December 05, 2013

TO: Jan Reiff
Chair of Academic Senate

FROM: Council on Academic Personnel

RE: Comments on Moreno Report

CAP received a copy of the Independent Investigative Report on Acts of Bias and Discrimination Involving Faculty at the University of California, Los Angeles ("the Moreno Report" or "the Report") on November 4, along with your request that any comments from our committee be submitted to you by December 6, 2013. This memorandum is in response to that request.

Committee members individually read the Moreno Report and collectively held a discussion of the Report and its implications. As members of the Academic Senate and the UCLA faculty we share the concerns of many that the conduct described in the document is deeply troubling, contradicts the university’s responsibilities and commitments and must be addressed as soon as possible. We think that the report represents an important first step but stress that this issue cannot be allowed to slip off the agenda and should be given the highest priority.

As CAP, the Committee obviously does not have direct responsibility for the implementation of the Moreno Report recommendations. We did think that the proposal to hire a Discrimination Officer and establish mechanisms to address current procedural and reporting deficiencies makes good sense as it would avoid some of the problems regarding the lack of clear lines of responsibility and authority. The current mechanism for investigating and addressing sexual harassment certainly is far superior to the diffuse and unclear structures for dealing with incidents of racial bias.

Since CAP is restricted to evaluating the dossier before it in assessing cases for promotion and appointment, necessarily CAP can consider only the material presented. Thus, to the extent that information pertaining to bias never makes its way into any formal grievance or into any evaluation, CAP believes that much of the work to correct these reporting deficiencies needs to happen in advance of the dossier’s arrival at CAP. However, we note that there are ways to address one of the major issues that the Report identifies which is the lack of accountability for acts of bias by faculty. While we affirm that there is a community-wide responsibility to address bias, we think that the failure to impose appropriate consequences for faculty who commit bias is deeply problematic and can lead to an erosion of confidence and perceived legitimacy, not only for the specific unit involved but for the institution as a whole. The systematic failure to hold accountable those who
behave in a biased manner towards other members of the UCLA community then must be addressed. At the same time, procedures must be established to allow for those who experience bias to report it without imposing onerous burdens or undue procedural hurdles.

The committee offers the following suggestions:

- Where relevant, CAP should consider how experiences with discrimination may have negatively impacted productivity. Social science and public health research has documented that experiences with discrimination— chronic and immediate, overt and covert—take a measurable toll on the mental and physical well-being of people who experience them. In the context of academic performance, it is well documented that discrimination may have negative impacts on academic achievement. While there is often both internal and external pressure to try to overlook incidents of bias and to disprove biased opinions by stellar work performance, this kind of approach is frequently extremely costly in terms of detriments to health as measured by reactions to long term stress. One can therefore surmise that discrimination could potentially impact the productivity of faculty of color at UCLA who are targets of such discrimination. Once a system for reporting and codifying experiences with discrimination is established, if a candidate believes that these experiences negatively impacted her scholarly productivity, teaching or service in ways that could jeopardize promotions and advancement, this information should be included in the dossier as material relevant to CAP’s determination. CAP also recommends that candidates are informed that negative impact of discrimination on performance is a factor that can be considered where relevant. To be clear, CAP cannot be involved in investigating any claims; rather, it would assess how such claims may have impacted relevant issues.

- The evaluation of chairs and Deans should include assessment of how they have handled issues of discrimination or bias. Recognizing that serving as department chair is often a difficult and underappreciated service task, we did not think that this measure of accountability could be productively imposed without focus, training and resources devoted to supporting chairs in recognizing the importance of responding to bias, and in providing clearer guidance for doing so. Deans also should receive training on the question of addressing bias and should be apprised that there is an affirmative duty to become aware of bias incidents and to become familiar with the relevant procedures for addressing them. The review of Deans’ performance should include how they have dealt with these issues, and in particular, whether chairs are supported in developing effective responses and are held accountable for failing to do so.
December 4, 2013

Jan Reiff
Chair, Academic Senate

RE: Committee on Committees’ Response to the Independent Investigative Report on Acts of Bias and Discrimination Involving Faculty at UCLA

Dear Jan,

On behalf of the 2013-14 Committee on Committees (ConC), I am writing to provide you with the membership’s feedback concerning the recent Independent Investigative Report on Acts of Bias and Discrimination Involving Faculty at UCLA, as issued by a task force led by former California Supreme Court Chief Justice Carlos Moreno. The ConC was alerted to the report at its meeting on November 7, 2013, and spent a significant portion of its meeting on November 21st discussing it. Members’ observations and concerns are summarized below and focus on a number of key issues revealed in the report, and the ConC’s consideration of related Academic Senate processes, bylaws and procedures.

First and foremost, the ConC is unanimous in its assessment that the acts of bias and discrimination revealed by the Moreno Report are completely unacceptable and have no place in a celebrated diverse institution like UCLA. Unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately with respect to these issues being brought forward, the revelations of the Moreno Report were very unsettling to the ConC’s membership. Some members shared their own anecdotal evidence of the pervasiveness of gender, racial and ethnic discrimination on this campus, and of the perceived inactivity of the University’s senior administration to rectify it. The early statement by the Chancellor that this did not reflect the University as he knows it was mentioned as an indicator that either the highest level of leadership is very out of touch with the campus or that the desire to downplay even serious issues gets in the way of meaningful action. Members were outright angry after reading about the specific cases cited in the report. However, to be frank, many were also quite skeptical about the campus climate changing if significant efforts are not made at the top that hold not only the individual perpetrator, but also UCLA, accountable for permitting these egregious acts to occur in the first place. While a Chancellor’s statement of zero-tolerance may be effective on a smaller scale, members feel that the Administration must be willing to impose (and identify in advance) serious disciplinary actions on those who are found to be guilty of committing discriminatory acts. As stated in the report, current efforts by UCLA are directed towards “making whole the injured faculty member, without any repercussions to the offending party.” With no obvious penalties the University is condoning – and creating – a hostile environment for faculty, students, and staff.

