

COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION
Annual Report 2000-2001

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Last fall, the Committee on Affirmative Action (CAA) proposed and this body passed Senate Resolution AS/SCP/1282-8, which affirmed our commitment to excellence through affirmative action and strongly urged the administration to join efforts with the Academic Senate in advancing faculty diversity and excellence on this campus. CAA then proceeded to devote the remainder of the year to exploring ways to implement the Resolution.

Fruitful meetings with the Divisional Deans, Assistant Chancellor Armstrong-Zwart, Executive Vice-Chancellor Simpson, and Chancellor Greenwood led us to focus our attention on reviewing the preliminary Divisional long-range plans to ensure that each division integrate affirmative action and diversity goals to achieve excellence in their plans. As we wrote the Committee on Planning and Budget (**Attachment A**), we were concerned that three out of five divisions neglected to even mention diversity in their executive summaries, and that all of the academic plans lacked specific strategies to enhance faculty, staff, and student diversity. Our report urged the Deans to consider subject areas, programs, positions, and recruitment strategies that would advance curricular and faculty diversity in their respective divisions. We intend to remain involved in the planning process as it continues and to work with individual departments as needed on diversity hiring strategies.

CAA also continued to work closely with Human Resources and EEO/AA to coordinate faculty diversity efforts on this campus. During the spring quarter, Chair Yung and EEO/AA Director Hiramoto met with each division's Council of Chairs to discuss best practices and diversity issues in their searches. In addition, CAA members met with state auditors investigating gender equity and worked closely with EEO/AA on the campus's response to their recommendations. During the summer, CAA again teamed up with Human Resources and EEO/AA to set guidelines for the Diversity Fund Program that EVC Simpson has established to encourage recruitment and diversity efforts in the departments over time (**Attachment B**). CAA has agreed to assume the responsibility of reviewing all proposals and making recommendations to EVC Simpson.

Following up on a faculty retention survey that CAA conducted in 1998, we decided to conduct exit interviews with the thirteen faculty who had resigned since 1998 to ascertain causes of dissatisfaction (**Attachment C**). We found that the majority resigned because of better job offers with regard to resources, salaries, housing, and research opportunities. Compared to the results of our survey three years ago, spousal hiring and housing remain the key retention issues. Because of the small sample of women and faculty of color, differences due to gender, race, and ethnicity could not be discerned in the current study. We thus felt that the Committee on Faculty Welfare would be a more appropriate body to conduct exit interviews in the future, and they have agreed to do so.

Other ideas for implementing the Senate Resolution on excellence through affirmative action that we hope to pursue this coming year include:

- Work with Graduate Division to increase diversity in the academic pipeline.
- Work with Committee on Academic Personnel to acknowledge diversity efforts of individual faculty in personnel reviews.
- Work with Committee on Educational Policy to diversify curriculum.
- Work with Committee on Research to add diversity efforts as a criteria for granting research funds.
- Participate in the Gender Equity Review process.
- Work with individual departments to improve diversity efforts.
- Work with Human Resources and EEO/AA to develop awards program to honor individuals/units for promoting diversity.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Bettina Aptheker

Doyle Foreman

Patti Hiramoto, EEO/AA Director

Robert Levinson

Triloki Pandey

Christy Teranishi, Graduate Rep

Avril Thorne

Judy Yung, Chair

September 25, 2001

Attachment A

May 15, 2000

TO: John Hay, Chair
Committee on Planning and Budget
FROM: Judy Yung, Chair
Committee on Affirmative Action
RE: Preliminary Long Range Plans

The Committee on Affirmative Action write in response to EVC Simpson and your call for faculty input on the preliminary Divisional long-range plans. In particular, we welcome this opportunity to review how well each division has integrated affirmative action and diversity goals into their long-range plans in keeping with this campus' affirmative action policies, Academic Senate Resolution 1282 (commitment to excellence through diversity in hiring practices), and EVC Simpson's directive that "enhancing faculty, staff, and student diversity" should be a goal of the academic plans. We are pleased that for the first time we are being called upon to intervene in the departmental and divisional planning process early on so that corrective measures can be made in the final plans if necessary.

