

COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND DIVERSITY  
Annual Report, 2002-03

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

This year, the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) worked to mainstream affirmative action and diversity goals in a wide range of activities relevant to faculty, staff, and students. We continue to work closely with Director Patti Hiramoto (EEO/AA), Assistant VC Barbara Brogan (AHR), CPEVC John Simpson, and various Academic Senate officers and committees to keep diversity issues on the forefront and to devise new strategies to further advance diversity goals.

**Diversity Fund Program**

We commend CPEVC Simpson for his commitment to sustaining the Diversity Fund Program, which offers departments up to \$2,000 for proposals that will improve the likelihood of increasing applications from members of underutilized groups over time, supplement an existing diversity-oriented program, promote the pipeline of PhD students, or contribute towards a project or event that is linked to affirmative action or diversity goals. The committee hopes that this program will continue to be funded in future years.

**Comprehensive Review Plan**

The CAA was asked by the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA) to review its criteria for undergraduate admissions to UCSC, which will become selective in the next few years. We considered the proposed selection criteria with regard to their potential impact on admissions of students from under-represented groups. CAFA reassured CAAD that comprehensive review is not a way to avoid affirmative action. We strongly urge that diversity issues be kept in the forefront in devising strategies for selective undergraduate admissions.

**CAA Membership on SAC**

For the last several years, CAAD has been working to become a member of the Senate Advisory Committee (SAC), the advisory board of the Santa Cruz Division. Our reasons for this request included the facts that (1) there are affirmative action implications in every decision we make, as institutions or as individuals; (2) as a member of SAC, CAAD can work more closely with other senate committees; (3) the University is entering a period of rapid expansion in the size of our faculty and student body and CAAD can help advance excellence through diversity in compliance with government regulations. This year we were heartened that the Academic Senate at the May 16<sup>th</sup> meeting approved the Committee on Committee's proposal for permanent membership on SAC. We look forward to now being able to participate on more equal footing with other SAC committees. Given the changing demographics of California, CAAD input on faculty, student, and curricular diversity is now more crucial than ever.

### **Change to Committee Name**

The Committee on Committees asked that the Committee on Affirmative Action (CAA) change its name to be consistent with the systemwide committee. The CAA agreed to add "and Diversity" to the committee's name (CAAD), and a Bylaw change was passed by the Senate at the May 16th meeting.

### **Diversity Awards Program**

CAA discussed a new EEO/AA proposal for a Diversity Awards Program to help institutionalize diversity and recognize excellence in diversity. The program focused on staff and faculty efforts in hiring and on highlighting outstanding programs. There were 17 nominations received from the campus community and 7 individuals were chosen based on a long-standing history of diversity practices. Recipients were honored at a luncheon at the University House with Chancellor Greenwood and CPEVC Simpson.

### **Encouragement of Departmental Affirmative Action Plans**

One of our major goals this year was to encourage more efforts at the departmental level to incorporate best practices in recruitment and retention of students, faculty, and staff. Although Divisions are required to include Affirmative Action plans in their Long Range Development Plans, departments are not. With regard to faculty diversity, annual statistics are currently provided by departments to the campus EEO/AA office. Accountability then shifts to the divisions each of which handles the situation differently. There is presently no accountability for incorporating best practices at the department level. We conveyed our concerns to CPEVC Simpson with regard to the importance of developing a diversity planning and reporting process that is the same across departments and divisions. We support CPEVC Simpson's idea of making the deans and chairs "diversity officers" which would empower them to hold their units accountable by instituting a best practices process for increasing faculty, staff, curricular, and student diversity. We also urged that CAAD feedback be required on all affirmative action plans.

Further, the CAAD feels very strongly that the campus-wide summit of chairs, deans, and heads of the search committees should do more to emphasize the importance of affirmative action and diversity and provide support mechanisms for their achievement. One modest effort toward implementation, suggested by CPEVC Simpson and which we strongly endorse, is to add a paragraph to search letter templates indicating methods for obtaining a diverse pool of candidates.

### **Complaint of Racial Discrimination**

A subset of the CAAD discussed a complaint sent to Chair David Cope from a UCSC lecturer who had applied, but was not chosen to teach a course. The lecturer filed a complaint with a dean and then with the EEO/AA office claiming there been racial discrimination during the search, but was unsatisfied with the responses, and therefore decided to contact Chair Cope. Our CAAD sub-committee reviewed all documents and correspondence related to the case with an eye to bias in policies and practices. We found that there were aspects of the search and selection process that appeared problematic and thus resulted in less than ideal hiring practices:

- The selection criteria, such as preferred and required skills, were not adequately defined ahead of time.
- Changes to the course's educational goals were made during, rather than before, the interviews, without proper discussion between members of the selection committee, and candidates were not alerted to these changes even though they were critically important to the final selection.
- The selection process was not clearly defined before the search. The roles of each official and 'unofficial' committee member were not specified, and procedures for handling differences of opinion, for voting within the committee, and for making the final selection were not explicitly defined before or during the search. It appears that the final selection was made by the Department Chair, which was within his authority but without providing a forum to fully consider the dissenting opinion. Because the final selection was not made by a collective assessment of each candidate's qualifications relative to specific predefined selection criteria, this search had an overtone of being an arbitrary process.

Because the charge of the CAAD includes the study of policies and practices of affirmative action, and the potential to make recommendations of policy changes, but not the handling of grievances, we could not take any actions that would resolve the specific complaints by the lecturer. However, we wrote a letter to the lecturer outlining our charge and viewpoint, and summarized the actions that we had taken:

- 1) We contacted the Senate's Special Committee on Non Senate Teaching Faculty to discuss that the process of hiring lecturers should enhance equal opportunity and diversity goals. The CAAD will follow up on this next year.
- 2) We wrote a letter to the faculty of the department in which the search occurred regarding the process by which the search was conducted and the implications of such practices for affirmative action. We emphasized the importance of well-organized and thoughtful searches for achieving diversity goals
- 3) We made recommendations to CPEVC John Simpson that would promote the development of more detailed and effective departmental affirmative action plans.
- 4) We wrote a letter to the lecturer outlining our charge and viewpoint, with information about what we intended to do (1 – 3, above).

### **Freshman Discovery Seminars**

Senate Chair George Blumenthal requested feedback on Freshman Discovery Seminars. The committee discussed the materials provided and suggested the following comments: In general, the committee generally supported the seminars, but has concerns about vague seminar descriptions, lack of student incentives to take courses, unclear relationship between seminars and Core courses, and a lack of any reference to diversity.

### **CAA Consultation on TOE Appointments**

When we met with CPEVC Simpson on June 4 we expressed our feelings that the CAAD should be consulted on Target of Excellence (TOE) searches much in the same way as CPB is consulted. We believe that TOE's, especially since they often target as full professors, require close scrutiny regarding affirmative action. Simpson agreed with our views and has since added

this consultation to the TOE search process. With regards to Campus Curriculum Initiative (CCI) searches, we were heartened that CPEVC Simpson is committed to maintaining the CCI searches, which are crucial to enhancing faculty diversity.

**Department Survey: climate for women**

The committee also investigated some faculty concerns regarding a survey instigated by a division that aimed to assess the division's climate for women faculty. The concerns centered on issues of confidentiality in responding to the survey, and the potential for retaliation in responding to questions about promotion and comparative salary levels. In order to protect the anonymity of the concerned faculty, a CAAD member relayed these concerns to the divisional administrator.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Sonia Alvarez

Karlton Hester

Nathaniel Mackey

Christina Ravelo

Avril Thorne

Patti Hiramoto, *ex-officio*

David Cope, Chair

August 29, 2003