Members commented that it is simply not acceptable for nothing to happen when reports of discrimination are filed. There is a common perception that perpetrators all too often go unscathed, and that the process even appears biased against the claimant. Such perceptions only perpetuate the problem, with likely countless claims going unreported. Even at the level of the Academic Senate’s judiciary committees a grievant is most often advised to attempt to informally resolve his/her concerns, which for many members equates to those concerns
being swept under the rug. Several members commented that the only seemingly effective means of resolving a grievance or charge is to employ outside counsel, which forces the University to respond. However, the expenses incurred by the University when settling these cases could go a long way towards reinforcing a campus framework that actualizes in everyday life the University’s stated commitment to diversity, and provide a safe and independent means for faculty, students, and staff to report acts of discrimination and bias.

With respect to your request to “consider the Academic Senate through the lens of your committee mandate” when reviewing the Moreno Report, the ConC has a number of observations and suggestions. As you know, the ConC’s primary task is to secure the appointment of new members and chairs for the standing committees of the Academic Senate. This mandate is very clear, as is its outcome in the reporting of all of these appointments to the Legislative Assembly at a minimum of once per year. However, the mandates of other standing committees may not be as clear, so ConC’s first recommendation – which is consistent with the recommendation it made in its 2012-13 Annual Report – is for “each committee (to) review its charge at the end of every year while in session to evaluate if it captures the committee’s current role, if it should be updated, or, if the charge remains unclear, whether the committee should be disbanded altogether.” While this latter option is not advisable for the Academic Senate’s judicial committees (P&T, Charges, and GAC) the principle of the recommendation is to encourage a holistic assessment of the committee’s operations to ensure that they remain effective and valuable for Senate faculty. Following meetings with judicial committee chairs in AY 2012-13, it became apparent to the ConC that the Committee on Charges was over-burdened with a large number of cases, but GAC and P&T were handling a comparatively light load. Such an imbalance might be indicative of a more systemic problem and, if these committees are meeting so infrequently, it seems questionable that there exists a rapport and trust amongst committee members and even an effective procedure to deal with cases in a fair and equitable way. The obvious loss of institutional and procedural knowledge from one year to the next presents clear obstacles for these committees to work effectively.

Regarding the judicial committees in particular, the Academic Senate may wish to consider a means of independently evaluating the committees’ mode of operation, and/or request greater detail in those committees’ annual reports, which could then be used to identify trends or give cause for a more thorough evaluation to ensure that they are meeting their charges and effectively serving their constituencies. While the ConC is not prepared to offer its assistance with evaluating judicial committee charges and outputs due to its own demonstrated workload, it might behoove the Academic Senate to consider assigning this task to the Committee on Diversity & Equal Opportunity (CODEO), which “provides advice to the University Administration on policies/programs to advance faculty diversity, including the recruitment and retention of women and underrepresented minorities.” The Academic Senate might also consider determining how other public and private Universities with a more harmonious climate are handling these issues.

Members acknowledged the formation of an Implementation Committee by the Chancellor, which will no doubt play a role in reviewing current Academic Senate processes. However, members feel that the Chancellor should provide greater clarification about the role of this committee, its mandate, and its anticipated outcomes. The Implementation Committee should be expected to not only evaluate divisional processes, but it should seek out and survey best practices at other comparable institutions, which would not only make sense from a management perspective, but from a legal one, as well. Members of ConC noted that the Implementation Committee members were overwhelmingly representing three professional schools (Law, Education and Medicine) while the infractions occurred throughout the University. Members were also concerned that the Moreno report so far only triggered the constitution of yet another deliberative committee and that the clear action plan specified in the Moreno report was not being implemented with the necessary urgency.
With respect to its own processes, the ConC considers diversity in all of its forms when making appointments to the standing committees of the Academic Senate. The membership takes great care when considering the composition of any given committee, but is especially careful to ensure the appointment of fair-minded and respected colleagues to the judicial committees. Given its respect for these colleagues, members surmise that any deficiency of the Academic Senate’s processes is systemic and not due to any incapacity of the committee’s membership. However, members of ConC do acknowledge that they get only very limited personal and no official feedback on the performance of individuals appointed to any committee or, as pointed out above, on the effectiveness of committees in general.

On behalf of the Committee on Committees, we thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Moreno Report. While it presents UCLA with some major challenges there is a sense of optimism reflected in the ConC’s own collegial and respectful interactions, which must somehow translate to the campus at large. It is with this spirit that I share ConC’s response and its willingness to collaborate with you and the committees of the Academic Senate to demonstrate the true merits of shared governance, mutual respect, and cross-cultural sensitivity.

With best regards,

Felix Schweizer
Chair, Committee on Committees

cc: Members of the Committee on Committees
Linda Mohr, Interim CAO, Academic Senate
Serge Chenkerian, MSO/Executive Assistant, Academic Senate
Kyle Cunningham, Senior Policy Analyst, Committee on Committees
Dear Professor Reiff,

The Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) met on Monday, December 2, 2013, and discussed the Independent Investigative Report on Acts of Bias and Discrimination Involving Faculty at the University of California, Los Angeles (Moreno Report). The council was asked to consider how the Academic Senate might address the concerns raised in the report and more effectively strengthen its role in addressing discrimination affecting faculty. It was a lively discussion. It should be noted that some question was raised about the recommendation to create another administrative office since creating another office would only increase the bureaucracy and will probably require significant resources. In general, most of the discussion centered on the Academic Senate committee structure currently in place—Grievance, Charges, and Privilege and Tenure—and how to strengthen these committees because issues of discrimination involving faculty should include the Academic Senate. The following are the suggestions that were discussed:

- Senate committees charged with hearing issues alleging discrimination should systematically keep records of the issues brought to them, process undertaken to resolve the issue, the nature of the resolutions, and any other necessary record keeping. Perhaps members who serve on these committees should receive some training. Other possibilities may include a faculty member of the Law School to serve as advisor to the committees. These were some suggestions regarding these committees.

- Several members voiced concern that there is often no punitive outcome for the offender. Also, there was some report of a lack of trust in the reporting agency, i.e. senior Caucasian male professor protecting their own.

- On-line required training as we currently have for sexual harassment. While some faculty felt that the sexual harassment training was either not taken seriously or was not an effective
training mechanism, the fact that it is required keeps the issue in the forefront as an important issue and often some new elements are learned. The on-line training could also incorporate role of microaggressions and implicit bias.

- There should be greater efforts to diversify senate committees, particularly those mentioned above and CAP.

