

COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND DIVERSITY
MEETING MINUTES – APRIL 18, 2013

Present: Manuela Martins-Green (Chair), Emily Roxworthy (Vice Chair), Byron Adams (UCR), Katherine Arosteguy (UCD alternate), Anthony Davis (UCSD), Kimberly Lau (UCSC alternate), David Lopez-Carr (UCSC), Francisco Ramos-Gomez (UCLA), Janet Shim (UCSF), Grace Tonner (UCI), Student Representative Michael Navarro (UCSD); Robert Powell (Council Chair, Ex Officio), William Jacob (Council Vice Chair, Ex Officio); Fredye Harms (Committee Analyst). Consultants Jesse Bernal, Susan Carlson, Janet Lockwood, and Martha Winnacker. Guest: Regent Fred Ruiz.

I. Chair's Announcements/Updates

• Academic Council Meeting

Chair Martins-Green provided updates from the meeting including discussion around SB 520 and SB 259.

She added that Bylaw 128.C has just been amended and approved to read, "...the at-large chair of a standing committee of the Assembly may not be a member of the corresponding committee of any division." Chair Martins-Green noted that this change will have particular ramifications for UC Merced.

The Chair noted that Mary Gilly from UC Irvine has been approved by the Academic Assembly to be the 2013-14 Academic Senate Vice-Chair.

II. Consent Calendar – Chair Martins-Green

A. Approval of the Draft Minutes from the October 18, 2012 Meeting and the January 10, 2013 Meeting

B. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: Members approved the Minutes and the Agenda.

III. APM 210-1.d

Chair Martins-Green reminded the committee about the extensive back-and-forth between UCAAD and UCAP regarding the revision of the language in APM 210-1.d. At the last Academic Council meeting, Chair Martins-Green accepted the latest revision of the policy, and it has since been forwarded to the Provost.

Although the language of APM 210-1.d is not ambiguous, the Chair feels that it would be beneficial to have a white paper to substantiate it. The committee discussed some examples from various campuses that could be culled to form a sharp and concise white paper. This paper would be distributed to the division deans and chairs to underscore the importance of contributions to diversity.

ACTION: Chair Martins-Green asked the members to collect examples and best practices related to diversity and send them to her so that she can begin drafting the white paper as soon as possible.

IV. Preparation for Regent Ruiz Visit

During Executive Session, the committee discussed topics it wanted to share with Regent Ruiz.

V. Visit with Regent Ruiz

During Executive Session, Regent Ruiz visited with the committee to discuss diversity-related topics within the University.

VI. Announcements from the President's Office

Diversity Coordinator Jesse Bernal remarked that the Annual Sub-Report on Diversity at the University came before the Regents in January and focused on faculty diversity. Over the next two years, the report will focus on campus climate; in 2015 it will report on graduate/professional degree diversity. Every four years, the report will summarize comprehensive indicators for faculty, student, and staff diversity.

The University has had tremendous response to the campus climate survey. Close to 150,000 complete surveys have been received, with a high percentage of faculty response. The campuses will get high-level reports of their individual findings as they close the survey. Systemwide results with significant findings will be presented to the campuses in November, and the comprehensive survey results will be presented at the Regents' meeting in January 2014.

Each campus will receive a draft report from the consultant and will be able to respond and provide context for its findings and outcomes. Each campus will also help develop a communication strategy to most effectively convey the survey information to its constituencies. The campuses will have about two weeks to work on the draft reports. Ultimately, all of the information will be public and available on the website. The University wants the data to be used to advance teaching, learning, and diversity.

The President's Advisory Council on Campus Climate has been suspended until new president is selected and determines how to use the survey data. UC leadership sees the climate study as a solid launching pad for the new president and a road map to move forward.

The Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) Task Force has been working for the past 18 months to revise the policy surrounding professional degree tuition. The findings of the Task Force are awaiting student input and will not be available until fall 2013. It is anticipated that they will be presented to the Regents in November 2013 or January 2014.

The LGBT Task Force has brought forward an issue regarding tax disparity in UC hiring. Same-sex domestic partners who receive health benefits through UC are required to pay federal taxes on the value of that benefit because those partners are not recognized by the federal government. The Task Force recommended UC immediately implement tax equity benefits for same-sex partners by providing funds that would offset the federal tax. President Yudof has asked the Vice President of Human Resources to determine the impact of such a measure on the University.

Vice Provost Susan Carlson discussed the mentoring workshop held earlier in the month at Riverside. She will send the link to the workshop video once it is available; materials from the workshop are already up on the OP website. The next roundtable in will be in San Diego on October 25 and will focus on review, including discussion of APM 210-1.d.

The President has committed one-time money to the Presidential Post-Doctoral Fellowship Program specifically to fund a large group of STEM fellows. The University will have 60 fellowships next year; heretofore, it has never had more than 45. The Vice Provost has requested that this additional funding become a permanent part of the program. Similarly, the Executive Vice Chancellors have agreed to keep funding UC Recruit.

VII. Mentorship Document Planning

As a follow-up to Sheila O'Rourke's January presentation on mentoring, Chair Martins-Green compiled information from a number of sources regarding mentoring techniques, approaches, and challenges. She provided a PowerPoint presentation that outlined the components of a successful mentorship program and asked the committee for input as to how it could develop a comprehensive paper that the campuses could use as a roadmap for mentorship planning. The committee discussed the needs and obstacles of a

strong mentorship program at length. Effective practices and shortfalls on each campus were discussed as well as individual perceptions and experiences.

