# COMMITTEE FOR DIVERSITY AND EQUITY (D\&E) ANNUAL REPORT <br> AY 2015-2016 

## To the Merced Division of the Academic Senate:

Academic Year (AY) 2015-2016 was the inaugural year of the Committee for Diversity and Equity ( $\mathrm{D} \& \mathrm{E}$ ). The committee was empaneled as a result of the request made by the former Committee on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom that diversity and equity issues would be better served if they were placed under the purview of a separate, standing Senate committee such that exists on all other UC campuses. Following an approval vote by the Senate faculty in spring 2015, D\&E was officially created as a standing committee.

In AY 2015-2016, D\&E held a total of 6 regularly scheduled in-person meetings in order to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate Bylaw II.IV.6. Some additional business was completed via electronic mail discussions.

## Areas of Focus/Academic Year Goals

In the first meeting of fall semester, $D \& E$ members outlined four areas for the committee to pursue throughout the academic year.

## 1) Establishment of equity advisors.

D\&E members recognized the need to recruit and retain diverse faculty members in an effort to more fully diversify the faculty as a whole. To that end, the committee conducted research on the practices of other UC campuses in this regard. Four UC campuses have faculty equity advisors (FEA) whose roles include advising faculty search committees on recruitment strategies, reviewing candidate pools, addressing campus climate issues, and assisting in approving the short list before campus visits begin. D\&E members acknowledged that such a system at UCM would represent two major challenges: a culture change and an additional service burden on faculty members who volunteer to serve in this role. Therefore, the committee decided that the proposed plan for implementing FEAs at UCM should be introduced in phases. Phase 1 would be to establish diversity statements as a requirement across the schools, phase 2 would be to identify one or two faculty members in each school to act as an equity
advisor, and phase 3 would be to appoint one faculty member to each search committee to serve as an equity advisor for that search.

It was also acknowledged that FEAs would have to agree to undergo training in order to more efficiently advise faculty search committees. In January 2016, Chair GolashBoza attended a training session on implicit bias at UC Davis and in early spring, D\&E members worked on adapting those training materials for UCM's future FEAs.

Phases one and two were both completed in fall semester 2015: in October, ex-officio, non-voting committee member and Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF) Gregg Camfield informed D\&E that school deans have agreed to require statements of contributions to diversity from all faculty candidates and in December 2015, a D\&E member announced that she identified one full Professor who was willing to serve as an FEA beginning fall 2016.

In April 2016, the D\&E committee submitted a formal proposal to Division Council for the establishment of FEAs at UCM. After an online discussion with Council members, D\&E's proposal was slightly revised. Division Council formally endorsed the revised proposal in May and the proposal was then transmitted to the Provost/EVC and VPF for implementation by August 2016. The proposal's main tenets stated that 1) FEAs will work with search committees to help them develop a search plan that includes outreach to relevant disciplinary groups, explains the search process, and includes benchmarks for candidate pool diversity; 2) FEAs will work with search committees in an effort to meet benchmarks in terms of a diverse long list and a set of on-campus interview candidates, and 3) FEAs will be selected by the D\&E committee, in consultation with the VPF and the school deans, will serve for a two-year term, will receive \$5,000 in additional annual compensation, and finally, will attend FEA Training at UC Irvine.

At the time of this writing, the proposal (including Division Council's endorsement memo) was under review by the Provost/EVC and VPF.
2) Selection and reappointment of endowed chairs.

In the last academic year, the former Committee on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom submitted a memo to Division Council, pointing out the lack of gender and ethnic diversity in UCM's endowed chairships. The memo was discussed at a subsequent Division Council meeting. At the fall semester Meeting of the Division,
the Provost/EVC asked for D\&E's input on procedures that can be used by each school in the selection and reappointing of endowed chairs.

In fall 2015, D\&E members, in consultation with the VPF, reviewed the endowed chairs section (6001) of the Merced Academic Policies \& Procedures (MAPP) and recommended revisions that became the committee's proposal for the selection and reappointment of endowed chairs. D\&E sought to create a process that is equitable, transparent, and in line with practices at other UC campuses.

The main points of D\&E's proposal stated that 1) a search committee, with multidisciplinary (unit) representation, shall be appointed by the appropriate dean(s) after consultation with the relevant academic personnel chair(s) and should be charged with searching for and recommending an appointment for an endowed chair; 2) an endowed chair may be used either as a recruitment tool during the faculty appointment negotiation process or an endowed chair appointment can be made to existing faculty members; 3) appointments to endowed chairs shall be made in accordance with regularly established procedures for faculty appointments as stated in MAPP 2013, and 4) for reappointment, a review of the accomplishments of the endowed chair holder shall be conducted at the beginning of the final year of the specified period of appointment or in the appointee's fifth year, whichever comes first, and the review dossier should include the results of consultation with the faculty and the vote, which should follow the same procedures used for appointment of the chair holder. The proposal also included a list of suggested criteria for the review of the chair holder.

In April 2016, the D\&E committee submitted a formal proposal to Division Council. The Council endorsed it in May and at the time of this writing, the proposal is under review by the Provost/EVC and VPF.
3) Campus diversity event for faculty.

In December 2015, D\&E members discussed the idea of holding an event for faculty of color and other allies to address issues such as micro aggression and effectively working with students, administrators, and colleagues.

On March 8, 2016, D\&E hosted its first diversity event with the campus visit of Professor Patricia Matthew of Montclair University. Professor Matthew delivered a luncheon talk on the "unwritten rules of tenure" and held meetings with faculty
members, academic leadership, and graduate students. The event was well-attended and well-received and Professor Matthew expressed her admiration for the diversity work being conducted at UCM.

## 4) Diversity considerations in program review.

In the last academic year, $\mathrm{D} \& E$ chair Golash-Boza (then serving as vice chair of the former Committee on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom) suggested to the Periodic Review Oversight Committee (PROC) that diversity issues should be required to be taken into consideration in program reviews. PROC agreed and this year, that committee sought to include this requirement when it revised the program review policy.

In fall 2015, the revised undergraduate program review policy was submitted to UGC and GC as the lead reviewers, but D\&E chose to also review the policy given its position that as program review can be an opportunity for units on campus to reflect on their efforts to promote diversity and a welcoming climate for all. D\&E's two main suggested revisions to the undergraduate program review policy were 1) to specify that a program must describe its efforts to recruit faculty from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds, particularly in terms of gender and ethnic diversity, and 2) that external reviewers meet with a diversity and equity representative during their site visit as it would add accountability to the program review process.

While D\&E conducted regular Senate business throughout the year, these four issues guided the direction of much of the committee's work.

D\&E also deliberated on the following:

## Mentoring of President's Postdoctoral Fellows

D\&E was concerned that assistant professors are not allowed to serve as postdoc mentors. With its preponderance of assistant professors, UCM is placed at a disadvantage not being able to allow untenured faculty members to serve as President's Postdoctoral Fellow mentors for the following reasons: 1) it diminishes assistant professors' roles in forming the collaboration with a postdoc; 2) postdocs often choose their advisors based on specific research interests (not status of their potential advisors), and not allowing a postdoc to apply to be a President's Postdoctoral Fellow because
their advisor is an assistant professor does a disservice to the specific postdoc and to the field as a whole; 3) the majority of current postdocs at UC Merced are ineligible to apply to be a President's Postdoctoral Fellow simply because their advisors are assistant professors. This puts UC Merced at a significant competitive disadvantage for attracting top postdoc candidates; 4) assistant professors are often ideal advisors for postdoctoral fellows as they have more recent and relevant experience with modern-day job searches, and 5) the presence of these postdocs not only serves to build an assistant professor's research profile, but can help assuage the faculty member's sense of intellectual isolation, especially on a small campus.

D\&E strongly recommended that the President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program requirements be modified to allow assistant professors in those fields where advising postdocs is the norm at all academic ranks (e.g. the laboratory sciences), to serve as President's Postdoctoral Fellow advisors and requested that Division Council forward D\&E statement to systemwide Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Programs Susan Carlson.

## Systemwide Review Items

- Faculty salary increase. Campuses were asked to opine on the pool of funds available for redistribution which amounts to $1.5 \%$ of total faculty salary. D\&E proposed that deans should examine each bylaw unit - and conduct an analysis across bylaw units - to identify gender, race-based, or sexual orientation inequities. If no inequities are found, then the deans should make an argument for redistribution based on exceptional merit, then on compression and inversion. Once the deans have submitted their requests for faculty salary increases, the Provost/EVC should redistribute the funds to the schools on the basis of these requests with the following priority: 1) equity; 2) exceptional merit, and 3) compression and inversion.
- Retirement Options Task Force Report. At the request of UC President Napolitano, a systemwide task force was formed to made recommendations on the revision of the UC Retirement program on which the campuses were asked to opine. One of the task force's recommendations was to create a defined contribution plan which D\&E argued individualizes the investment risk and stands in contrast to the defined benefit plan that is the hallmark of the strong
benefits package currently offered by the UC. D\&E therefore opposed the proposal, pointing out that it reduces retirement benefits for a significant portion of future employees.
- D\&E endorsed the proposed revision to the APM that would change the name of the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity to the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity.
- Search Waiver Guiding Principles. D\&E did not completely endorse the guidelines as presented, as they did not include exceptions to allow for addressing the lack of under-represented minorities among UC faculty. D\&E requested that the guidelines be modified to reflect stipulations for diversity.
- University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE). Chair Golash-Boza kept D\&E members informed about UCAADE business. The main items of discussion this year were the Regents' Statement of Principles Against Intolerance, the revised presidential policy on sexual violence and sexual harassment, the retirement options benefits task force report, anti-discrimination policy, and a discussion with systemwide Provost Aimeé Dorr and systemwide Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Programs Susan Carlson about faculty diversity.

Respectfully submitted:

## DEE members:

Tanya Golash-Boza, Chair (SSHA) - UCAADE representative
Wei-Chun Chin, Vice Chair (SOE)
Clarissa Nobile (SNS)

## Ex officio, non-voting member:

Gregg Camfield, Vice Provost for the Faculty

Staff:<br>Simrin Takhar