- Finally, the Council discussed the importance of examining aggregate data gathered by the relevant committees to determine where we stand with respect to improvement in addressing complaints of discrimination and to monitor the adequacy of the reporting processes used.

This summary reflects most of the discussion regarding the Moreno Report. We hope that some of these recommendations help in your overall discussion.

Sincerely,

Rosina Becerra
Chair, Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Joel Aberbach, Vice Chair, Academic Senate
    Linda Sarna, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    Linda Mohr, Interim Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Members of the Council on Planning and Budget
Dear Jan,

Per your request the Graduate Council discussed the report on acts of bias and discrimination involving faculty at UCLA released by Chancellor Block, the result of a taskforce led by former California Supreme Court Chief Justice Carlos Moreno. After a lengthy and relevant discussion during the Graduate Council’s meeting on November 8th, I drafted a report that included the comments made during our deliberations, and sent it to all the incumbents via email. What follows are the insights and recommendations of the members of the Graduate Council, borne out of the discussion during our meeting, and the comments generated by the drafted report.

Let me start by stressing that the Graduate Council considers the allegations of racial discrimination a matter of the gravest concern, and something that was given absolute prominence at the Graduate Council meeting during which it was discussed. First of all, it was agreed upon that, although the report refers specifically to racial discrimination among faculty, racial discrimination (and for that matter, any kind of discrimination among faculty or any other member of the university including students and staff) negatively affects the whole campus. “Affect”, in fact, is too weak a word: “Contaminate” is more appropriate, in the sense that racial discrimination (again, any type of discrimination) has strong propagating powers, and tends to expand insidiously, if not cut short at its roots. Often, what we see is only the tip of the iceberg. Thus “isolated cases” are never such. They are the symptom of an often invisible, and therefore even deadlier, syndrome.

A syndrome, hélas, that also affects/contaminates our graduate student population, and here is where Graduate Council needs to intervene expeditiously and with the “zero tolerance” attitude endorsed by the Chancellor. There are two instances in the Moreno Report where graduate students are specifically mentioned, and identified as direct, or indirect (if “indirectness” is ever possible when discrimination takes place) victims of racial discrimination. On page 14, and under the rubric (b) “Incidents of Racism,” the following case is described:

“In 2008, soon after the professor [a Latino faculty member in the health sciences] was hired as a fully tenured faculty member at UCLA, a ‘senior faculty member’ in the professor’s department, upon seeing him for the first time in the hallway, asked loudly in front of a group of students: ‘What is this fucking spic doing here?’ Upset, the professor went to the assistant dean, who expressed sympathy but advised him that going to the dean of the school would only cause more trouble. The assistant dean promised that he would talk to the senior faculty member. The professor is not sure whether the assistant dean...
ever did so. The professor stated that he still feels threatened by the faculty member, who is still at UCLA, and that he believes that the man left a screwdriver in the Latino professor’s faculty mailbox in 2010.” (Emphasis is mine).

Three issues stand out in this case, which the report defines as an “egregious incident.” First of all, it is profoundly alarming that an incident of these proportions remains hidden from public view and condemnation, and is disclosed only years after the occurrence. Second, it is even more egregious and unjustifiable that the Administration (in this case, an assistant dean) withholds support from the victim of discrimination, and discourages further action. The victim does not receive the necessary protection from his institution, and the perpetrator of a crime of racial hatred is never held responsible for his heinous act.

Third, and this of utmost importance to the Graduate Council, students were involved in this case, and had to witness racial discrimination first hand. The Moreno Report does not specify if these students were graduate students or undergraduate students, or a mixture of both, perhaps. In any case, the fact remains: students, the most vulnerable section of our academic population, witnessed an act of violence and racial hatred, and therefore became victims themselves. And UCLA, by not taking immediate and resolute action, utterly and miserably failed its student population. This is a fact hard to stomach, but a truth that needs to be openly confronted and acknowledged by all, the Graduate Council included.

The Moreno Report refers to a second case of racial discrimination that affects students, this time a graduate student, who became the targeted victim of racial hatred:

On page 8 of the Moreno Report and under the rubric, (b) “Formal Academic Senate Committees,” it states the following:

“The Academic Senate provided statistics to the Review Team regarding complaints filed with its formal committees from the period of 2007 to the present. During this time, two charges of perceived discrimination brought by faculty members were filed with the Charges Committee. One of the formal charges filed by a faculty member, brought in the 2011-2012 academic year, claimed that another ladder-rank faculty member had engaged in discrimination on the basis of race or ethnicity both against the complainant faculty member and a graduate student.” (Emphasis is mine).

As is apparent from the two cases quoted above, students and among them, graduate students, have become the specific targets and/or victims of racial discrimination. And in both cases, UCLA has failed to respond adequately. Needless to say, UCLA’s failure to take action further victimizes our student population as a whole, graduate and undergraduate alike.

The Graduate Council firmly believes that an academic climate tarnished with racial discrimination is detrimental to the campus population at large, particularly to its most vulnerable members: students. Therefore, the Graduate Council applauds the exhaustive investigation and firm tone of the Moreno Report. But it also notes that it is of crucial importance to stress two important facts, not necessarily emphasized in the report: First, that racial discrimination against faculty deeply affects students and harms them in a fundamental way; and second that, in order to effectively eradicate racial discrimination from our Campus, UCLA has to tackle discrimination as a whole, and address discrimination in all its forms. Other UC campuses have since long ago recognized these two essential facts. Berkeley, for example, has an Office for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination (OPHD) in place, with the first paragraph of its website stating the following:
“The Office for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination (OPHD) is responsible for ensuring the University provides an environment for faculty, staff and students that is free from discrimination and harassment on the basis of categories including race, color, national origin, gender, age and sexual orientation/identity.” (Emphasis is mine)

Note how Berkeley includes faculty, staff and students in its introductory paragraph, and, even more importantly, specifically states that discrimination and harassment can happen on grounds of a series of categories, such as race, color, national origin, gender, age and sexual orientation/identity.

There is general agreement among Graduate Council members that, as the Moreno Report suggests the establishment of a “centralized resource for fielding, investigating and making findings regarding [...] incidents [of racial discrimination]” (Moreno Discrimination, page 17) is of paramount importance for guaranteeing a safe, non-discriminatory climate on Campus. It was emphasized further during the Graduate Council meeting that a much needed “centralized resource” (in the form of a “Discrimination Officer”) should attend to the concerns of the Campus as a whole. In order to be truly effective, it needs to listen to concerns not only from faculty, but also from students, postdoctoral scholars, and staff.