Having reviewed the Executive Summaries of all the divisions, we are very concerned with the overall lack of consciousness, urgency, and creativity in the inclusion of diversity goals with long-range curricular and research planning. Three out of five divisions did not even mention diversity in their plans, and all of the academic plans lacked specific strategies to enhance faculty, staff, and student diversity. Yet, we know from our past meetings with the deans and from their reports in the "Affirmative Action Plan for Academic Employees" that they are committed to diversity and have exerted great efforts in recruiting, hiring, and retaining women and faculty of color. We feel strongly that there must be a stronger alignment between their affirmative action goals and long-range academic plans.

We wish to note that the Social Sciences and Arts divisions were good about emphasizing their commitment to excellence through diversity in their introductions. In the Social Sciences' Executive Summary, the Latin American and Latino Studies Department and the Center for Justice, Tolerance, and Difference were the strongest in addressing diversity issues in their curricular and hiring plans. Other departments mentioned new foci and subject areas that held strong possibilities for the hiring of women or faculty of color (e.g., Global Economics in the Economics Department; Feminism and Women of Color in the Sociology Department; Social Documentation in the Community Studies Department; Social Justice in the Politics Department; Early Childhood in the Psychology Department; etc.). With the one exception of Sociology, these departments did not show awareness of diversity in hiring for these positions; that

is, there was no indication of strategies for diverse recruitments. There was also no mention of staff and student diversity, even in the plans to have College Nine and Ten concentrate on Global Perspectives and Social Justice issues, respectively.

The Arts Division was explicit about placing the importance of faculty diversification on an equal par with the challenge of new technology and the globalization of curricula in their long-range plan. We commend their efforts to diversify faculty and curricula through the Campus Curriculum Initiative program and by requiring students to take courses in non-traditional, non-Western subject areas. They also made a point of referring to their faculty targets in the “Affirmative Action Plan.” We urge the Art Division to also address faculty, staff, and student diversity issues in their plans for new graduate programs and an increased presence in Summer Session and the Silicon Valley Center.

The Humanities Division has the best track record for hiring women and faculty of color, yet they failed to discuss diversity issues in their long-range plan. Again, we see strong possibilities for further diversity hires in the dean’s proposal for new programs in Global Studies, Public Humanities, Liberal Arts, Religious Studies, and South Asian Studies. The Linguistics and Language programs would do well to think globally and include such important languages as Hindi, Arabic, and some of the more important African languages. The study of Islam is also a major omission on this campus. We commend the Division for including diversity of faculty and graduate students as one of their twenty-one “Accountability Milestones,” but would suggest that they detail how this goal will be achieved.

The Engineering Division needs to include diversity language, goals, and strategies from their Affirmative Action Plan in their long-range plan. In particular, it needs to specifically address diversity issues in plans to develop subject areas of excellence, to conduct senior hires and Target of Excellence recruitments, and to play a major role in the Silicon Valley Center, the Pacific Rim Roundtable, Summer Session, and college sponsorship of College Eleven or Crown College.

Although the Natural Sciences divisional plan did not address diversity at all, its three foci—health, environment, and technology—sound very promising. We urge the Division to specifically address the issue of diversity in future faculty appointments as well as in staff and student recruitments. For example, women’s health is itself a vibrant field, as is public health issues of communities of color. Likewise, the field of environmental racism is of increasing importance, as is globalization. We encourage our colleagues in the Sciences to develop FTEs in a way that take these issues of diversity into account.

In conclusion, we urge all the deans to take the lead in integrating affirmative action goals into their long-range plans in the interest of advancing excellence through diversity on this campus. We urge them to think of ways that their curricula might address issues relevant to the diverse population of California and the indigenous communities throughout the world. How might their curricular plan attract diverse faculty and students to UCSC? And how would a diverse faculty strengthen their curricula as well as attract diverse student and staff populations? Lest we forget, the decisions we all make now, and the seriousness with which we go about recruiting and retaining a diverse population

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ
Committee on Affirmative Action

AS/SCP/1324-5

of faculty, staff, and students, will affect the character and quality of education at this university for many years to come.

