

COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION
Annual Report 1999-2000

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

We are pleased to report on the activities of the Committee on Affirmative Action last year and to take this opportunity to make some important recommendations to the Academic Senate for the following year.

Committee on Affirmative Action Activities

The enactment of Regents' Resolution SP-2 in 1995 and Proposition 209 in 1996 did not totally abolish affirmative action efforts at the University of California. As a Federal contractor the University is still required to comply with Federal affirmative action regulations governing employment. In addition, University policies allow us to engage in a variety of voluntary practices that promote equal employment opportunity without running afoul of State prohibitions. With this in mind, the Committee focused last year on monitoring progress in affirmative action and recommending ways to improve that record to the administration, deans, and department chairs.

Much of our time was devoted to investigating the issue of gender imbalance among ladder-rank faculty in a certain department, an issue that was brought to our attention by two faculty members of that department. After reviewing reports and records of the department's past searches, we determined that there was gender imbalance according to federal affirmative action regulations and that the department in question had not made a good faith effort to recruit women. The current search for two ladder-rank positions was terminated in that department and the Committee followed up with suggestions on how to recruit more vigorously for women candidates in future searches.

In addition, the Committee worked with EVC John Simpson to add diversity language to the Target of Excellence allocation policy and made recommendations to the Committee on Educational Policy and the Committee on Committees in regards to the "E" requirement in college core courses and the composition of Senate committees, respectively. For the remainder of the year, the Committee worked on an affirmative action plan for this campus in response to UC President Atkinson's call for every campus to adopt a plan that would result in the recruitment of outstanding new faculty who reflect the University's commitment to excellence and diversity.

Affirmative Action Plan

Comparative statistics from our EEO/AA office show that UC Santa Cruz has the most diverse faculty of all UC campuses, but progress has been slow in the past ten years, particularly in the recruitment of women, African Americans, Chicano/Latinos, and Native Americans. The number and percentage of women faculty grew from 110 (26.5%) in 1990-91 to 152 (33.3%) in 1999-00 (see Attachment A); and the percentage of non-white faculty grew from 73 (17.4%) to 105 (22.9%) during the same period (see Attachment B). There has been little change in the number and percentage of African Americans (from 11 or 2.6% to 17 or 3.7%), Chicano/Latinos (from 24 or 5.7% to 29 or 6.3%), and Native Americans (from 3 or 0.7% to 4 or 0.9%). Based on federal affirmative action regulations that require us to compare the percentage of women and minorities in our departments to the percentage of women and minorities available in the respective fields, every division on this campus still falls short in some areas (see Attachment C). Moreover, our faculty make-up does not reflect the diversity of people we seek to serve in California, which is now 50% women and 50.2% non-White, and projected to be 60% non-White in 2020 (see Attachment D).

At the same time, the Campus has arrived at a pivotal moment for growth. As a result of enrollment increases and faculty retirements, over 600 new faculty will be hired at UC Santa Cruz in the next 10 years. We have, in essence, a golden opportunity to dramatically increase faculty diversity and at the same time, raise standards of excellence on this campus. Following the lead of UC Davis, which recently completed an excellent study, "Report of the Chancellor's and Provost's Task Force on Faculty Recruitment," we wish to present the following principles for re-framing the affirmative action debate and our recommendations for achieving faculty diversity on this campus.

Re-framing the Debate: Excellence and Diversity

In accord with the UC Davis Report, we affirm that "the pursuit of excellence in teaching, research, and service at a public land grant university depends on the commitment and achievements of a diverse community of faculty." We wish to establish the connection between excellence and diversity in two ways. The first is the obvious demographic gap between the increasing diversity of California's population and the continued preponderance of faculty who are Euro-American and male. In this context, a prerequisite to excellence is the narrowing of that gap so that our faculty may more accurately reflect the diversity of the state. The second measure of excellence is in the scholarly achievements of those who have been historically underrepresented on our faculty; namely, women and people of color.

Affirmative action has been largely framed as a matter of numbers, and concomitant goals of representation so that arguments about the lowering of academic standards have been advanced and many faculty, even the more liberal amongst us, have felt a sort of jaded resignation in the face of these old arguments. It should be remembered that those who have carried out the affirmative action mandates have ourselves been the product of a highly racialized and gendered education. Despite this there has been much good will and courageous progress. With the serious backlash against affirmative action, and the various limitations of the policies now in place, we believe that it is important to advance new perspectives. To this end, we propose a re-framing of the affirmative action debate precisely on the grounds of excellence. We seek, in short, a middle ground between those who would be color and gender blind in the face of historical patterns of discrimination and subjugation, and those who would essentialize the attributes of those who have been historically underrepresented. In joining affirmative action to excellence we believe that the hopeful enthusiasm and spirited endorsement that first engaged this project may be rekindled.