In fact, Berkeley’s aforementioned OPHD follows precisely such a model of centralization. And, as it was suggested during the Graduate Council’s discussion of the Moreno Report, UCLA would probably benefit greatly from the methods and systems implemented by other UC Campuses in regards to the efficient prevention of all forms of discrimination. UCLA should take a close look at universities nationwide that have become exemplary for their highly diverse campuses, the welcoming academic climate that these universities have succeeded in creating, and their zero tolerance vis-à-vis any type of discrimination. Moreover, UCLA should also explore its own pedagogical training and implement sensitivity training for anyone (faculty, lecturers and TAs) who directly interfaces with and educates our students. We must lead by example.

The Graduate Council generally agrees with the final recommendations of the Moreno Report: A. Chancellor’s Policy Statement; B. Discrimination Officer; C. UCLA Procedure for Responding to Reports of Incidents of Bias or Discrimination; D. Creation of Gateway; E. Implementation of Recommendations (pages 21-25). Recommendation A, namely, a statement by the Chancellor that declares “zero tolerance” for all incidents of discrimination, was deemed absolutely essential by the Graduate Council. Discrimination will prevail on our Campus if it is not effectively and openly condemned by the highest levels of our Administration. Such a statement of “zero tolerance” should also include a proclamation of consequential sanctions for those who commit discriminatory acts; and, perhaps even more importantly, actual implementation of those sanctions when acts of discrimination are proven to have occurred.

Resolute measures endorsed by the Chancellor and channeled through a centralized resource (an Office on Discrimination), on the other hand, need to be accompanied by absolute visibility and accessibility; therefore the importance of a Gateway (recommendation D. of the Moreno Report, page 24). The Moreno Report further “recommends that prominent links to this website be placed on websites such the Office for Diversity and Faculty Development, the Office of Academic Personnel, and the website of the Office of Diversity Affairs at the David Geffen School of Medicine, among other appropriate websites” (page 24). In this regard, the Graduate Council had some observations to make, and some recommendations to offer. First, it was noted that the suggested websites were essentially geared towards faculty, a selection that once again implicitly “reduces” discrimination to an issue “solely”
affecting faculty members. The Graduate Council cannot stress this enough, on behalf of the graduate student population in particular, and of the whole campus population in general: Discrimination affects us all. It is an illness that --sadly and ironically enough-- does not discriminate. Therefore, the Graduate Council considers it paramount that “prominent links for this website be placed on websites” geared towards students (graduate and undergraduate) and staff as well. In regards to UCLA’s graduate student and postdoctoral scholar populations, whose welfare is of special interest to the Graduate Council, “prominent links to the website” should be added to the website of the Graduate Council, to the website of the Graduate Division, and to the website of the Academic Senate, among others.

During our Graduate Council meeting it was also noted that a system-wide campus climate survey was conducted in the last academic year. The results of this laudable and highly necessary effort, however, have not been published. The survey website https://diversity.ucla.edu/uc-campus-climate-survey-ucla states that the outcome of the survey will be announced during 2013. But the UCOP website now says that the results won’t be available until Spring 2014. http://campusclimate.ucop.edu/index.html. It is important to stress that any delays in making the results available to the UC community are detrimental precisely to the climate of our campuses that the review is trying to assess. Again, transparency, timeliness, and resolute effectiveness are essential. The Graduate Council has never been approached with more detailed updates about the campus climate survey, and it is the Graduate Council’s belief that it can play a crucial role in assessing the outcomes of the climate review, and in helping to contribute further to the improvement of the campus climate at UCLA. The Graduate Council encourages the administration to publish the outcomes of the campus climate survey as soon as possible, and to actively consult with the Academic Senate and its various committees on this matter.

Finally, the Graduate Council wants to point to yet another important role that it can play (and is, in fact, playing already) in UCLA’s concerted effort to effectively ban discrimination (in all its forms) from Campus. As you, as Chair of the Academic Senate, have indicated to me, as the Chair of the Graduate Council, on several occasions, the routine evaluations of Departments and Programs, in which the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils play fundamental roles, are (or should be) conceived and promoted as “early warning systems” able to identify discrimination issues (on the levels of faculty, students, and staff) still (one can hope) at its early stages.

Let me stress that I cannot agree more with you on this, Jan. From my experience as a member of the Graduate Council, and a member of several review teams visiting Departments representing both “north” and “south” campuses, I was soon struck by how often, and how persistently, diversity surfaced as an issue in many of the reviews. But I was also surprised and discouraged by what I would characterize as an alarming dissonance between the urgency of the concerns voiced in many of the interviews, and the ancillary role given to these concerns in the oral and written reports resulting from reviews. Diversity concerns are a frequent presence in many Departments. It has grown into a veritable leitmotiv, hélas, one of those recurrent themes that, instead of downplaying or even openly ignoring, we should effectively use and interpret as “early warning signs.” To pro-actively address issues of diversity and discrimination, the Academic Senate, in collaboration with the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils, should consider embedding its own “zero tolerance” statement into the program review process, as well as providing review team members with the tools and resources they need to identify these “warning signs” and making recommendations to resolve them effectively; or, in evident cases, counsel any victim of discrimination whose case comes to light during the program review process.

Not only do “early warning signs” surface during the reviews of Departments and Programs across campus, but they also appear during routine Graduate Council meetings when many cases of such a
diverse nature are discussed around our table. For example, recently one of our graduate student representatives brought to the attention of the Graduate Council the inclusion in the official Student Code of Conduct document, posted online, of the word “sodomy” as a way of describing certain sexual acts, and of assisting students in identifying possible sexual assault situations. As the graduate student representative rightly pointed out, the word “sodomy” is often perceived as offensive and discriminatory by certain sectors of the population. This, again, is a matter of grave concern, and something that should not be treated as an isolated occurrence. As was discussed during our last Graduate Council meeting, an incident such as the one just mentioned becomes alarmingly relevant and symptomatic in the present climate at UCLA, and the developments referred to in the Moreno Report.

