) is 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, one undergraduate student, and one graduate student representative.

Summary of CDE activities over 2014-15

There were a total of nine meetings of CDE members over the 2014-15 term (three each quarter). CDE’s primary areas of focus during the term were: 1) APM 210-1-D Contributions to Diversity and Equity and its impact on the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) case review process; 2) Proposed Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence Policy; 3) Proposed Revisions to UCSB Red Binder Section VII-1 regarding Policies to Open Recruitment for Academic Appointments; 4) Campus Climate Survey; 5) Systemwide Diversity Workshop for Chairs and Deans; and 6) UCSB Designation as an Hispanic Serving Institution.

CDE discussed these topics at length and shared its recommendations with Academic Senate Chair Kum-Kum Bhavnani when appropriate. Priority topics and recommendations are briefly described below.

Reviews of Systemwide UC Issues:

1) APM 210-1-d Contributions to Diversity and Equity in merit and personnel cases

The committee spent several meetings discussing the implications of the proposed revisions to APM 210-1-d and the impact on personnel and merit reviews. In January, the committee met with Brad Chmelka and Sharon Farmer, Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), to discuss implications of APM 210-1-d, which instructs personnel committees to give credit for diversity efforts in merit and promotion cases. The committee had questions of the guests regarding how the policy is implemented at UCSB.

It was noted that CAP follows not only the systemwide Academic Personnel Manual but also the UCSB Campus Policies & Procedures for Academic Personnel (“Red Binder”). Cases are reviewed based on four criteria: (1) teaching, (2) research and other creative work, (3) professional activity, and (4) University
and public service. Section I-75 of the Red Binder (Appointment and Advancement) offers a campus interpretation of corresponding policies found in the APM and often quotes directly from the APM. Evaluations rely on a written record of a candidate’s work, including a bio-bibliography, samples, and a self-interpretation of one’s work. The last item includes the Diversity Self-Assessment (I-75, Section VIII).

CDE agreed that evaluation criteria need to be sufficiently broad so that they are applicable and able to be interpreted by colleagues across disciplines. Conversations occurring on all campuses regarding the implementation of APM 210-1-d reflect a dynamic tension in the instructions between flexibility and appropriate specificity.

The committee requested information on how many cases have been given credit for contributions to diversity. Although data for this has not been compiled for reporting, it was shared that a case search of the files has revealed that out of approximately 400 cases per year, it has been a positive factor in about 20 cases last year (2013-14), 28 cases in 2012-13, and 10 cases in 2011-12. The committee noted that many faculty do not think to include a Diversity Self-Assessment, and without this submission CAP has no way of considering these contributions for a case. It is the responsibility of department chairs to inform their faculty that they should include the Diversity Self-Assessment if they wish to be considered for their efforts in this area. While some training and notification on this has occurred in the past, leadership changes frequently and additional training may need to be done more regularly.

The committee deliberated on the meaning of the statement that diversity-related accomplishments need to “rise above and beyond the normal expectations for the relevant area of review” in order to be credited. If one’s research involves diversity issues, what would count as “above and beyond”? For those whose research does directly relate to diversity issues, there may be concern that those who do are automatically being credited simply for doing their research. On the other hand, those in programs like ethnic studies may be concerned that contributions greater than what is expected of them will not be credited.

The committee expressed frustration that there are not only differing interpretations about APM 210-1-d but also a great deal of misinformation. The committee suggested that perhaps some examples would be useful. For example, giving a list of things that could be rewarded might include but are not limited to the following.... The guests resisted this suggestion, stating that this would vary greatly by field and it should be up to individual departments to make such a determination or come up with examples and guidance for its reviews. Also, the deans could be consulted to provide guidance in helping CAP define “above and beyond” in crediting diversity-related work. It was suggested that perhaps previously successful Diversity Self-Assessments might be shared – with permission and redacted – as examples. There is, of course, a privacy issue and this would need to be considered. The committee also requested that CAP begin collecting data on how many candidates include a Diversity Self-Assessment has part of their cases.