The chair discussed the traditional mentoring model, involving a single mentor/mentee relationship that can vary in components, length, scope, and focus. The alternative model, introduced by Ms. O'Rourke, is multifaceted and based on the premise that a team of mentors can best address the many needs of a new faculty member. The chair showed a graphic depicting the many roles mentors can play in the life of a mentee: advisor, life balance, career, research, and peer. These mentors can come from informal interactions, broad professional networks, and off-campus networks and services.

Chair Martins-Green acknowledged that mentorship can pose some challenges. It is, by necessity, time-consuming, requiring training, development, communication, networking, feedback, and follow-up. With those challenges in mind, the Chair asked the committee for thoughts on creating a comprehensive paper that the campuses could use as a roadmap for a mentoring program.

Members discussed hindrances experienced by mentoring programs. Efforts are often thwarted by departments and individuals who feel that they do not need mentoring – that their current system is working well. In many cases, faculty might not come forward because requesting a mentor could be interpreted as a sign of weakness. Legal liabilities also can pose a concern.

Several members suggested ways to reduce concerns about stigma or awkwardness associated with a mentoring program. If all faculty -- across the board -- were required to have a mentor, concerns about special needs would be eliminated. Similarly, the institutionalization of a mentorship program – having it as a requisite expectation for faculty – makes the task of seeking a mentor less onerous. The Chair added that the creation of a mentoring website that facilitated pairings between mentors and mentees would be very helpful.

Professor Janet Shim (UCSF) noted that her campus has a standard baseline expectation for mentoring; everyone is expected to have multiple mentors. This expectation grew out of campus climate survey that revealed a profound lack of mentoring for faculty. The campus then identified resources to hire a half-time mentoring director. That director created an institutional infrastructure for mentoring that includes mentor and mentee training programs and prestigious awards with recognized award ceremonies. The award structure is staggered for new, mid-career, and long-term faculty; the expectation is that aspects of the mentoring process will continue through a faculty member's trajectory.

Professor Shim stated that all new faculty members have to report that they have secured a research mentor and a career mentor – those are the two baseline requirements. If they are unable to find a mentor, the director helps them identify potential candidates. She also noted that when she got tenure, she was encouraged to apply for UCSF's mentor training program and leadership training programs. Some sections of the mentoring training are explicitly about learning to mentor female and URM faculty. These programs, she explained, are by application-only, with selective admission. Overall, she said, the culture surrounding mentoring at UCSF has changed quickly for the better in about six years.

The committee discussed the UCSF program and how it might be adapted to other campuses. Consideration was given to the creation of new vice and assistant positions that would provide leadership shadowing opportunities for women and URM. Concerns about potential conflicts of interest with regard to mentors and evaluation were also voiced. Members shared aspects of small campus efforts that could be incorporated into a larger mentoring program.

The committee agreed that UCAAD should create a document that strongly recommends a formal mentorship framework/program for the campuses. This effort will need to include education about the benefits of mentoring.

ACTION: *The Chair offered to collect some materials related to mentoring and asked committee members to forward their best practices and suggestions to her. The goal would be to provide campuses with a framework for developing a mentoring program that is easily perpetuated and adaptable to the needs of each campus.*

VIII. Revised Summary of Faculty Equity Plans

Chair Martins-Green asked if the committee had taken the time to read the campus submissions and asked members for their opinion on the content of the plans. Surprise was expressed at the lack of plans to acquire and analyze the data in the vast majority of the plans submitted. Additionally, most of the plans did not provide any information on how the campuses would address their findings. It was felt that the cover letter from the president providing direction for the plans was clear and explicit. Academic Senate Chair Robert Powell has asked a few key committees for feedback on the plans which will then be conveyed to the Academic Council.

The committee discussed the shortcomings and brevity of most of the plans in contrast to the more thorough analysis provided by a few. Suggestions were made as to how the data collection could and should be improved. Senate Chair Powell suggested that the committee should not be prescriptive in its response, but instead should provide direct feedback as to whether the plans did or did not meet the set expectation.

ACTION: *It was agreed that the committee should submit a letter expressing extreme dissatisfaction with the effort put in to the plans. Chair Martins-Green will draft a letter that she will circulate through the committee members for comment and then sign and send to Chair Powell.*

IX. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership

Academic Senate Chair Robert Powell explained that the amendments to SB 520 (Steinberg) were released yesterday and that the Senate is going to oppose the bill. An Academic Council meeting will be held in Sacramento so that the chairs can testify at the bill's hearing. At that time, Council members also will suggest amendments to SB 547 (Block) that could make it acceptable to the University.

All of the University workgroups met last week at UC Irvine and at OP to talk about online education and how to handle the \$10M set aside by the governor. Chair Powell remarked that the meetings went well and generated significant enthusiasm on the part of faculty.

Admissions data for 2013 will be out shortly and is likely to precipitate interesting discussions due to the marked increases in international student admissions. This increase is particularly glaring in light of California resident admissions which are down 2.2 percent.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 P.M.

Attest: Manuela Martins-Green, UCAAD Chair
Prepared by Fredye Harms, Committee Analyst