The demographic evidence is incontrovertible. A majority of the people in the state of California today are people of color. This reality was already reflected in enrollment figures for K-12 in the public schools in 1997-1998 in which 40.5% of students were Hispanic, 8.1% were Asian, 8.8% were Black, and 38.8% were White. One measure of excellence for a public, land-grant institution is the extent to which its faculty, staff, and resources meet the needs of the population it serves. For students of color, the pedagogic experience is marked by seeing themselves reflected in the highest levels of authority within the university. This is not a mechanistic matter of numbers, but a complex intellectual and psychological process that affects the culture of learning itself, the styles of interrogation, attributes of language, and the nuances of social context. For White students as well, a multi-racial and multi-cultural learning experience transforms their understandings of race and culture, gender and socialization, history and language in an increasingly diverse and transnational nation. These experiences are prerequisite to the harmonious, engaged, alert, and informed populace of a democracy, and absolutely essential to economic and political globalization. This is the meaning of excellence in the demographic sense.

The excellence of scholarship in diversity has been amply and uncontrovertibly established in virtually every field. Race is not a biological or genetic determinant; it is, however, a political and cultural context in a nation obsessed with racialization. Gender is not a biological and genetic determinant; it is, however, a significant cultural factor in socialization, fears of violence, and issues of reproductive autonomy and technology. The confluence of race, gender, and class produce complicated patterns of socialization and consciousness distinct from those who have been historically over-represented in positions of authority and power.

These culturally-induced social constructs deeply affect the kinds of research questions our colleagues may ask, and the methodological and empirical issues they face.

For example, it is not coincidental that the first multi-cultural history of the United States in World War II is produced by an Asian American scholar; or, that the first multi-cultural economic history of women in the United States is produced by two women; or, that the deconstruction of primatology is executed by a female scholar; or, that the reconstruction of primate and human evolution is envisioned by a female scholar; or, that educational psychology previously based exclusively on empirical evidence of white, male, middle class standards of achievement has been challenged by female, African American and Chicano/a scholars; or, that established medical and genetic understandings and interpretations have been successfully re-visioned by female, African American, and Asian American scholars; or, that studies of immigration, migration, and post-coloniality have been particularly the domain of Chicano/a, Asian American, and Third World scholars, male and female.

Likewise, established methodological and empirical processes may be problematic. For example, in studying indigenous peoples or African American women it is much more difficult to find documentary evidence in the authenticated sense traditionally used in historical research. The further back one goes the harder it is. Similarly, a scholar unfamiliar with the historical and cultural context of a people may make serious interpretive errors, either in the work itself, or in the way in which it is received. Thus, excellence itself must be judged with new standards of understanding and a flexibility of mind. In a similar way, the empirical process in psychological, sociological, and anthropological contexts is shaped both by the perceived identity of the researched as s/he questions informants and observes interactions, and the questions asked and the observations made are likewise deeply affected by the cultural, racial, and class background and experiences of the researcher. For example, it was a female anthropologist who first uncovered a crucial dimension of an aboriginal culture because male anthropologists had not perceived women as important, and so did not investigate their role in the culture. This is not to say that the race or gender of a scholar determines a greater sensitivity or insight, only that it is a more likely factor in the intellectual project.

Many of our young scholars, among them people of color and women, are asking astonishing questions, venturing into new and uncharted avenues of research. We have only to give them the benefit of our best judgment and support, develop a trust in them, and in their capacity to meet and surpass our highest standards of excellence. A re-visioning of our own standards of scholarly excellence requires of all of us an open-mindedness, a curiosity, and a flexibility of thinking divested of our need to cling to traditional paradigms, methodologies, and epistemologies when others also clearly work.

The decisions we make now, and the seriousness with which we go about recruiting and retaining diverse scholars will affect the character of the university for the next thirty years.

Legal Strategies and Best Practices for Increasing Faculty Diversity

Despite the changes in UC and state policies that prohibit the consideration of race, sex, or ethnicity in employment practices, UC Santa Cruz has been able to maintain a holding pattern in the percentages of underrepresented groups. But we will have to be more creative and aggressive if we intend to bridge the demographic gap, comply with federal affirmative action regulations, and compete with other institutions for the best scholars and teachers to join our faculty. Although we realize that each department, program, division, and campus faces different issues and hurdles in diversifying its faculty, we believe that the following legal strategies and "best practices" for increasing faculty diversity put forth by the UC Office of the President have broad applications and warrant our consideration. Some of these practices (check-marked) are already being implemented at UC Santa Cruz, but we believe that more, if not all, of the following approaches need to be undertaken if faculty diversity is to increase in the next ten years. Please note that many of these practices apply to the recruitment of all faculty, but within the context of affirmative action, they are especially useful in the recruitment of a diverse faculty.