The committee suggested two actions: 1) engage the deans, department chairs, and/or the Associate Vice Chancellor in a discussion to define “above and beyond” in crediting diversity-related work, and 2) recommend that the Academic Senate conduct trainings on how to prepare a successful diversity self-statement. For the later, the committee discussed the possibility of including this in advisory meetings for those who will be coming up for review the following year. This information could be included with panels in the spring or even fall.
2) Proposed Sexual Harassment & Sexual Violence Policy

In April, members of CDE reviewed the proposed Sexual Harassment & Sexual Violence Policy (Revised) and offered comments. First, and most important, while the committee had some suggestions for improvement, there was general agreement that the revised policy was an improvement over last year’s version. Overall, committee members felt that the new document was easier to understand and read more clearly. In particular, the section on “Consent” was strengthened, expanded, and clarified. CDE also felt that the portions discussing “Incapacitation / Intoxication” were good.

The committee recommended additional clarity with regard to the specification of “Designated employees.” The document defined “Designated employees” in Section II-G: “Any employee, who must report incidents of sexual harassment or sexual violence to the Title IX coordinator or other appropriate University designees. Generally, this includes all employees, including academic appointees unless s/he has been identified as an employee who can provide confidential consultations for the University community pursuant to Section V.F. of this Policy.” The committee noted that the policy appeared to indicate that “all employees” are (or may be) “designated employees,” but this was not clear.

The Committee also requested additional information in the form of a table or perhaps a flowchart – describing and comparing the various reporting options. Currently, there is a long list of campus resources to which a survivor of sexual harassment/sexual violence may seek help. But what is missing is a way for someone to know the role of each, pros and cons of reporting to one versus another, whether each is confidential or not, whether each provides counseling/emotional support or not, whether there is mandatory reporting to Police/Judicial Affairs, etc. Additional information would be useful to better understand and evaluate the various reporting options. Such a table of information should also include easy access to contact information (phone number, email address, physical location, etc.).

The group also sought clarification regarding how the policy and procedures are to be disseminated to students (and others). The following questions were raised: (1) Which methods of information are mandatory, and which are merely suggested? (2) Is it mandatory for the campus to disseminate the information about the policy during student orientation? (3) The policy seems to make no distinction between undergraduate and graduate students, yet these are very different constituencies with different orientations. How will each be notified? (4) How, and by whom at each location, will this policy be distributed to staff and faculty?

Reviews of Campus Issues

1) Proposed Revisions to UCSB Red Binder Section VII-1: Policies to Open Recruitment for Academic Appointments

In November, CDE reviewed the revisions to the UCSB Red Binder on “Policies to Open Recruitment for Academic Appointments.” Several comments were offered by the committee. In particular CDE questioned a change to the section on “Exemptions from Open Recruitment Policies”, regarding the newly created Exemption F. While members saw the value of this as a logical method to retain current UCSB research employees who have been in their positions long term, members also saw this particular exemption to open recruitment as needing careful and specific oversight to prevent the perception that equal employment and affirmative action requirements and department diversity goals are being disregarded.
CDE also commented on proposed changes to the section titled, “Exceptions to Open Recruitment Policies.” Under the process to request exceptions to open recruitments, the draft language would remove the responsibility from the departments to indicate how an employee hired under an exception would impact the department diversity goals and places that reporting responsibility on the Director of Equal Opportunity. CDE members agreed with this change in responsibility for who prepares the report, but suggested that the language clearly state that departments would receive a copy of the report prepared by the Director of Equal Opportunity.

2) Campus Climate Survey

The Committee on Diversity & Equity discussed the Campus Climate Survey over the course of several meetings. The UC system-wide survey was designed to evaluate a variety of issues related to campus climate in order to assess the learning, living, and working environments at the University. CDE was particularly interested in the implications and relevance of the report to UCSB. The committee received reports from the Campus Climate Implementation Team (consisting of 10 faculty members), which held its first meeting on January 13. The Implementation Team assigned three groups to focus on different areas of concern identified by the survey: staff; lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgender (LGBT) concerns; and sexual violence.

