

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND DIVERSITY

Teleconference Meeting

Monday, March 17, 2014

9-11 a.m.

MINUTES

Present. Emily Roxworthy, Chair (UCSD); David Lopez-Carr, Vice Chair (UCSB), Janice Tsoh (UCSF); Sean Malloy (UCM alternate); Weng Kee Wong (UCLA); Colleen Clancy (UCD);

1. Chair's Report/Announcements/Updates. Chair Roxworthy reported the following. (1) At its February meeting Academic Council repeated its endorsement of UCAAD's 2005 letter recommending best practices for empowerment of divisional CAADs and will distribute the letter to the divisions with the intent of involving the entire Senate in raising the profile of CAADs, including possibly recommending further revisions or more assertive implementation of APM 240 and 245 regarding diversity responsibilities of administrators. (2) A proposal to amend Bylaw 55 is currently under review; the proposed revision would allow divisions to authorize individual departments to extend voting rights on faculty appointments to certain non-Senate members of those departments; the proposal originated at UCSD, where non-Senate faculty comprise a significant portion of the medical school faculty. The disproportionate representation of women and minorities among non-Senate faculty and the possible diversity implications of such a change have not been highlighted in discussions to date. A member asked for systemwide statistics on the demographics of Senate and non-Senate faculty. [Note: This data appears in the annual Accountability Report; a link was distributed to the listserv after the meeting.] Members noted that research and publication expectations are different for different title series, and voting may be difficult in large departments where faculty may not know each other's work well; the use of non-Senate appointments reflects financial realities – research faculty who do not individually generate large revenue streams are supported by external funds in rich departments. UCAAD will discuss and opine on the proposed amendment of Bylaw 55 at its April meeting after the divisional committees have discussed it.
2. Consent calendar. The agenda was approved as noticed.
3. Proposed revisions to APM 133, 210, 220, 760. Members were generally supportive of the proposed revisions, which clarify the role of contributions to diversity in merit reviews and which expand provisions for “stopping the tenure clock” for child rearing and other family caretaking responsibilities. Members strongly support the proposed revision to APM 210, which was negotiated between UCAAD and UCAP last year. Members supported the expansion of stop the clock provisions but noted specific concerns with the policy as drafted: Senate oversight of the approval process has been removed; there is no provision for appeal from a Chancellor's decision; the definition of children whose care may trigger a stop the clock process is too narrow; the criterion that circumstances must be “beyond the faculty member's control” is too subjective; individuals who stop the clock may be subject to subsequent bias. Members argued

that nobody *wants* to stop the clock and that it is unlikely that faculty members would “game” the provisions for doing so. Accordingly, the policy should be interpreted as liberally as possible. **Action:** Members agreed that UCAAD should relay these concerns in a letter to Vice Provost Carlson commenting on the proposed policy revisions; a draft will be circulated to members for their review and approval. [Note: done]

4. Recommendations for collection of data on gender identity and sexual orientation. Chair Roxworthy reminded members that UCAAD considered an earlier version of these recommendations in 2012 and that BOARS had recommended against collecting this kind of data on application materials, since applicants may not wish their parents to see how they define themselves and/or may feel forced to identify in ways that are premature for their individual situations. In 2012 UCAAD agreed. Members expressed concern that the task force has ignored those recommendations in drafting its final report. Other concerns were discussed: very few institutions collect this data on application forms, and there is no established view that it is “good” to do so; the proposal to collect data from applicants (as opposed to matriculating students) hasn’t been properly vetted; students may not be comfortable with the likelihood that this information will be shared with departments in which they enroll or take courses; students should be surveyed to find out whether they would feel “exposed” or “liberated” by a request to provide personal information on gender; the request for information must be accompanied by clear descriptions of how the data will be used and by a statement that response is voluntary; the current language provides detailed questions but little information on how the data will be used and how it will facilitate services to students in various gender categories; the proposed choices of gender identity and expression may be very confusing, more like Facebook options than serious choices about who a person is and could cause identity crises for 17- and 18-year-old applicants; some of the classifications assume information that may not be available to all applicants, e.g., birth certificate data on gender; the questions about gender expression use terms that scholars no longer accept, e.g., there is no fixed meaning for “feminine” or “masculine.” Members agreed that UCAAD could support adding “gender expression” to all applicable UC policies, as it has already been added to UC’s statement on non-discrimination; an opt-in data collection would be better than opt-out; field research is essential to find out how comfortable students are with providing this kind of information. **Action:** Members agreed to convey the above concerns in a letter to be delivered to Vice Provost Carlson in time for the upcoming meeting of the task force; members will have an opportunity to review the letter before it is sent.
5. Update on training seminars for department chairs and mentors. Chair Roxworthy is working with Vice Provost Carlson to develop a theater module for use in training seminars.
6. Release of campus climate survey data. Council Chair Bill Jacob joined the call for this item. Chair Roxworthy reviewed the plan for releasing the data at the Regents meeting on March 19 and urges members to view the presentation and to designate at least one divisional CAAD member to do so as well. Analysis of the data will provide opportunities to understand diversity issues. Although sample sizes are not always as robust as desired, it will be important not to allow concerns about sample size to divert attention from grappling with real issues as they are identified. The data has been closely held until now but will be fully available on the web on

March 19, and the President will ask every campus to propose two or three actionable items by late 2014; UCAAD and divisional CAADs need to be active participants in developing these recommendations.

7. Next meeting. Chair Roxworthy confirmed that UCAAD will meet in person on Thursday, April 17. The agenda will include pay equity study updates; climate survey data; and the Moreno report.