1. Make academic administration accountable at all levels for affirmative action efforts:
 - Include diversity efforts in performance reviews of deans and chairs
 - Evaluate diversity efforts in allocation of departmental resources
 - Make affirmative action and diversity mandatory elements of short and long term planning

2. Provide financial incentives to departments and divisions for effective good faith efforts to promote faculty and campus diversity:
 - Consider record of affirmative action efforts in the allocation of FTE
 - Award discretionary funds and additional graduate support funds as reward for exemplary efforts

3. Collect, analyze and distribute information about the nature of the problem:
 - √ Conduct focus groups, campus climate surveys and exit interviews
 - Conduct regular pay equity studies and implement a process for salary adjustments
 - √ Track hiring results by gender and race, and make the information readily available to faculty involved in hiring and to the campus community
 - Add Affirmative Action/EEO links to campus home pages, departmental sites, and academic personnel web information
4. Examine hiring practices to optimize diversity:
 - √ Focus hiring at the junior level where the pool is more diverse
 - √ Examine opportunities for cluster hiring and Target of Excellence appointments
 - √ Use non-specific position announcements to get a broader pool
 - √ Include diversity language in the job description regarding the ability of the applicant to contribute to campus diversity through their research, teaching, and/or service
 - Ensure that search committees are broadly representative and include people committed to diversity
 - Assign one member to monitor affirmative action efforts and to track women or minority candidates.
 - √ Encourage all faculty with a stake in the outcome of a search to contact colleagues at other institutions for names of potential candidates
 - √ Sustain and increase resources for advertising and recruitment as well as for competitive offers in terms of salary, a transition allowance, attractive mortgage loan, and research support
 - √ Develop effective spouse/partner hiring and housing programs
 - Build an academic pipeline to promote diversity in academic employment and develop postdoctoral programs focused on diversity issues to cultivate potential faculty
5. Conduct affirmative action training programs for deans, chairs and search committees:
 - Discuss current research on the educational benefits of diversity and the connection between diversity and excellence in research innovations
 - Emphasize the economic consequences of failure to address diversity
 - √ Illustrate the legal risks in violating equal opportunity principles
 - √ Identify and address "best practices" in search and recruitment activities
 - Include training on responding effectively to discrimination complaints

6. Value diversity by valuing research, service and teaching that contributes to the diversity of the academic community:
 - Use faculty development programs to reward diversity contributions
 - Value diversity in promotion and merit reviews
 - Develop special recognition and award programs
7. Make efforts to identify and plug "leaks" in the pipeline:
 - Establish mentor programs for junior faculty
 - Promote informal networks between junior and senior faculty
 - Recognize and compensate for the "double duty" imposed on women, minority, and other faculty who are underrepresented in their field
8. Enforce existing non-discrimination policies in academic personnel:
 - Have clear effective grievance procedures with prompt remedial action
9. Sponsor regular efforts to promote a welcoming and culturally rich campus climate:
 - √ Publicize an annual statement from academic leaders
 - Sponsor more educational and multicultural events and lectures
 - Implement prompt and effective response to identified problems
10. Participate in system-wide efforts to promote faculty diversity
 - √ Develop system-wide web links for academic position openings
 - √ Attend annual system-wide meeting on faculty affirmative action
 - √ Share good practices with other UC campuses

Conclusion

While this report contains many recommendations that can have a major impact on the recruitment of an excellent and diverse faculty, we believe that the best way to succeed in diversifying the faculty is to require a vigorous effort by departments and programs and forceful leadership by deans and the administration. Therefore, we propose the following resolution for Academic Senate adoption.

COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Resolution:

Whereas progress has been slow in the recruitment of underrepresented groups of faculty over the past ten years;

Whereas the campus has arrived at an opportune moment for faculty diversity in that over 600 new faculty will be hired in the next ten years as a result of projected enrollment increases and faculty retirements; and

Whereas the pursuit of excellence in teaching, research, and service at a public land grant university depends on the commitment and achievements of a diverse community of faculty;

It is Resolved:

That the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate affirms its commitment to excellence through affirmative action and strongly urges Chancellor Greenwood and Executive Vice-Chancellor Simpson to join efforts with the Academic Senate in advancing faculty diversity and excellence on this campus;

That departments and programs be rewarded for both their past and present efforts in hiring and retaining diverse faculty;

That deans, departments, and programs should be held accountable for promoting diversity and equal opportunity; and

That the Committee on Affirmative Action work with appropriate Senate committees and the administration to develop the format for implementing the items above.

Respectfully submitted,

Committee on Affirmative Action

Bettina Aptheker

Julie Bettie

Doyle Foreman

Patti Hiramoto, Director of EEO/Affirmative Action

Robert Levinson

Triloki Pandey

Christy Teranishi, Graduate Representative

Judy Yung, Chair

October 19, 2000