In sum, Council members agree that the Graduate Council has a crucial role to play in the effective fight against discrimination in all its forms on our campus. We and what we do constitute, in more ways than one, an “early detection and warning system,” and the Council has the potential to become an even more important mechanism for efficiently resolving situations that could lead to even more discrimination and injustice, so detrimental to the well-being and sense of safety and dignity of our graduate student population.

The Graduate Council is looking forward to a close collaboration with the other committees of the Academic Senate, and with the university administrators, in regards to all matters concerning the improvement of diversity and tolerance on our campus.

Sincerely,

Maite Zubiaurre, Chair
Graduate Council

Cc: Members of the Graduate Council
    Linda Mohr, Interim CAO, Academic Senate
    Serge Chenkerian, MSO/Executive Assistant, Academic Senate
    Kyle Cunningham, Policy Analyst, Graduate Council
December 6, 2013

To: Professor Jan Reiff, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Professor Leobardo Estrada, Chair
   Undergraduate Council

Re: Undergraduate Council Response to the Justice Moreno Report

On behalf of the Undergraduate Council, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to review and opine on the Justice Moreno Report. The membership discussed the report at its meetings on November 15, 2013 and December 6, 2013, and denounced the incidents of bias and discrimination experienced by UCLA faculty. The Council recognizes the far-reaching impacts of discrimination and would like to draw attention to the potential effects on undergraduate education at UCLA.

Bias and discrimination are reportedly behind some departmental decisions which could determine which professors are permitted to teach certain courses, the scholarship that is taught, and with whom the students have the opportunity to interact. Every faculty member’s scholarship should be equally-valued and represented on the UCLA campus, and students will benefit from a diverse presentation of perspectives. While the report focuses on faculty, it should be noted that a poor climate within the faculty ranks will spill over and affect the learning experience of undergraduate students.

The membership was particularly saddened and deeply disturbed to learn that some incidents of racial discrimination occurred in the presence of students. As a top-tier higher education institution, it is our obligation to lead by example and act swiftly to condemn and resolve any acts of bias on our campus. The Undergraduate Council urges the Administration to move beyond the creation of a Diversity Officer to address the root cause of the problems expressed in the Justice Moreno Report, and facilitate the necessary mechanisms to prevent future acts of discrimination.

Thank you, again, for the opportunity to provide feedback in response to the Justice Moreno Report and for considering the Council’s concerns. Please contact me (x56574; leobard@ucla.edu) or Academic Senate Policy Analyst Melissa Spagnuolo (x51194; msplgno@senate.ucla.edu) if you have any questions.

cc: Linda Mohr, Interim Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Melissa Spagnuolo, Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
To: Jan Reiff, Chair, UCLA Academic Senate  
Fr: Christina Palmer, Chair, College Faculty Executive Committee  
Date: December 6, 2013  
Re: College FEC response to the Moreno Report

The College FEC discussed the Moreno Report at our committee’s meetings on November 15th and December 6th with Chancellor Block joining us for an informative discussion about the report at our first meeting. Our committee commends both Chancellor Block and Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Scott Waugh for establishing a committee to examine complaints from minority faculty—African-American, Asian-American, Chicano/Latino or American Indian—about pervasive acts of discrimination on campus.

Based on our discussions which covered a wide range of topics, we elected not to vote on any particular motion related to the report. Instead, I recount here a summary of the points that were made during our discussion:

1. The Report focuses on the last few years and partially faults the top leadership of Chancellor Block and EVC/ Provost Waugh for not reacting quickly or strongly enough to the mistreatment of minority faculty. This is not quite fair to the current leadership as several of our members believe acts of discrimination are much more pervasive and long-standing than is communicated in the report. To focus on the present is to ignore the past and the conditions that have created the current situation. The report itself surmises that it has considered only the “tip of the iceberg.” The Moreno Report did not consider the full depth of discrimination at UCLA, only what is more readily observed.

2. Much of our discussion focused on the critical role of two faculty committees in the welfare and careers of our faculty: the Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T) and Council on Academic Personnel (CAP). The former examines alleged acts of faculty misconduct, including discrimination in all forms; the latter recommends faculty hiring, tenure, and advancement and promotion. At least one of our members served as chair of both committees.

   While serving on P&T, the member recounted hearing testimony from minority faculty about acts of humiliation, degradation and injustice. While the member believed the Committee helped as best it could to address these complaints, the member reported feeling as though the committee’s efforts encountered resistance from administrators and faculty colleagues; the end result being that satisfactory solutions rarely occurred.

   While serving on Council on Academic Personnel (CAP), one of our members recounted a period where there were no women appointed to the committee as an example of lack of diversity on a committee critically important to the career advancement of UCLA faculty. Moreover, on numerous occasions the member observed instances in which minority faculty were more closely scrutinized than other faculty, and more likely to have their cases reviewed by specially-appointed, outside committees, a procedure
used to indicate misgivings. While minority faculty could be held to the very letter of guidelines used to make decisions, the committee was perceptively less strict with non-minority cases.

Thus, while CAP and P&T have the potential to remedy acts of discrimination, they are in fact products of a central problem at UCLA – our campus lacks fundamental *intellectual and moral* appreciation of diversity. It is true that UCLA has a diverse student body, although it has become less diverse in the last decade, as the Moreno Report observes, and we also have a diverse faculty—slightly more than 25 percent of faculty are African American, Asian American, Hispanic or Native American. It seems appropriate that we advertise our diversity as an asset; however, faculty appreciation for intellectual diversity appears weak as documented in the report. As a community, we ought to embrace minority faculty because it is morally right to do so and it furthers our collective wish to make UCLA a world-class institution.

