May 11, 2010

Professor Rosina Becerra
Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Development
Chair, Chancellor’s Advisory Group on Diversity

In Re: Senate Response to the Draft Strategic Plan on Diversity

Dear Rosina,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the UCLA Strategic Plan for Diversity. Upon receipt, I distributed it for review to all Faculty Executive Committees, the Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council, the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity, and the Executive Board, which speaks for the Senate on such matters. All other Senate committees were welcome to opine. I am attaching the responses we received for your information.

The Academic Senate applauds the development of a comprehensive, inspiring strategic plan for diversity at UCLA. The area essays provide valuable historical background and context, and the document as a whole makes clear that the campus climate is not simply an outcome of admissions and hiring practices. By spanning all populations (undergraduate and graduate students, staff, faculty), the plan establishes a broad foundation for advancing diversity in a comprehensive way. The ideas set forth are ambitious and meritorious.

The plan represents a significant step forward, in that specific actions are enumerated in each area. That said, the Executive Board believes that it falls short of being a sound strategic plan that would enable substantial, documentable progress. This weakness is apparent at the lowest level, in that the actions vary significantly in their specificity and achievability. Some “actions” could be more accurately described as ideals or values; as such, they are not actionable. Other actions are characterized by benchmarks and metrics, but only vaguely describe mechanisms for achieving progress and also lack timelines. Through most of the document, there is little indication of the resources that will be committed to achieve progress, or of the enforcement mechanisms (teeth) that will be used to sustain and reward progress. We thus question how valuable this document will be as a strategic planning tool. We also wonder how leaders will be held accountable to the plan. For example, in 5-year reviews of administrators, we should be able to ask individuals how they have facilitated the plan and met the stated goals.

For these reasons, while the Executive Board endorses the scope and vision of the plan, we recommend substantial revisions to address the following particularly important points, as well as the attached comments from the Senate committees.

- The Board was supportive of the following point articulated by the College FEC:
  
  An expressed area of concern is the proposed mentoring of faculty during recruitment and retention. We recommend establishing a pool of mentors from different fields to choose from, which may be more productive than assigning mentors to new faculty only from the home department. In addition, educating mentors to become better mentors would also make the process more effective for both parties. (We believe a program along these lines has been launched).
• The Board believes the plan will be greatly improved with specific, articulated goals and accountability mechanisms for each component of the plan. Absent this, there is little incentive to adhere to the goals and timelines.

• In developing an accountability framework for faculty and staff diversity, particular attention should be paid to units that are outliers, the ones with the worst records. Efforts should be focused on these “worst offenders” : the least diverse, or ones that have made the least progress (relative to availability pools, peer institutions, or other relevant benchmarks). There should be consequences for failing to try and to demonstrate measurable progress. There should also be mechanism(s) for formulating steps to help the outliers improve.

• The mechanisms for dealing with harassment need to be improved and better coordinated, recognizing that complaints may come through anonymous reports of bias, through the campus ombudsperson, and through the Senate Grievance Advisory Committee. Lack of coordination weakens our ability to develop swift and effective remedies or to identify patterns that lead to poor climates.

• The Board, concurring with both CUARS and the SOAA FEC, stresses the need to include discussion of the resources that will be committed to implement the plan, with specific attention paid to how the current fiscal crisis will impact implementation. While the document should articulate broad aspirations, as a strategic plan, it should prioritize UCLA’s broad goals and the specific action items. It should be realistic and achievable.

• The Board recommends that the document more clearly frame diversity as a collective responsibility. There is often the perception that that diversity is only the concern of select groups.

The Academic Senate appreciates having the opportunity to participate in developing this important document. Please do not hesitate to contact me, should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Robin L. Garrell
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Cc: Jaime R. Balboa, Academic Senate CAO
    Susan Drange Lee, Executive Director, Faculty Diversity and Development
February 3, 2010

To: Robin Garrell, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Joseph B. Watson, Chair
   Undergraduate Council

Re: Strategic Plan for Diversity

At its meeting on January 29, 2010, the Undergraduate Council (UgC) strongly approved the UCLA Strategic Plan for Diversity unanimously with a few recommendations [16 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions; student vote: 3 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.]. Overall it is timely, well written, and addresses the fundamental issues required to enhance and broaden diversity on the UCLA campus and make it flourish. The UgC endorses the Plan with the following revisions:

1) A clearing house should be provided to allow a central reporting mechanism for issues related to harassment and diversity.
2) Some concern was raised about Tables in Appendix A that may not reflect what is stated in the text (e.g. Figures 4, 5, page 20) and may need more supporting data. It might be prudent to cross-check all Tables with relevant conclusions in the text for accuracy throughout the document.
3) Some committee members felt the report lacks substantial information about research programs that might foster an understanding of Diversity, especially in light of UCLA prominence as a leading research university.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me (x 57587; jwatson@mednet.ucla.edu) or Judith Lacertosa, UgC Principal Policy Analyst (x51194; jlacertosa@senate.ucla.edu).

cc: Jaime Balboa, CAO, Academic Senate
   Judith Lacertosa, Principal Policy Analyst, Undergraduate Council
   Dorothy Ayer, Assistant to Senate Leadership & CAO
February 2, 2010

Robin Garrell, Chair
Academic Senate

RE: UCLA Strategic Plan for Diversity

Dear Robin,

As requested, the Graduate Council reviewed the draft of UCLA’s Strategic Plan for Diversity at its meeting of January 22, 2010. I am pleased to report that the Council voted unanimously to endorse the report as written (13 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions; GSA Reps: 3 in favor). I summarize below the Council’s discussion and some suggestions it made to strengthen the document.

The general consensus of Council members was that the Strategic Plan was very well developed and comprehensive. It contained some very positive statements about the University’s ongoing commitment to diversity among its faculty, students, staff and academic programs. Council members were impressed that it considered the current climate on our campus, and of our society at large, and formally recognized the pipeline between students (especially at the graduate level) and faculty. Members commented that there really was nothing not to like about the plan.

That said, despite their overwhelming support and endorsement, members felt that the plan did not sufficiently detail the University’s accountability for adhering to the plan. They commented that it would be helpful to receive annual reports from the various administrative units that show the plan is being executed as presented. Additionally members felt that the document could be strengthened if it provided a concrete timeline for implementing its goals. Since there have been a number of diversity initiatives at UCLA over the years, members wanted more assurance of the University’s commitment to diversity by having the report identify the mechanisms with which the University will ensure compliance to its diversity objectives.

These suggestions are intended as constructive feedback and not as conditions of our endorsement of the document. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me or the Graduate Council’s analyst, Kyle Cunningham, at extension 51162.

Sincerely,

Steven Nelson
Chair, Graduate Council

cc: Jaime Balboa, CAO, Academic Senate
    Kyle Cunningham, Graduate Council Analyst, Academic Senate
    Dorothy Ayer, Executive Assistant, Academic Senate
February 3, 2010

To: Robin Garrell  
   Academic Senate, Chair

From: Tom Chou  
   Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity, Chair

Re: **Senate Items for Review:** UCLA Strategic Plan for Diversity

The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity reviewed and discussed the UCLA Strategic Plan for Diversity at their meeting on November 30, 2009. Overall, The Committee endorsed UCLA's Strategic Plan for Diversity, but also made a few clarifying recommendations and addendums, particularly on issues related to undergraduate and graduate diversity. Below are our concerns and proposed modifications:

1. **Section I.**
   
   a. **Challenge 2 -** The Committee suggests the following insertion: “Our efforts to treat equitably and retain all faculty, by paying special attention to the needs of women and under-represented groups...”

   b. **Challenge 2 Action 1 -** The Committee suggests moving Action 1 to Action 3 and inserting the following language for Action 1; “Assure equitable treatment in personnel reviews and the allocation of salaries, service, and teaching responsibilities, and the allocation of departmental and university resources.”

   c. **Challenge 2 Action 2 –** The Committee suggests moving Action 2 to Action 4 and inserting the following language for Action 2; “Create training programs, analogous to the search committee training programs, to train personnel committees, review committees, administrators, and CAP in treating personnel cases equitably.”

   d. **Challenge 2 Action 3 –** Insert the language from the original Challenge 2 Action 1, “More preemptive efforts to retain diverse faculty must be used. These efforts should include insuring faculty are given the support needed to succeed, addressing work/life issues, and building a community of like scholars.”
e. Challenge 2 Action 4 –Insert the language from the original Challenge 2 Action 2, “Place as much effort on retention as on recruitment, particularly among diverse faculty if they are to be retained.”

f. Challenge 3 Action 2 – Insert a space between “Work/Life” and “issues”

g. Challenge 3 Action 2 – The Committee found this statement to send a message that perpetuates inequality of roles. The following language is suggested “... play a role particularly for women, single parents and primary care givers.”

h. Challenge 3 Action 2 – Attention must be lent to ensuring salaries are competitive with other top tiered universities and in line with regional cost of living.

i. Challenge 3 Action 3 – The Committee suggests adding a bullet in between the two existing bullets. With the proposed change, the text would read as follows, “Since advancement to the rank of full professor or above is, at times, a prerequisite to academic leadership, the administration needs to ensure that women and minorities hired as assistant and associate professors are equitably progressing up the ranks.”

j. Challenge 4. Action 2 - Please define a “Campus Diversity Initiative.”

k. Challenge 4 Action 5 – The Committee suggests replacing “and demonstrates inclusiveness in faculty hiring” with, “by means of inclusive hiring practices and equitable treatment of current faculty.”

l. Challenge 5 Section 3 –The Committee suggests the following insertion, “...periodic climate surveys, quantitative analyses of salaries and rates of advancement (e.g., the use of the LEAD database), exit interviews...”

2. Section IV.

a. Challenge 1 Action 1 - The committee recognizes that African American and Chicano/Latino students are not the only groups with low graduation rates; the Campus Retention Committee has conducted studies indicating that Americans Indians, Pacific Islander, Southeast Asian, Filipino students and possible other groups should also be listed in this section.

b. Challenge 2 Action 3, as well as, Section IV. Challenge 5 Actions 1 and 2 indicate the need to expand or seek funding for various programs. The Committee questions the resources available.

c. Challenge 5 Action- The Committee believes that this section should also acknowledge and support the work of existing student organizations.
3. Section V

   a. Challenge 1 Action 1, and Section V Challenge 3 Action 1 - indicate that certain issues need to be monitored, but fails to allocate responsibility.

4. Overview of UCLA’s Diversity Plan

   a. Five Integrated Themes, Section 2

      i. 1st Bullet – The committee suggests that the sentence reads as follows, “supports programs aimed at increasing diversity at all levels through: enhanced efforts of recruitment and/or hiring; equitable treatment of all current employees and students; and improve retention of underrepresented students, faculty, and upper-level staff; and aligning department demographics so that they more closely resemble campus-wide and availability demographics.”

      ii. 3rd Bullet – The committee suggests that the sentence reads as follows, “create clear administrative channels for faculty, staff, and students who have potential claims of discrimination and sexual harassment, and then, monitor carefully and act quickly on claims of discrimination and sexual harassment, and correct potential problems before they escalate.”

We thank you for the opportunity to participate in this process.

Cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
Dottie Ayer, Assistant to Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
Brandie Henderson, Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
January 29, 2010

Professor Robin Garrell  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: UCLA Strategic Plan for Diversity

Dear Dr. Garrell,

The Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) has had the opportunity to review the UCLA Strategic Plan for Diversity.  

CPB is worried about one aspect of the well-meant effort described in the text that aims at ensuring that underrepresented groups are represented in decision- and policy-making bodies. This may result in these individuals becoming more engaged in service work than is the norm on campus and carries the risk of compromising faculty members’ teaching and research efforts and unintentionally placing them at a disadvantage for competitiveness within their academic units, and therefore for promotions. Therefore, CPB suggests that the document be clear in terms of alerting faculty members to be careful in terms of not over committing to university service in general, including efforts dedicated to the diversity arena.  

CPB’s main concern about the document is related to its ambitious goals viewed in the context of an era of diminished and possibly further diminishing resources. There is no doubt that the goals of diversity are worth a concerted effort, but having an extensive list of recommendations without prioritization may have the net effect of placing an additional rather heavy layer of bureaucracy on the university, on the staff and on the faculty, not to mention the cost associated with it. While CPB agrees that we need to do everything possible to fulfill the plan’s recommendations, thought needs to be given to what is realistic in a given time frame. With that in mind, CPB can only endorse the plan if the recommendations listed in the document be prioritized and their implementation be linked to time frames that will not add an excessive and unrealistic workload to university personnel.

Sincerely,

Paulo Camargo  
Chair, UCLA Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Michael Goldstein, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate  
Ann Karagozian, Vice Chair, Academic Senate  
Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Linda Mohr, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Council on Planning and Budget Members
February 4, 2010

To: Robin Garrell  
   Academic Senate, Chair

From: Mitchell Wong  
   Faculty Welfare Committee, Chair

Re: Senate Items for Review: UCLA Strategic Plan for Diversity

The Faculty Welfare Committee reviewed and discussed the UCLA Strategic Plan for Diversity at their meeting on December 15, 2009. The Committee endorsed UCLA’s Strategic Plan for Diversity, but has the following concerns:

1. Section I addresses several challenges to hiring and retaining faculty and describes a general approach to these issues. In Action 1, it describes accountability from deans and chairs to adhere to APM 240 and 245, but it does not provide specific actions as to how accountability will be monitored or enforced other than through exit interviews and periodic surveys. The action plan lacks sufficient detail for monitoring and accountability.

2. Section I. Challenge 1. Action 1 recommends certification in search committee training. While we see the value of educating search committees about the pertinent issues related to equity and diversity in hiring decisions, we are skeptical that requiring training and certification is the best method for achieving this goal. The number of training and certifications for other purposes, such as ethics and sexual harassment, already place a burden on faculty. Any additional training requirements should be considered with great care, only implemented if there is greater certainty about its effectiveness, and targeted in specific schools or departments where diversity appears to be a problem.

3. Section I. Challenge 2 appropriately emphasizes the need for early and aggressive efforts to retain all faculty, especially women and minorities, but the action plan lacks specificity. Possible additional actions might include active monitoring and reporting of performance on hiring and retention of minority and women faculty within each school and department. This oversight could also include regular surveillance of salaries and evidence of systematic bias or discrimination, with additional in-depth assessment of hiring and retention practices for those departments and schools where evidence of possible bias exists.
4. Section I, Challenge 2 should also identify a mechanism to assist faculty when faced with issues related to discriminatory hiring or retention practices that do not fall under the jurisdiction of the Academic Senate’s Charges Committee or Committee on Privilege and Tenure. For example, it might be useful to have a specific committee that could hear informal and formal grievances about issues of diversity and equity and perform further inquiry when warranted. The committee might provide advice to the faculty for further action and to the University when repeated and systematic complaints occur.

5. The *Overview of UCLA’s Diversity Plan* is to serve as a summary of the UCLA Campus Strategic Plan For Diversity, however it includes statements that are not addressed in the actual Strategic Plan For Diversity, such as discrimination and harassment.

We thank you for the opportunity to participate in this process.

Cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Dottie Ayer, Assistant to Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Brandie Henderson, Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
February 3, 2010

To: Robin Garrell, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Darnell Hunt, Chair
    Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools

Re: UCLA Strategic Plan for Diversity

I am writing to report that at its January 22, 2010 meeting, the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (CUARS) thoughtfully considered the UCLA Strategic Plan for Diversity. The Committee endorsed the Plan unanimously, contingent upon the revisions below with 5 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The student vote was 2 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Although the consensus of the Committee was to endorse the Plan, and members appreciated that the proposed UCLA Plan for Diversity reflects the campus’ long-standing commitment to “enhancing diversity at all levels of our campus community in order to serve the interests of the State of California and to be a model campus that ‘can promote mutual respect and make possible the full, effective use of the talents and abilities of all to foster innovation and train future leadership’”, two primary concerns were raised that CUARS urges be addressed in the Plan:

- Members noted that CUARS plays an important role at UCLA in advising the Office of Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools and the Chancellor’s Office on matters pertaining to undergraduate admissions policy, helping to formulate guidelines for admission to be used during the admission process, as well as establishing the holistic review parameters for selecting UCLA admittees from the larger pool of those who are UC eligible. Working within the boundaries of California law and Academic Senate regulations, CUARS regularly makes admissions policy decisions that may substantially impact student diversity at UCLA. The Committee requests that the CUARS charge, as it relates to diversity, be clearly defined in the Plan.

- The Plan does not articulate whether resources will be committed to achieving a more diverse student body through the admissions process. CUARS encourages the administration to consider the additional burden that will be placed on the Office of Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools during the application process and the anticipated increase in eligible applicants, particularly following implementation of eligibility reform in 2012. Members request that the Plan address and state clearly the additional funds that will be allocated to the more labor-intensive admissions processes necessary for enhancing student diversity at UCLA.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me (x 7-4304; dhunt@soc.ucla.edu) or Judith Lacertosa, CUARS Principal Policy Analyst (x51194; jlacertosa@senate.ucla.edu).

cc: Jaime Balboa, CAO, Academic Senate
    Judith Lacertosa, Principal Policy Analyst
    Dorothy Ayers, Assistant to Senate Leadership & CAO
February 1, 2010

Robin Garrell
Chair of the Academic Senate
UCLA

Dear Robin,

At your request, the College Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) reviewed the draft Strategic Plan for Diversity at our meeting on January 8, 2010. Overall, the committee found the report to be useful and voted to endorse the proposal, but we request revisions along the lines indicated below (9 votes in favor, 0 votes in opposition and 1 abstention). This letter summarizes the FEC’s comments.