Respectfully submitted,

Committee on Affirmative Action
Judy Yung, Chair
Bettina Aptheker
Doyle Foreman
Robert Levinson
Triloki Pandey
Avril Thorn
Patti Hiramoto, EEO/AA Ex-officio

Cc: EVC Simpson
Dean Houghton
Dean Godzich
Dean Kong
Dean Kliger
Dean Chemers

Attachment B

Diversity Fund Proposals

In order to support your recruitment and diversity efforts, the Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor will be offering funding up to \$2000 for proposals that reflect the division/department's affirmative action or diversity goals for 2001-2002 and beyond. This program replaces and expands the supplemental outreach funding program that was offered in the past. **The criterion is that the proposal must directly promote efforts that will help diversify the applicant pools for a particular ladder-rank search or that over time, will improve the likelihood of increasing applications from members of underutilized groups.** Proposals that have a collaborative component across disciplines are strongly encouraged. Examples include:

- Sponsoring colloquia that include women and minorities who may be viable applicants for UCSC faculty positions. Funds may be used for honoraria and travel
- Hosting visiting scholars whose work is tied to diversity or who may potentially apply for positions and enhance diversity at UCSC
- Developing curricula that deal with diversity issues
- Funding programs that encourage all students, including women and underrepresented minorities to apply to PhD programs and increase diversity in the academic pipeline
- Funding search committee members to attend conferences to recruit and interview candidates
- Supplementing recruitment costs including advertising and mailing
- Funding to pay for larger short list and second visits of serious candidates who will promote diversity
- Funding to increase start-up for top candidate who will contribute to diversity
- Funding faculty to attend conferences related to diversity such as the American Council on Education's (ACE) Diversity Conference (Oct 18-20, 2001), "Educating All of One Nation"

Use of Funds

Diversity Funds may be used to supplement existing programs in the department. Departments may want to consider collaborating on sponsoring events or programs in order to maximize funding opportunities. Please remember that under Proposition 209, funding cannot be targeted solely for underrepresented groups but that all outreach and programs must be inclusive of all potential applicants. Diversity Funds may not be used to provide honoraria or travel solely on the basis of gender or race, or to augment salary for any UCSC faculty.

Application and Review

Proposals must be signed by the Dept Chair and Dean and are due in the Academic Senate office by November 1, 2001. The Senate Committee on Affirmative Action will determine which proposals receive funding based on the criteria listed above and the department's justification for the request. Proposals that are submitted after the due date will be considered as long as funds are available. An application form is attached.

Contacts

If you have any questions regarding the program or application, please contact Barbara Brogan at x9-4219 or Patti Hiramoto at x9-2349.

Attachment C

May 4, 2001

BARBARA BROGAN, DIRECTOR
ACADEMIC HUMAN RESOURCES

Re: Summary of Exit Interviews, Spring 2001

Dear Barbara:

Three years ago, the Committee on Affirmative Action conducted entrance and exit interviews among faculty members in order to determine the causes of dissatisfaction and hopefully suggest ways to improve campus efforts for the retention of faculty, especially women and racial minorities. We thought it would be useful to do such a survey again, but this time we decided to conduct exit interviews only.

Initially, surveys were sent out to thirteen faculty who had resigned since 1998 in early February, allowing them to fill out the questionnaire and return them by mail. We followed up on those for whom we did not get responses with a phone interview. Seven members of the Committee on Affirmative Action conducted interviews throughout the month of March until early April. Three primary questions were addressed: 1) What is the major reason for your decision to leave UCSC? 2) Do you have any specific recommendations on how the campus could have been more responsive to your needs? 3) How would you compare the quality of your experience at this campus to other campuses where you have been employed.

Thirteen exit interviews were conducted among faculty who resigned, including nine White males, two White females, one Asian male, and one Indian female. Six of the faculty were in the Natural Sciences, three were in the Social Sciences, two were in the Humanities, and one was in Engineering. Among the thirteen faculty members, two were employed for 1 to 2 years, three were employed for 3 to 5 years, four were employed for 7 to 9 years, and three were employed for 10 to 12 years.

The following were the major reasons faculty said they resigned. These are listed in order of importance according to repeated mentions.