**With respect to CAP and P&T, our committee recommends that the Senate review the structures and charges of these committees and consider reforms that would enhance membership diversity, promote cultural values consistent with diversity and inclusion, enable committee members to recognize and minimize the effects of personal biases, enhance objectivity, and better handle complaints of bias and mistreatment.**

3. **Members also recounted instances of discrimination at the department-level where colleagues have lobbied against hiring, awarding tenure to or promoting minority faculty. Members also recall instances where subtle racial or ethnic comments have been made at faculty meetings about minority faculty, present or not. In some instances, a climate of secrecy exists within departments, which only serves to exacerbate problems. Members pointed out that the report overly faults administrators for biases, but neglects to address department culture as a key component of larger campus problem. Our committee recommends that department chairs, vice chairs, and faculty receive proper training to identify, address, and ultimately eliminate discriminatory behaviors.**

4. **Several members felt that the Moreno report was vague in its definition of bias or discrimination, e.g. at some points focusing only on racial bias, and at other points recognizing that bias and discrimination can be complex and involving a number of factors including religion, sex/gender, age, disability, sexuality, and ethnicity. The fact that prejudice is complex raises several questions about the recommendation for a Discrimination Officer.**

   a. **Finding a home for the “Discrimination Officer.”** Although the report is not clear about the scope of anti-discrimination policies and procedures that such an officer might be responsible for, it would be useful to know whether this important office would/should cover *all* forms of discrimination--ethnic, racial, religious, sexual, gender, etc. It might also assist matters if the report clarified where such an officer would be located. We already have Vice Provost Littleton’s busy office that focuses on equality, diversity, and faculty development. There is a similar one housed in the Geffen School of Medicine. And there are the Ombuds Office and the Sexual Harassment Officer. Other offices and committees also exist. Is the idea that this new position would have an entirely separate office of her/his own or a position that is placed in, say, Vice Provost Littleton’s office or the Ombuds Office? The problem becomes apparent in footnote 32 (p. 21), where the report states that the “Discrimination Officer’s responsibilities could encompass other forms of discrimination, including on the basis of gender, age, and sexual orientation.” For example, this observation raises the question whether we also need separate officers to address bias against LGBT faculty members. In other words, is the idea that the “Discrimination Officer” should primarily focus on race? Or should such an officer embrace other (and often related) forms of bias?
b. **The “Discrimination Officer” as source of “primary referral” for faculty reporting incidents of bias.** On p. 23, the report suggests that the university establish the “Discrimination Officer” as the main administrative resource for reporting bias. But it is unclear where this suggestion leaves all of the other officers and units that currently assist in addressing problems of bias on campus. It is noticeable that footnote 34 (p. 23) is longer than the paragraph it comments on. In particular, the expansive comments in this note suggest that the “Discrimination Officer” might have to maintain careful distance from the important work of Vice Provost Littleton’s office. Would such a separation of responsibilities benefit the task of combatting bias? The flowchart in Appendix B appears to do away with any possible dialogue between the “Discrimination Officer” and the existing units that discuss complaints of bias with faculty members.

Some/most members feel that a more comprehensively integrated, consultative model—one that benefits from using existing resources such as the Ombuds Office and the Sexual Harassment Officer—should be considered. Although it is significant to have a dedicated individual/office to handle discrimination complaints, several members fear that giving a “Discrimination Officer” wholly independent “authority” to embark upon autonomous “fact-finding investigations” at the very beginning of the process might result in one-sided conclusions and perspectives. In other words, the “Discrimination Officer” might start discriminating in biased ways. Perhaps the “Discrimination Officer” would need first to confer with a committee made up colleagues who already have expertise in issues such as racial and sexual harassment before drawing any conclusions as to whether a grievance is “found to lack merit or substantiation” (Appendix B).

Furthermore, although it seems appropriate that the Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel receive the final report of the “Discrimination Officer” for presentation to the P&T Committee, several committee members also felt strongly that the “Discrimination Officer” should directly provide reports to the Chancellor and EVC as well to ensure that these senior administrators are fully aware of what is happening on campus.

5. **Rethink the term “Discrimination Officer.”** On p. 3 the third recommendation in the bullet points is that there should be the “creation of a single Discrimination Officer.” There is an issue of linguistic sensitivity here. Most institutions would prefer either Anti-Discrimination or Non-Discrimination Officer.

6. Unfortunately, the report—while consciousness raising—did little to quantify the scope or depth of discrimination on this campus. Our committee felt a comprehensive assessment and reporting plan needs to be developed, if the campus is to benefit from the lessons learned from the Moreno report and the policies that will be developed as a result. We recommend, the outcomes assessment be developed in a manner that allows for cross-campus comparison.

As always, our membership appreciates the consultative process and welcomes the opportunity to opine on important matters like this. You are welcome to contact me at cpalmer@mednet.ucla.edu with questions. Kyle Stewart McJunkin, Academic Administrator, is also available to assist you and he can be reached at (310) 825-3223 or kmcjunkin@college.ucla.edu.

cc: Lucy Blackmar, Associate College Dean, College of Letters and Science
Linda Mohr, Interim Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
December 5, 2013

Jan Reiff, PhD
Academic Senate Chair
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA

Re: Moreno Report

Dear Jan:

I am writing as the FEC Chair for the School of Public Health offering our comments on the Moreno report. The report was discussed at our November meeting.

Let me begin by expressing appreciation for the work of Justice Moreno and the committee. The committee’s work was extensive.

One finding of the committee was both surprising and disturbing to our committee. The report appeared to document that victims of discrimination who have pursued complaints have been reasonably well served by the systems for resolving conflicts. Those who have carried out deliberate, conscious acts of discrimination do not appear to have been called to account. Some acts of discrimination may be unconscious or inadvertent, and in those cases, counseling, training and similar correctives are an appropriate approach to resolving the issue and improving the situation. But in the rarer number of cases where the acts are deliberate and intentional, holding those responsible accountable with more substantial sanctions is called for. The consequences for deliberate discrimination need to be increased, but the systems for assessment and punishment need to be able to distinguish between cases of deliberate and unintentional discrimination and respond appropriately.

Our committee was concerned about the introduction of another office into the mix of campus offices and officials dealing with discrimination. The report calls for the new office to be created as part of a process of standardizing the process of responding to incidents of perceived bias, discrimination and intolerance and for appropriate referrals. The report does not sufficiently address what the new standardized process would look like, how the new office would interact and integrate its activities with the other units, or even what the criteria and models are for appropriate referral.

We were also concerned that the call for more training and education was an inadequate response to the issues surfaced by the report. The report, while it examines a series of disturbing cases, is not comprehensive in its analysis of the issues of discrimination on campus, and ignores some important
issues including the experiences of nonfaculty and the question of campus environment. In Public Health, in our research and teaching, we regularly address issues of racial, ethnic, LGBT and other disparities in health outcomes, access and behavior, and disentangling the effects of genetics, environment, culture, education, economic status, active discrimination and other factors in interpreting how and why differences exist and how they might be mitigated. These are highly sensitive topics. One of the challenges we deal with is creating a climate of safety and respect in which all the members of our community, regardless of their race, ethnicity, gender or sexual orientation, economic status or cultural background, can deal with the substance of this work and the challenging conversations it sometimes requires. As we read the Moreno report, we did not see enough discussion of how to strengthen the campus culture of so acts of bias, discrimination and intolerance are less likely to occur or be tolerated. Training and education seem like inadequate responses to this challenge.

Regards,

Jack Needleman, PhD
Professor
Chair, Fielding School of Public Health Faculty Executive Committee
Los Angeles, December 11, 2013

Dear Senate Chair Reiff,

The GSE&IS FEC met on November 14 to discuss the Moreno Report, in response to Senate Chair Jan Reiff’s call to recommend what changes might be made to Academic Senate processes, bylaws, and procedures.

FEC members began by noting that the faculty of the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies is deeply vested in helping moving towards a more racially inclusive society. They also noted that the United States does not yet live up to the ideal of a post-racial society and that as such, the issues raised by the Moreno report far exceed the boundaries of the UCLA community. As well, they noted that sexual harassment policies have paved the way for similar comprehensive racial discrimination policies, and provide a model for raising awareness among faculty and all members of the UCLA community of the toxic consequences of discriminatory practices and behaviors.

FEC members felt that centralization of the grievance process was overall a good thing. Too many times, they noted, faculty that face discrimination issues must also navigate local resolution mechanisms rife with conflicts of interest. A centralized office will help de-link the grievance process from its institutional location in specific departments and schools, thus ensuring a fairer process. There was concern however that more needed to be done to prevent such incidents from happening in the first place.

Several FEC members felt that the review initiated by the Moreno report should not only examine of the efficacy of current university measures in terms of university’s admissions policies both and faculty hiring but also, personnel review. That it, it should examine the process whereby scholars and their scholarship are evaluated, and the ways this impacts tenure and professional advancement at UCLA. They noted that statistics related to the number of minority faculty denied tenure were
not available, and that such statistics would not necessarily be meaningful, since such faculty might choose to leave prior to the tenure process. It was suggested that facilitators, trained in issues of discrimination, might help resolve the sometimes delicate issues that can arise in the academic process.

Most of all, committee members expressed the sincere wish that the report would provide the opportunity for the UCLA community to educate or re-educate itself about the root causes of racial discrimination. Too often, they felt, the institutional response to such issues is couched in the language of liability and results in yet another web-based training program. In light of the seriousness of the issues raised by the Moreno report, the GSE&IS FEC felt that such a response would be, ultimately, a cynical one.

Following the FEC meeting, another discussion over email led to the following statement, which was endorsed by several FEC members:

Dear colleagues:

Based on the Report’s findings, I am in complete agreement that UCLA must develop a much more transparent, accessible, and consequential process for reporting, deliberating on, and adjudicating episodes of perceived racial/ethnic bias, discrimination or intolerance, particularly among the faculty. The process must be based on an unambiguous commitment to, and practice of, the highest standards of fairness, equity, cordial and civil interaction, impartiality, and regard for differing experiences and perspectives, which ultimately derive from the traditional academic culture of collegiality, open-mindedness, and intellectual freedom. Of course, academics can be just as frail, blind, insensitive, thoughtless, and just plain bigoted or mean as anyone else; but our shared intellectual, institutional and pedagogical mission demands that we hold ourselves and our peers to higher standards, beyond legal obligations or prescriptive codes of conduct. Reliance on the latter to solve larger institutional problems simply breeds a climate of cynicism and opportunism.

So in my view, what is called for is a fundamental re-engagement with and renewal of our academic values and rigorous faculty peer review and governance, in our own interests and those of our colleagues and the wider university. This is the wrong time to walk away from or surrender to administrators our basic responsibilities for supporting, sustaining, mentoring, critiquing, and when necessary, censuring our faculty peers, and applying fair and proportional sanctions when they are warranted on those occasions when they fail to meet our shared expectations.
I am concerned that throughout the Moreno Report there is an implicit assumption that faculty (especially tenured faculty) are unable or unwilling to hold one another accountable. My experience at UCLA on committees and task forces at all levels of the university has taught me otherwise. There is also the suggestion that the Academic Senate – our duly elected body for exercising the UC’s hard-won and exceptionally strong faculty governance system – is simply not as capable, effective, or impartial as senior administrators in articulating and upholding high standards of faculty conduct. Many of the comments quoted in the Report also seemed a shade vindictive, placing greater emphasis on outing and punishment, on “naming and shaming” colleagues, than on how we should go about building a system of more regular, explicit, constructive guidance and mentoring throughout our colleagues’ academic careers to reduce the need for such measures.

To suggest that a centralized process run by high-level administrators would be inherently fairer or more effective than faculty themselves in addressing institutional racial, cultural or ethnic bias is to imply that faculty governance and peer review are merely a Potemkin village designed to hide illegitimate privileges and power. It silently accepts the notion that the proper role of administrators, deans and chairs is to supervise and instruct an unreliable faculty in a superior-subordinate relationship. In healthy academic institutions administrators do not dictate the academic mission or set standards and sanctions for faculty performance; they facilitate, enable, and mobilize resources in the service of faculty-driven standards, priorities and objectives for scholarship, instruction, and service. One of the enduring strengths of the UC’s shared governance system is our partnership with administrative colleagues in an ongoing effort to realize our faculty-defined and –driven academic mission.

