



*Robert M. Anderson*  
Telephone: (510) 987-9303  
Fax: (510) 763-0309  
Email: [Robert.Anderson@ucop.edu](mailto:Robert.Anderson@ucop.edu)

*Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council  
Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents  
University of California  
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor  
Oakland, California 94607-5200*

August 16, 2012

VICE PROVOST FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL SUSAN CARLSON

**RE: FACULTY DIVERSITY WORKING GROUP REPORT**

Dear Susan,

At its meeting on July 25, 2012, the Academic Council discussed the recommendations of the Faculty Diversity Working Group of the President's Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture and Inclusion.

Council unanimously agreed that achieving a diverse faculty is an essential goal for the University of California. While progress in the past has been slowed by the limited number of underrepresented minority (and, in certain disciplines, female) candidates in the pipeline, it is essential that we commit ourselves to identifying and implementing best practices to enhance diversity in faculty recruitment and retention. While Proposition 209 also constrains our progress, it is essential to find 209-compliant practices that will enhance diversity. While a typical faculty career spans three to four decades, we note that on most UC campuses, a substantial cohort of faculty is now approaching retirement, and it is essential that the resulting turnover be accompanied by significant progress on diversity.

The Academic Council strongly supports the President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (Practice 6). Historically, this program has been UC's most effective tool for recruiting and investing in the careers of underrepresented minority faculty. We note with dismay that UC has chosen to respond to pressing budget problems by reducing the number of fellows supported by the program. While budget cuts have adversely impacted virtually every aspect of UC's academic program, we find that cuts to this program are extremely shortsighted, and call on the President to restore full funding. We also note that the stipend provided to the fellows needs to be re-evaluated, in order to ensure that the fellowships are competitive with opportunities provided by other institutions. Consideration should be given to an across-the-board increase in stipends in order to ensure that these fellowships are perceived as prestigious and attractive opportunities. At the very least, the stipends offered to candidates in certain disciplines need to be supplemented.

The Academic Council wishes to emphasize the critical role that provosts, deans and department chairs play in achieving diversity in faculty recruitment. While the members of all three groups are

members of the Academic Senate, they exercise their administrative roles largely outside of the formal institutions of the Senate. The first time the Senate formally sees an appointment recommendation is after it has emerged from the departmental review process (which typically spans two or more months of reviewing applications, conducting interviews, campus visits and departmental deliberation) and is forwarded by the Dean to the Senate's Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). CAP reviews the qualifications of the individual candidate, but is not in a position to compare those qualifications to other candidates whose files were not forwarded. There is substantial anecdotal evidence that deans and department chairs who have made diversity a priority have achieved greater diversity in faculty hiring and retention. In particular, we are aware of instances in which Deans have stepped in to mandate changes in departmental practices when appropriate. Accordingly, we strongly support the recommendation that contributions to diversity and equity be incorporated into the criteria for selection, appointment, reviews, and promotion of provosts, deans and department chairs (Practice 4).<sup>1</sup>

Council supports Practice 5 (Funding for a Reward Pool of FTE)<sup>2</sup> and Practice 7 (Updating the UCOP 2002 Affirmative Action Guidelines for the Recruitment and Retention of Faculty Brochure). Council notes that Central Diversity Offices are in place on most campuses now (Practice 10).

Council feels further discussion is needed to clarify the nature of the training recommended in Practice 2 (Providing Training for Members of CAPs) before a decision can be made. Council supports UCAP's proposal that individual campus CAPs work with the campus Committees on Affirmative Action and Diversity to develop guidelines that would also be reviewed by UCAAD.

Council agrees that diversity on Senate committees is important, and the campus Committees on Committees (CoCs) should be reminded to be consistently aware of the degree of diversity in the membership of these committees. However, Council does not support Practice 3 (Accountability Reports on Diversity of Key Senate Committees). Female and underrepresented minority faculty are often overwhelmed with requests to serve on committees, and accepting all or most of those requests would compromise their teaching and research. Council felt strongly that all members of committees, not just women and underrepresented minorities, should be committed to diversity, and that CoCs should take that commitment into account in making committee appointments. Council agreed that the diversity on *faculty search* committees is important and should be carefully considered at the beginning of each academic year when these committees are being formed in departments.

Council feels that Practice 11 (Cluster Hiring) deserves more study, in order to determine whether it has proven effective at UC campuses and other institutions. Council would be inclined to support it if there were more evidence of its efficacy.

The remaining recommendations of the Faculty Diversity Working Group concern various aspects of APM-210, which addresses the evaluation of contributions to diversity within the academic merit review process. Council recommends that this discussion continue before any specific actions are proposed. There is agreement that the implementation of APM-210 has been uneven among the campuses, and that the templates that individual faculty and their department chairs use in assembling merit cases need to do a better job of inviting faculty and departments to report on

---

<sup>1</sup> Senate reviewers felt the word "issues" in the short form of Practice 4 was problematic. They note it was not included in the long version, and Council recommends that it be deleted.

<sup>2</sup> Again, the use of the word "issues" in the short form of Practice 5 is problematic, and Council's support is conditional on its deletion.

contributions to diversity. However, different people read APM-210 in different ways as to how contributions to diversity should be credited in the merit process. Council members, speaking on behalf of their committees and divisions, are seeking to reconcile their commitment to evaluating research on its merits, regardless of the subject matter, with the language of APM 210 that some interpret as requiring different, more favorable, evaluation of research in certain areas. That process is ongoing, with some people criticizing APM-210 for seeming to require that research related to diversity receive extra credit, over and above the credit awarded to equally meritorious research which is unrelated to diversity. Others view APM 210 as intended to correct historical under-valuation of research contributions to diversity,<sup>3</sup> affirming that contributions to diversity should receive *equal* credit, whether in teaching, research or service. There seems to be consensus that research related to diversity should receive equal credit and not extra credit. There is not a consensus on whether that outcome is best achieved by amending APM-210, as favored by a majority of UCAP, or issuing an interpretation of APM-210, as favored by UCAAD and some members of UCAP. UCAP and UCAAD are continuing to work on this issue, and are seeking to determine the best way to clarify the meaning and to ensure that APM-210 is fully and appropriately implemented. Council felt strongly that the best course of action was to allow that discussion to continue into the fall, with further action anticipated in the 2012-13 academic year.

Thank you for your patience in giving Council time to complete its deliberations. Please feel free to contact me or 2012-13 chair Bob Powell at any time if you have questions or concerns about this letter.

Sincerely,



Robert M. Anderson

Cc: Academic Council

---

<sup>3</sup> For example, it is widely argued that medical research has at times focused too much attention on heterosexual white males, at the expense of women, underrepresented minorities, and LGBT individuals, who experience different health problems.