In February, CDE requested data from Steven Velasco (Director of Institutional Research, Planning & Assessment) regarding the Campus Climate Study. Specifically, the committee sought data on faculty and graduate students regarding: demographics (broken down by gender, race, sexuality), appointment type (Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Full Professor, etc.), and Division/College. The request on the graduate students came about due to the awareness and observations of faculty regarding their graduate students’ experiences vis-à-vis climate issues. Data was also analyzed by a Climate Survey Implementation Team, whose analysis is exploratory, and it is looking for patterns and direction of where the data will lead.

In March, a memo from Chancellor Henry Yang announced the results of the survey as well as a campus report from the consultants.

CDE received Mr. Velasco’s response in late April. The results indicated that – not surprisingly – underrepresented faculty felt less supported than their colleagues within their departments and on campus. Other preliminary findings were: women faculty thought that stronger family leave policies would improve climate, as compared to their male colleagues; young faculty were more confident in their supervisions than older faculty; Associate Professors were more dissatisfied (on the whole, and in their respective age groups); women reported experiencing more harassment than men; many faculty responded that they “don’t know” whether more diversity materials in course content would make a difference to the campus climate; about 40% of faculty thought that offering training would make a difference; and almost 3/4 of faculty thought that increasing student diversity would make a difference. Regarding the data on graduate students, the results indicated the following: younger students are more comfortable with the climate; LGBT graduate students are less comfortable; and Ph.D. candidates, white students, and men are all more comfortable with the climate. The committee agreed that a full analysis should be run on the data and then shared with the Executive Vice Chancellor, Deans, and the Senate for further review and eventual action.
3) Fostering Inclusive Excellence: Strategies and Tools for Department Chairs and Deans

Following the direction of UC President Janet Napolitano, a seminar developed by the UCOP, “Fostering Inclusive Excellence: Strategies and Tools for Department Chairs and Deans” was offered at UCSB in February. The intent of the interactive workshop was to help departments change the way they do recruitments and hiring. The CDE chair attended the workshop and reported back to the committee. A document titled “Tools for Department Chairs and Deans” that was used at the workshop was shared with CDE members. The committee agreed that this could be a useful resource for departments and administrators to recognize micro-aggressions and how to interrupt and address them. The workshop was a one-time event by UCOP, although the campus may hold additional trainings if it wishes.

4) UCSB Designation as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI)

It was announced in January that UCSB has been officially named a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) by the Hispanic Association of Colleges & Universities. The designation occurs when at least 25% of an institution’s undergraduate students are “Hispanic”, as defined by the federal government. There are many other higher education institutions in California with this designation, but most are community colleges (and many California State University campuses). Few other HSIs are research universities, and UCSB is the first HSI that is a member of the Association of American Universities (AAU). (It is expected that the UC Irvine and Los Angeles campuses will soon be granted the HSI designation.) One reason the designation is important is that it allows the campus to apply for certain federal grants, many of which are for work in STEM fields (Science, Technology, Engineering, & Mathematics) and retention efforts.

One concern that was discussed by CDE is that the campus is widely publicizing the designation and taking credit for it while ignoring the efforts of student activism which prompted the University to make changes that have allowed it to get to where it is today. A campus celebration that had been planned for spring quarter was postponed until fall. Another concern is the fear that all of the money will go toward STEM initiatives even though there is a great need for support of students in the humanities and social sciences. Finally, the committee noted that there is a difference between admission and graduation; what is the University doing to actual “serve” these students while they are here and retain them after they have been enrolled?

Pending Issues for CDE in 2015-2016

The issues of concern that were discussed by CDE and which are recommended for continued discussion by CDE over the next year (2015-16) are:

- Implementation of APM210-1-D, Contributions to Diversity. Members recognize that it will take some time before examples of faculty contributions that qualify under APM210-1-D are available. The committee recommends working with CAP and the Deans to identify appropriate examples for what constitutes going “above and beyond” on diversity issues in one’s particular field.
- The effects of maternity leave on female faculty salary
- CDE recommends that the results of the Campus Climate Survey, be analyzed and discussed with representatives of the campus administration, the Office of Diversity & Equal Opportunity, the Campus Committee on Climate and Inclusion, and the Affirmative Action Office. Following this analysis, recommendations should be shared with the EVC, Deans, and the Senate.
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