So in sum, I think the sense of crisis conveyed in the Moreno Report is in fact an opportunity to revive and expand faculty/Senate involvement in our peers’ professional advancement and well-being, not to hand that role to a tier of administrative overseers. The centralized, streamlined vision of a grievance process called for in the Report should reside primarily in the Senate, from entering allegations of bias or discrimination, to fact-finding and assessment, and the determination of disciplinary sanctions as needed. The Senate Committee on Privilege & Tenure and Committee on Charges are the appropriate existing venues for conducting these inquiries and determinations of fact and censure as warranted. This could be an important moment for us as a faculty and for the Senate to step in and make its role clearer to the whole faculty and university community at large, and to craft a stronger system of peer mentoring, education, and review. Once a body of faculty peers makes a determination in these cases, it seems to me that the implementation/execution, plus providing advice on the legal or employment
factors that may be involved, is the appropriate role for the university’s administrative officers.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

GSE&IS FEC Chair, 2013-2014,
Associate Professor, Department of Information Studies
December 6th, 2013

TO: Jan Reiff, Chair Academic Senate

FROM: Scott J. Brandenberg, Chair, HSSEAS Faculty Executive Committee

RE: HSSEAS FEC Input on taskforce to look at Academic Senate bylaws, policies, and procedures following Moreno Report

The Faculty Executive Committee in the Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Science discussed the Moreno report during our meeting earlier today. We are in favor of your action to form a task force to evaluate Academic Senate bylaws, policies, and procedures to improve our climate of racial inclusion, and to fight discrimination and harassment. Furthermore, we are in favor of improving transparency in the manner in which the University handles race discrimination allegations among faculty members.
MEMO

Date        December 4, 2013

From   Rodney McMillian, Chair, Faculty Executive Committee
School of the Arts and Architecture

To   UCLA Academic Senate Jaime Balboa, CAO

RE      Moreno Report

The Faculty Executive Committee of the School of the Arts and Architecture reviewed the Moreno Report at our November 22nd meeting. We agreed with many of the recommendations in the report and that it should be pursued as an important addition to protections offered to human rights on our campus. We believe the Campus needs a central person, a Diversity Officer, who can investigate charges of discrimination and racial bias. Currently, there is no formal means for reporting instances of bias with assured response as there is, for example, in cases of alleged sexual harassment.

We understand discrimination to be defined in subjective ways. We discussed the need for as clear a definition of discrimination as possible in the bylaws that should include “micro-aggression—” types of discrimination that are more subtle and innuendo-based1. There can be overt aggression, which is quite obvious, but “micro-aggression” is more difficult to prove yet damaging to the individuals and institutions implicated. It is further suspected that many faculty and staff are oblivious to their micro-aggressions (e.g., exclusion, discounting, stereotype assumptions, intolerance of diverse perspectives, etc.).

Additionally, FEC members asked for more clarification on the role of the Diversity Officer and how it would be analogous to the Sexual Harassment Officer. SOAA FEC members support the Discrimination Officer having a teaching/training function like that of the Sexual Harassment Prevention Officer. The workshops on Sexual Harassment are deemed very helpful. We also believe Teacher Assistants need this training and a system for handling grievances.

1Micro-aggression is subtle and constitute “brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults toward people of color.” (Sue, et al., 2007)
Finally, another issue of concern is the relationship between the Office of Diversity & Faculty Development and the Diversity Officer. How would they work together? The SOAA FEC members believe the campus needs a legally trained person in this position. The Office of Diversity and Faculty Development is not set up in this way because it’s an academic position. Thus, how and which entity can bring reckoning to an offending faculty member in ways consistent with common sense balanced with First Amendment rights and academic freedom? Are there penalties for such behavior in place now? What strategies are in place for addressing a hostile Departmental environment of institutional discrimination – not just a grievance between a single individual/faculty person? Also, will the Academic Senate have to give up their own power and authority over faculty by bringing in a Diversity Officer?

It was noted that the Campus could protect itself from liability by addressing these issues.
January 10, 2014

Professor Jan Reiff
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Justice Moreno Report on Discrimination

Dear Professor Reiff,

I am responding to your letter dated October 31st 2013 requesting feedback on the Moreno Report. The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity (CODEO) reviewed and discussed the Justice Moreno Report on Discrimination at our November 5th 2013 meeting and again on January 6th 2014.

At both meetings, the committee had a long discussion on follow up recommendations for the Moreno Report. At our January 6th 2014 meeting, we discussed and finalized our recommendations that CODEO has for follow up actions to the Moreno Report.

1. Biased Letters and Promotional Reviews

   a. When the VC for Academic Personnel initiates a reassessment of a promotion case, the office should be able to consider requests to excise prejudicial letters and reports from the initial assessment. There should also be an option to skip the department level reassessment and go straight to the university (CAP) review committee in order to remediate the discrimination and prejudice that may have occurred at the departmental level in the initial assessment.

   b. To minimize the ease of writing biased letters, there was suggestion that the chair has to respond to a questionnaire that accompanies the chair’s letter. Questions may include (i) Did the letter include minority comments? (ii) Were the same evaluation criteria commonly used in the department applied to the candidate? (iii) Was the chair’s letter written in a fair manner using the same format for other faculty? and (iv) How many faculty had previewed the chair’s letter and how many had comments?

2. Ongoing Departmental Diversity Climate Studies

Some suggested that it is helpful to have mandatory periodic departmental diversity climate studies that focus on inequity or emerging inequity issues in the department. This may include faculty recruiting and promotion issues, experiences of women and under-represented minorities at all levels (ranks) in the department. The studies are to be conducted by external evaluators who collect a mixture of qualitative (interview) and objective (compensation, hiring, promotion, exit) data. The department is required to make progress in addressing issues that were raised from one assessment to the next.
3. **Assistant Professors**

One member noted that the report included only examples of discrimination reports made by tenured and senior faculty. The committee agreed that the likelihood of an Assistant Professor reporting acts of discrimination is very low for fear of retaliation and so it was suggested the committee also find a way to create a pathway for Assistant Professors to submit reports of discrimination.

4. **Monitoring of the Review Process**

When a discrimination or sexual harassment claim has been investigated and found to have merit, the university should commit to monitoring and proactively intervening in subsequent reviews and discretionary decisions on the individual who initiated the investigation. This is because the individual may be vulnerable to retaliation (e.g., merit reviews, promotions, teaching allocations, research budgets, summer support, graduate student allocation, etc.).

5. **More Informed Monitoring by All**

Accountability by faculty is an important issue and CODEO recommends that there be a well-advertised telephone number for faculty to call and report any CLEAR violation of APM rules.

We appreciate the opportunity to review the Moreno Report and provide feedback. CODEO will, as always, continue to work diligently to promote a work environment as free of all sorts of biases as possible.

Sincerely,

Weng Kee Wong

Weng Kee Wong
Chair, Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity

cc: Joel Aberbach, Vice Chair, Academic Senate
    Linda Sarna, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    Linda Mohr, Interim Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Maya Moore, CODEO Policy Specialist
    Serge Chenkerian, MSO, Academic Senate
    Members of the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity