

COMMITTEE FOR DIVERSITY AND EQUITY (D&E)**Meeting Minutes
Thursday, December 6, 2018
10:00-11:30am****I. Chair's Report – Clarissa Nobile****A. DivCo Meeting Update ([11/27](#))****a) Consultation with Interim Provost/EVC Camfield**

The UC President has decided that there will be two budget meetings focused on three priorities:

- Research
- Campus sustainability
- Student success with respect to retention and graduation rates.

Interim Provost Camfield also reported that, in response to the recent air quality crisis following the Camp Fire, the campus's emergency plans are being revised. UCM will hire a consultant to prioritize the campus's needs. This person would not be part of the police department.

b) Consultation with VC Traina

Vice Chancellor Sam Traina and Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research Compliance and Integrity, Deborah Motton, updated members on the Federal Government efforts to manage the export of information to China and the implications for the university and campus's research and educational missions. The expectation is that this will increase requirements for research proposal processes. NIH has sent a letter to all investigators requiring they disclose all paid consulting engagements. There is concern that these new measures will negatively affect the climate for faculty colleagues, including graduate students and post-docs.

c) DivCo discussed the following review items

- Presidential Policy Principles of Accountability with Respect to Financial Transactions
Members were asked to determine the Division's response to the proposed presidential policy [Principles of Accountability with Respect to Financial Transactions](#) (redlined version [here](#)). As per [the cover letter](#), the policy represents the codification of existing UCOP financial policy that is currently available on the Office of the Chief Financial Officer website. The lead committees for the review are CAPRA and the school executive committees. All committees declined to comment, with the exception of the School of Engineering Executive Committee [which reported](#) the finalized policy will be posted the school's internal website for all faculty to access. CAPRA did, in a [November 13 memo](#) however, make related recommendations to the Transition Oversight Committee. These were forwarded to the committee on the 13th. Similar concerns about the campus's capacity to implement the expectations outlined in the policy were [raised by FWAF](#). At the meeting, the CAPRA chair noted that it is not clear that our campus complies with this policy or has the capacity to do so. CAPRA's memo aims to clarify these responsibilities.

- Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy BFB-RMP-7 Protection of Administrative Records Containing Personally Identifiable Information. The revised policy:
 - Combines and updates BFB-RMP-7, Privacy of and Access to Information Responsibilities; BFB-RMP-11, Student Applicant Records; and BFB-RMP-12, Guidelines for Assuring Privacy of Personal Information in Mailing Lists and Telephone Directories
 - Incorporates the UC Statement of Privacy Principles and Values
 - Clarifies the roles of Privacy Officials, Records Management Coordinators and Information Practices Coordinators

The recommendation was to forward CRE's and the School of Engineering's comments to Academic Council for consideration.

- Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-46 (Use of Vehicles and Driver Selection policy) As per [the cover letter](#), the proposed changes aim to increase accountability for vehicular usage throughout the UC system, to improve safety, reduce vehicular accidents, and create cost savings to the University. The lead committees for this review were CoR, GC, and UGC.

UCM's comments will be sent to Academic Council.

II. Consent Calendar

- A. Today's agenda was approved as presented
- B. The November 8 Meeting Minutes were approved as presented.

III. Highlights from the November 26 Meeting with Senate Chair May and Vice Chair Bhavnani – Vice Chair Asmeret Berhe and Member David Jennings

- A. Professor Berhe reported that the meeting with senate leadership was positive. Two new SSHA faculty who were in attendance shared their perspectives as new UCM faculty and asked questions about the campus and the UC efforts to promote diversity and inclusion. Faculty who have been with UCM for several years were also in attendance and were invited to share their opinions. They indicated that there needs to be more accountability on this campus with regard to diversity and there is widespread faculty interest to address these issues. Others noted that diversity is a matter that has to be addressed at the unit level. Interim Provost/EVC Camfield, VPF Matlock and AVPF Valdez were also in attendance.

At this meeting, it was also noted that the UCM diversity data that has been used by UCOP and published on the UCOP website is incorrect and does not reflect our demographics. It would be useful to figure out how to provide accurate data to OP. APO had previously been asked to provide a breakdown of faculty hires that included race and gender.

This discussion will continue at a future D&E meeting.

- B. Dr. Jennings reported that the topics discussed at his meeting with the Senate leadership were confidential and he was advised not to report on the discussion. He was able to report on some aspects of the discussion that are publicly available: there was a strong sense from the discussion between the Chair and Vice Chair that they feel that access to health care for UCM faculty is important and is an equity issue. Other UCs have access to high quality health care, Merced does not. Chair May encouraged the UCM Senate to explore ways to promote an agenda that would improve access to health

care for UCM faculty. Multiple mechanisms were mentioned (e.g. extending the range of health care providers).

This topic will be revisited by D&E in the future.

C. Consultation with Faculty Equity Advisors Tanya Golash-Boza and Valerie Leppert

FEAs reported on their experiences in recent faculty recruitment activities. Their reports are briefly summarized below.

- FEAs oversee the diversity and equity procedures involved in the search process. FEAs meet with committee chairs and give presentations to the search committee about diversity, best practices, evaluations, criteria, and various initiatives that are available on campus to help diversity pools. Following the search, the search committee chair prepares a memo/report to the Deans.
- Search committee chairs are not supposed to evaluate the candidates prior to the FEA presentations. This step of the process is communicated to the chairs but it might be useful to ask the Deans to reinforce this message.
- There is evidence that mandatory trainings for FEAs could be effective.
- At times, search committees do not respond in a timely manner.
- It is important and required (per the FEA guide) that FEAs be tenured faculty.
- The campus needs a website and online tools for campus procedures to be used by FEAs.
- The Academic Personnel staff members in SOE are doing a good job communicating with the school's FEA. It would be useful to send regular reminders to staff in the schools about the importance of staff maintaining regular communication with the FEAs as the ads are placed.
- The representation of women varies across the disciplines in the School of Engineering. For instance, a pool currently includes 250 women and another has only 20. For the latter, an argument could be made to keep the search open.
- FEAs' roles are advisory and can only make recommendations to the Deans regarding searches. Actions are at the Deans' discretion.
- D&E feels that there may be situations where some recommendations will need to be enacted as policies.

Action: The D&E Chair will encourage the Department Chairs to attend the FEAs' presentations and to consult with the FEAs each academic year (before the end of the spring semester) as they are gearing up for the hiring season.

Prof. Leppert noted that due to a conflict of interest, she will no longer be able to serve as FEA for the School of Engineering. A potential replacement is under consideration.

IV. Guidelines for Faculty Retention

This topic was discussed by D&E on September 13 and November 8. D&E members discussed revising the guidelines in a way that more accurately addresses the systemic reasons why faculty separate from the university. Former Provost/EVC Peterson drafted guidelines last year for the Senate's review. Several committees, including D&E, had critical comments. D&E's memo can be viewed [here](#).

Members discussed the guidelines and proposed preliminary suggestions for edits.

The Provost will be invited to attend a D&E meeting in the Spring semester to discuss the guidelines.

Discussion:

- The document should include consistent, transparent, and streamlined guidelines for equity review.
- There should be more transparency regarding salary ranges in comparison to peer institutions. D&E recommends revising the language in the section “Future Potential and Estimate of Loss” as it is debasing and it seems odd that the value of faculty would be assessed based on the worth of individuals. The committee also recommends the use of a different title for this section (instead of “Future Potential and Estimate of Loss”).
- There should be transparency on how determinations related to retaining faculty are made.
- A member noted that at a recent meeting, the Systemwide Senate Chair noted that it was important to think about closing the salary gaps relative to other UCs as much as possible, in a proactive rather than a reactive way. The Provost and Deans ought to consider how to remediate the salary gaps. Members recommended that the administrative leadership also consider additional incentives, other than monetary.
- Under “Analysis of Competing Offer”, the guidelines should describe and elaborate why these questions matter in a faculty retention case. Some of the questions presented in the guidelines could potentially create equity issues.
- Consider expanding the last paragraph with the inclusion of a timeline.
- Consider expanding the language related to preemptive measures.

Recommendation: D&E commends former Provost Peterson for drafting this document. Echoing last year’s comments, D&E recommends that the administration (and the Senate leadership) take action to address the salary gaps that exist among faculty and explore ways to incentivize faculty to remain at UCM.

Action: Members are encouraged to review and share their thoughts on this document via email. This item will be discussed at the first D&E meeting in the Spring (January 29).

V. Campus Review Items

A. [Draft Policy for the Establishment of New Schools/Colleges](#)

Action: Comments will be summarized by the Analyst and circulated for review.

Update: A draft memo was reviewed by members of D&E and [sent to DivCo on December 14, 2018.](#)

B. [Campus Space Planning Principles](#)

Action: D&E members will review the proposed principles via email.