1. Members wished for more information about the historical context for the specific programs discussed in the report, especially since it was not always clear which programs were ongoing and which were being proposed for the future. For example, there is mention of assessment and surveys, which the committee assumes already to be in place. More discussion of what is happening now in terms of diversity would provide readers with a richer contextual understanding of diversity at UCLA.

2. Members request more information as to what resources are needed to support the initiatives in the strategic plan. It did appear that many of the discussed initiatives are currently underway (resulting in little if any additional cost), but this should be clarified.

3. Members are interested in more information regarding diversity training for departments. Currently, departments submit a diversity plan during their 8 year reviews and faculty/staff have the option to participate in diversity training.

4. The number of Teaching Assistantships and more general graduate student funding is declining for non-residents and International students. Are there any programs in place to maintain and augment this population? Related to this, a component of the plan addresses increasing class sizes, and members questioned how this could be done without increasing the number of Teaching Assistants in order to preserve the quality of instruction. The report should address these elements more explicitly.

5. An expressed area of concern is the proposed mentoring of faculty during recruitment and retention. We recommend establishing a pool of mentors from different fields to choose from, which may be more productive than assigning mentors to new faculty only from the home department. In addition, educating mentors to become better mentors would also make the process more effective for both parties. (We believe a program along these lines has been launched.)
6. Concern was raised over the relative treatment of men and women. Although we understand the need to address current and ongoing inequalities, we would like both the discussion and campus practices to point as well to the principle of equality, so that, ideally, decisions would be governed by merit.

7. Diversity is described in terms of not only race and ethnicity, but also religion and socio-economic status among other things, but statistics and data usually point only to race and ethnicity. Are all aspects of diversity being monitored?

Thank you for the opportunity to opine on this Senate Action Item for Review. You are welcome to contact me at (310) 206-2278 or knapp@humnet.ucla.edu with questions. Dayna Baker Weintraub, Executive Coordinator, is also available to assist you and she can be reached at (310) 794-5579 or dbweintraub@college.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Ray Knapp
Chair, College Faculty Executive Committee
Jaime -

The SEAS FEC met Jan 15, 2010 to discuss the Report on Diversity. The FEC came to the following conclusion by unanimous vote of the members present:

1. SEAS FEC cannot support the report without serious revision.
2. SEAS FEC does strongly support diversity in the university.
3. The current report (even the first 16 pages) is far too wordy and redundant. A 1-2 page summary of the ideas is needed.
4. A simple one page summary of the “reporting requirements” that are required by the departments and schools needs to be clearly stated.

Your truly,

Oscar Stafsudd
Chair, SEAS FEC
Hi Jamie,

The School of Nursing FEC endorsed the proposal as written.

Linda Sarna, RN, DNSc, FAAN
Professor and Lulu Wolf Hassenplug Endowed Chair
School of Nursing
University of California, Los Angeles
700 Tiverton Ave, Box 956918
Factor 4-262
Los Angeles, CA 90095-6918
Phone: (310) 825-8690
Fax: (310) 206-9695
email: lsarna@sonnet.ucla.edu
www.tobaccofreenurses.org
MEMO

Date February 2, 2010

From Andrea Fraser
Chair, Faculty Executive Committee
School of the Arts and Architecture

To UCLA Academic Senate
Jaime Balboa, CAO

RE SOAA FEC Review of the UCLA Strategic Plan for Diversity

The FEC of the School of the Arts and Architecture reviewed the UCLA Strategic Plan for Diversity, as requested by the chair of the UCLA Academic Senate. At our January 15 meeting, the committee voted to endorse the proposal with the following revisions.

While the committee does not feel comfortable opposing the plan, we cannot endorse it unless it includes some acknowledgement of the impact that the UC budget crisis and the measures taken to deal with that crisis are likely to have on diversity. The challenge that rising student fees will pose to recruiting and retaining a diverse student body has been at the forefront of debates on fee increases. Clearly, the barriers that confront historically excluded and underrepresented populations often take the form of economic barriers. As fees rise in our undergraduate and professional programs, so will the barriers to the recruitment and retention of these populations. We found it shocking that this “Strategic Plan” does not even mention this challenge, much less propose strategies for meeting it. If, for some reason, these economic challenges are outside of the purview of this proposal, it should, at the very least, acknowledge the omission and call for a plan to address the impact of rising fees on student diversity.

Our committee also noted that four of the six “celebrated students” mentioned by Chancellor Block in his introductory message are athletes. We are concerned that this list reproduces racial stereotypes and does not reflect the broad range of achievements of our minority graduates.