- Got better job offer with regard to resources, colleagues, and opportunities (N = 10)
- Heavy workloads combined with low salary with extremely high housing costs (3)
- Spousal hiring (N = 3)
- Tenure process unfair (N = 2)
- Better opportunity for academic research and lack of appreciation by the administration (N = 1)
- Department lacked leadership and was strongly factionalized (N = 1)
- On leave from another university with colleagues and family on the East Coast (N = 1)

Ten of the thirteen faculty who resigned were offered a better position at another campus that provided them with more resources, higher salary, more affordable housing, and better research opportunities. Three of the faculty resigned because their spouse got a better position elsewhere and they were also given better positions due to availability of spousal hiring. One of the faculty indicated that faculty was divided when he was hired and they warned him that he would be prevented from getting tenure. One faculty was happy at UCSC but was on leave from another university and his family and colleagues were there.

Faculty described positive experiences about the campus including the geographic location and physical beauty of the campus (N = 4), the students, department and colleagues (N = 4), the intellectual culture (N = 1), and the ability to do interdisciplinary work (N = 1). One faculty said, "UCSC's intellectual culture is open, flexible, and engaging. The top 20% of the student body is excellent, combining intellectual curiosity and strong academic skills with a concern for the world. My best colleagues were excellent teachers and scholars." Faculty indicated the things that they like the least were dealing with the administration (N = 5), the misallocation of resources (N = 3), lack of colleagues or graduate program in their area (N = 3), housing costs (N = 1), the tenure process (N = 1), and spousal hiring (N = 1). Five faculty indicated that the problems had to do with the infrastructure of the university, including misallocation of buildings and space, lack of computing resources and technical support, faculty tension, and the way the Deans, Departments, and faculty work together in terms of faculty promotion and accelerations. Three faculty indicated that although their salaries were comparable to other universities in their field, the cost of living is high and housing is unaffordable.

Faculty provided specific recommendations for how the campus could be more responsive to their needs. The following were their recommendations:

Departments and the Administration need to foster the success of faculty in terms of promotions and accelerations (N = 2)
Raise both salaries and criteria employed in hiring and retention decisions to improve the quality of faculty (N = 2)
Spousal hiring (N = 2)
Affordable housing (N = 2)
Research support needs substantial improvement. Instead of viewing faculty as a source of funds to be tapped for Divisional needs, the Dean needs to commit to resources to fostering the success of the faculty (N = 1)
Develop more coherence using resources more wisely. Departments that have resources are not utilizing them, and those who need resources have a hard time obtaining them (N = 1)

In comparing the quality of their experience at UCSC to other campuses, five of the faculty said UCSC was better, two said it was about the same, and five said it was worse. Of those who rated it as better than other universities, faculty said UCSC is quite good with regard to availability of scientific collaborations, and fairer than other universities in that everything is done by negotiation between faculty member, Chair, and Dean. Of those who rated it worse than other universities, faculty said it was due to the unresponsive administration, lower faculty quality, lower salaries (both absolute and relative to the cost of living), higher faculty workload, and a lack of a coherent intellectual community.

These are the major themes that emerged out of the exit interviews. Compared to the results of our survey three years ago, spousal hiring and housing remain the key retention issues. Due to the small sample of women and minority faculty, differences due to gender or ethnicity could not be discerned in the current study. All of the faculty members who were interviewed were very responsive and provided important feedback for helping to improve campus efforts for faculty retention. As one faculty said, "The campus cannot afford to lose high quality faculty members if it truly wants to attain excellence." This is an important point for why these exit interviews must be taken seriously to better understand the needs of the faculty. UCSC needs to acknowledge and value these high-quality faculty who contribute to the quality of teaching and research this campus has to offer.

Although we feel exit interviews are important to conduct periodically to assess faculty dissatisfactions and ways to improve retention rates, we don't feel that our committee is the appropriate body to continue this task. Rather, we believe the responsibility should reside with the Committee on Faculty Welfare or Academic Human Resources. We look forward to your response.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ
Committee on Affirmative Action

AS/SCP/1324-11

Yours sincerely,

Judy Yung, Chair
Bettina Aptheker
Doyle Foreman
Robert Levinson
Triloki Pandey
Avril Thorn
Christy Teranishi, Graduate Rep
Patti Hiramoto, EEO/AA Ex-officio
COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

CC: Roger Anderson, Chair, Academic Senate
Mark Traugott, Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee