

UC Office of the President

Recent Publications

Title

The Art of Diversity: A Chronicle of Advancing the University of California Faculty through Efforts in Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, 2010–2022

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7rt4b2pc>

ISBN

978-8-9897617-0-8

Author

Carlson, Susan

Publication Date

2024

DOI

10.6074/D4159V

Peer reviewed

THE ART OF DIVERSITY

A Chronicle of Advancing the
University of California Faculty
through Efforts in Diversity,
Equity, and Inclusion,
2010–2022

SUSAN CARLSON

The Art of Diversity

The Art of Diversity:

A Chronicle of Advancing the
University of California Faculty
through Efforts in Diversity, Equity,
and Inclusion, 2010–2022

Susan Carlson

eScholarship Publishing, University of California
Oakland, CA

Copyright © 2024 by Susan Carlson



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

*Published in the United States of America by
eScholarship Publishing, University of California*

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.6074/D4159V>

Print ISBN: 978-8-9897617-1-5

Open access ISBN: 978-8-9897617-0-8

Cover design by Amanda Karby, California Digital Library

Contents

Prologue	vii
1. Status of UC’s Work on the Diversity of the Faculty in 2010	1
2. Contributions to Diversity and APM 210-1-d, 2005 and After	11
3. “Meeting the California Challenge”: UC ADVANCE PAID, 2011–2014	21
4. “Fostering Inclusive Excellence: Strategies and Tools for Department Chairs and Deans,” 2014–2015	39
5. Faculty Retention and Exit Survey, 2015 and After	61
6. Advancing Faculty Diversity (AFD), 2016 and After	73
Epilogue	109
Sources and References	117
Acknowledging My Community	129
Appendix A	131
<i>Faculty Profiles for the 21st Century: A white paper for the University of California (2011)</i>	
Susan Carlson	
Appendix B	143
<i>Advancing the Intellectual Work of the University Summary Report: Advice from UC Campuses on Systemwide Efforts in Faculty Diversity (2019)</i>	
Susan Carlson	
Appendix C	161
<i>Other Programs, Initiatives, and Partnerships from 2010–2022</i>	
About the Author	169

Prologue

Why a Chronicle?

For decades, the University of California (UC) has been a leader in issues of faculty diversity. Notable expressions of this commitment have been the University's forward-looking embrace of diversity among the people of California and the powerful language in the UC Academic Personnel Manual (APM, especially section 210-1-d). UC's public land-grant mission and its research and research-based teaching and outreach provide a unique environment for such work. To help build an accurate record of this commitment, I have written this Chronicle of systemwide efforts to enhance the diversity of the faculty and to build an academic community with equity and inclusion as core values. My focus is on the period during which I was responsible for the faculty diversity work at the University of California Office of the President. Happily, the Chronicle records significant progress and strong partnerships, but I have detailed setbacks, constraints, and roadblocks as well. This work, of course, goes on within a constantly changing context.

This Chronicle captures the details of such work between 2010 and 2022, my time as the Vice Provost of Academic Personnel and Programs (APP) at the University of California Office of the President (UCOP).¹ The work was mandated by the UC Regents, who had consistently expressed concern about the slow progress in the diversity of the faculty. The work was also supported by the State of California legislature, which made direct budget allocations to UC's faculty recruitment efforts for five of these years. Most

1. The Department was named Academic Personnel from 2010 to 2014. In 2014, it became Academic Personnel and Programs, when several systemwide academic programs were added to the unit. I have used the latter title of Academic Personnel and Programs (APP) for the entire period, since the change in title did not affect the office's responsibility for faculty diversity.

importantly, University leadership—including the presidents, the chancellors, and the Academic Senate—was aligned in the commitment to new interventions and investments. In my Vice Provost role, a key responsibility was designing and leading systemwide programs that could assist UC’s ten campuses in their efforts to recruit a more diverse faculty and to ensure an academic environment that enabled the best work of all faculty. Funding for the systemwide work was erratic, so the efforts may appear more opportunistic than strategic. This Chronicle highlights the growing cross-campus networks that came to define this work during my twelve-year tenure, in which I witnessed an increasing recognition of the importance of UC’s diversity work.

This Chronicle is primarily descriptive and draws whenever possible from the public record, particularly documents and other materials available online.² Given the large body of activity covered, it also primarily provides summaries rather than substantial detail. For the most part, I have avoided extended analysis to present an overall picture of what actually took place in these years. In Chapter One, I begin with a look back at key efforts before 2010 that set the stage for the programs and activities after 2010. In Chapter Two, I focus on the foundational policy in APM 210-1-d, touching on events from 2005 through 2020. In Chapters Three through Six, I provide descriptions of the major new systemwide efforts from 2010 to 2022, in chronological order. Finally, in the Epilogue, I offer reflections on undertaking the work of building a strong, innovative, and diverse faculty during a time of quickly changing demographics, both in California and the nation, and increasing urgency surrounding this work.³

2. To assist readers in accessing the source material, I have provided a separate list of references for each chapter, combined in “Sources of Information” at the end of the Chronicle. These chapter-by-chapter reference lists are preceded by a single chronological list of the relevant UC Regents documents.
3. There are also three appendices, the first two with reports I wrote related to the work discussed elsewhere in the Chronicle and the third providing very brief summaries of other activities in APP closely related to the programs and issues described in Chapters Two through Six.

Chapter One

Status of UC’s Work on the Diversity of the Faculty in 2010

I joined UCOP in July of 2010, so details of events from then until June of 2022, when I stepped down from my Vice Provost position, include my first-hand experience in leading the APP work. I begin this account, however, with selected details of the state of the faculty in academic year 2010–2011, as well as a brief account of influential pre-2010 efforts focused clearly on diversity, equity, and inclusion. The new activities we undertook after 2010 were built on and influenced by these earlier efforts.

The Faculty Competitiveness Report: The Status Quo of Fall 2010

The 2010 status of the faculty was well documented in a report to the UC Regents a few months after I began my UC work. In January 2011, Academic Council Chair Dan Simmons and I reported to the UC Regents on a wide range of faculty issues in the “Biennial Accountability Sub-Report on Faculty Competitiveness.” The report was prepared jointly by APP and systemwide Academic Senate leadership, including Chair Simmons. This report followed up on the 2009 “Faculty Competitiveness Report” and was built on the premise that any report on faculty competitiveness must include infor-

2 The Art of Diversity

mation on the demographics of the faculty. Some of the most important data on the demographic diversity of the faculty included the following (all direct quotations from the report to the UC Regents¹):

- In 2009, 30 percent of UC’s Professorial Series Faculty were women, with the highest percentage in Education (52 percent) and the lowest percentages in Engineering/Computer Sciences (13 percent), and Mathematics (14 percent). Women continue to be represented at low levels in STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) fields (p. 18).
- In 2009, eight percent of UC’s Professorial Series Faculty were under-represented minorities and 15 percent were Asian Americans (p. 20).
- While gender availability and UC’s recruitment success varies by disciplinary area, UC hired women assistant professors at a rate below their availability in all but two disciplinary areas (computer science/mathematics/engineering, and physical sciences). Overall, women accounted for 47.5 percent of the pool of nationwide doctoral degree recipients but only 39.9 percent of UC’s new hires (p. 14).
- Figure 11 offers similar availability and hiring data for under-represented minorities (American Indian/Alaskan Native, African American, Chicano/Latino). The University has had some degree of success in hiring from these pools of potential faculty at a rate slightly over availabilities in selected areas (in Arts/Humanities/Social Sciences, in the Life Sciences, and in Education). Overall, under-represented minorities accounted for 11.3 percent of the pool of nationwide doctoral degree recipients and 12.5 percent of UC’s new hires (p. 16).
- The aging of the faculty poses both near-term and long-term challenges for faculty renewal (p. 12).²

1. The statistics in the report focus on gender (male or female) and on race/ethnicity—under-represented minorities (American Indian/Alaskan Native, African American, Chicano/Latino); Asian American; White. Citizenship status was added to reports produced after 2014. Terminology about race, ethnicity, citizenship status, and gender varies in the reports and other documents cited in this Chronicle, as it does in public discourse of the time. Other self-identified characteristics—sexual orientation and gender expression, for example—were not collected systematically during this time.
2. Full citation for the report is in the first section of “Sources of Information,” listed with all Regents items referenced in this Chronicle. Minutes of the January 2011 meeting are separately posted online.

This systemwide data on the demographics of faculty and faculty recruitment as of January 2011 documents what were widely seen to be disappointingly low numbers of women and under-represented minorities in most disciplines. During the Regents' discussion, the statistic that stood out for them was that the Ladder-rank faculty at UC had only 8% under-represented minorities.

Reporting on the representation of women and of under-represented minorities (African American, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Chicano/Latino, shortened to URM) in Ladder-rank and Equivalent faculty and reporting on UC's hiring compared to the national availability pools continued throughout the period of this Chronicle. During this time, the demographic data on current faculty and on the hiring of new faculty has also been updated annually in the UC Information Center, which includes the "Annual Accountability Report." The 2011 "Faculty Competitiveness Report" was the last report with this title, but most of the same information was later incorporated into the Annual Accountability Reports.

The Regents' acknowledgment of slow progress in diversifying the faculty was built into the structure of the report. Indeed, the 2011 report was framed with an on-the-record recognition of UC's disappointing results in efforts to build a more diverse faculty in the prior decade, with acknowledgment of slow progress in diversifying the faculty at both the beginning and the end of the report. On the first page, this summary statement appears: "Campus efforts to increase the representation of women and under-represented minorities on the faculty have resulted in limited progress" (p. 1). Perhaps even more striking, on the final page, the report highlights findings that potential new faculty—UC graduate students and postdoctoral scholars—viewed faculty careers as less attractive than in the past. A survey of UC graduate students and post-docs by Marc Goulden, Karie Frasch, and Mary Ann Mason was summarized as follows:

While 45 percent of men in Ph.D. programs began with the goal of seeking a faculty career, at the time of the survey, only 34 percent were still considering this career path. For women, the drop was greater, from 38 percent to 25 percent. Similar drops in the attractiveness of faculty careers occurred among the post-doctoral scholars surveyed. The clear message from potential faculty is that the job is increasingly undesirable, both because of its perceived incompatibility with raising children and its reward system (p. 33).

Thus, the 2011 "Faculty Competitiveness Report" captures widespread frustration with the status quo. The UC Regents receiving this report shared their frustration during discussion and chided UC leaders for not doing more to "move the needle" on faculty diversity. In my own experience of UC Regents' engagement with this issue, it was not until May 2022 that I heard unequivocal

4 The Art of Diversity

cal acceptance that we were making real progress in the diversity of UC faculty. By that time, we had built a sustained record of innovative new efforts in faculty recruitment and retention.

Recognition of the pressing need for change had also motivated three systemwide activities in the years immediately before 2010, especially the prior decade, activities that established key ingredients for subsequent attention to faculty diversity: 1) major changes to the Academic Personnel Manual, 2) an important presidential task force and follow-up summit, and 3) the President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program.

Academic Personnel Manual Revisions, 2005

On 1 July 2005, revised portions of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) were issued for three sections: APM 210, APM 240, and APM 245. The importance of these policy revisions—adding explicit language on UC's commitments to diversity, equity, and inclusion—cannot be overstated. Revisions to APM sections 240 and 245 specify the administrative responsibilities of deans and department chairs (and their equivalents) to maintain an affirmative action program with a focus on recruitment and retention. In section 240 on deans, for example, the language reads as follows: "This assignment [as dean] includes . . . responsibility for ensuring diversity of the faculty, students, and staff, including maintaining an affirmative action recruitment and retention program consistent with University affirmative action policies, Regental policy, and applicable law" (APM 240-4-a).

In section 245 on department chairs, similar language appears: "The appointee [department chair] is responsible for maintaining a departmental affirmative action program for faculty and staff personnel, consistent with University affirmative action goals." In addition, annual reporting on this work is a chair's responsibility: "[the chair's administrative goals are] To report annually on the department's affirmative action program, including a description of good faith efforts undertaken to ensure equal opportunity in appointment, promotion, and merit activities, as well as a report on affirmative action goals and results in accordance with campus policy" (APM 245, Appendix A). These direct and decisive statements on the administrative responsibility of deans and chairs in issues of recruitment, retention, and climate underscore the partnership of faculty and faculty administrators in such work.

While these revisions to APM 240 and 245 were significant, the revisions to APM 210 continue to be the most important of the 2005 APM revisions. In short, revisions to the criteria for evaluating faculty performance contained a new statement that "contributions to diversity and equal opportunity" be "encouraged and given recognition in the evaluation of the candidate's quali-

fications” (APM 210-1-d). In what is, perhaps, the most important section of the APM, this new language made explicit that UC rewards faculty achievements in research, teaching, outreach, and service that address issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion. In Chapter Two of this Chronicle, I provide additional details about the prominent role of the new language in APM 210 in UC's efforts to prioritize its mission of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Presidential Task Force and Summit on Faculty Diversity, 2005–2007

The second important 2005 action was President Robert Dynes' appointment of an 11-member systemwide President's Task Force on Faculty Diversity in May of that year. Its charge was comprehensive: to “review faculty diversity at the University of California.” The Task Force issued its report in spring 2006, and the report subsequently served as the foundation for a President's Summit on Faculty Diversity, held on 23 May 2006. In attendance were the President, nine of the executive vice chancellors/provosts, and over 85 other attendees. (Notably, some of the 2006 attendees continue to play important roles in UC faculty diversity efforts in 2023.) One outcome of the Task Force report and the Summit was a “Statement on Faculty Diversity” signed by President Dynes and all ten campus chancellors.³ It reads in part:

A diverse faculty reflects inclusiveness and opportunity that are essential if UC is to maintain excellence and legitimacy in its role as a land-grant university. UC will remain competitive as a leading institution of higher education only if it fully utilizes the available talent pool. UC will retain its leadership as the premier public research institution in the world only if it is inclusive, so that all members of our heterogeneous society can participate in the educational and research programs necessary for our future.

The Task Force report adopts the definition of diversity that had recently been endorsed by the Assembly of the systemwide Academic Senate (10 May 2006):

Diversity—a defining feature of California's past, present and future—refers to the variety of personal experiences, values, and worldviews that arise from differences of culture and circumstance. Such differences include race, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, language, abilities/disabilities, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, and geographic region, and more (p. 1).

3. The Task Force report and other key documents, including the “Statement on Faculty Diversity” are available online.

6 The Art of Diversity

This statement was later incorporated into UC Regents Policy 4400: Policy on University of California Diversity Statement.

To take on its expansive charge, the Task Force focused on “assessing the status of racial and ethnic diversity” in the faculty, with the assumption that the Task Force goal of promoting “a new culture of inclusion, opportunity and tolerance at the University of California” for the faculty will benefit “all members of the academic community” (p. 5, Executive Summary). The Task Force made five recommendations on faculty diversity for UC, in areas of 1) leadership, 2) academic planning, 3) resource allocation and faculty rewards, 4) faculty recruitment and retention, and 5) accountability. The report also includes a comprehensive compendium of then-current efforts to address faculty diversity on the campuses, including campus diversity officers, relevant committees, research and curricular initiatives, web resources, climate studies and diversity reports, retention data, and diversity awards. Follow-up to the Task Force report and the Summit included campus visits by the Provost and Executive Vice President Wyatt Hume in fall 2006 and spring 2007, as well as reports to the UC Regents, the Council of Chancellors, the Council of Vice Chancellors (campus provosts), and divisional and systemwide Academic Senate representatives.

The Task Force and its report, the high-level presidential Summit, and the round of campus visits by Provost and Executive Vice President Hume constitute an impressive series of efforts to ignite action. The APM policy revisions give such efforts an anchor in policy as well. And yet when I arrived in 2010, several years of instability in UCOP leadership had overshadowed this promising agenda.

President Dynes had resigned in 2007, followed by nearly a year without a president, and then by President Mark Yudof’s appointment in 2008. Provost and Executive Vice President Hume served as the University Executive Operating Officer between presidents and then resigned on the first day of Yudof’s presidency. Dr. Larry Pitts was appointed as the Interim Provost in 2009 and was then appointed as Provost and Executive Vice President in 2010 for two additional years.

Just as important for the systemwide faculty diversity work, there were two years—from 2008 to 2010—when there was no Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, a period preceded by the service of the prior Vice Provost Nicholas Jewel for a single year. As a result of all these leadership transitions, in addition to cataclysmic reductions in UC’s allocation of state funding during this time, work on faculty diversity was a ghostly presence at UCOP. For instance, the signature President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program was moved from UCOP to the Berkeley campus during this period; I was at UC for a year before I was told that the program still reported to me at UCOP, even though its employees and budget had been moved to UC Berkeley.

President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP)

The PPFP program is, indeed, the third systemwide activity that laid an important foundation for APP work between 2010 and 2022. It is a nearly 40-year-old effort to enhance the excellence of the faculty by recruiting and mentoring postdoctoral scholars, scholars with research, teaching, or outreach engaging issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion. Since its founding by President David Gardner in 1984, the program has established the idea that UC could organize its commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion for faculty, at least in part, at the systemwide level. The latest annual report (2021–22) succinctly summarizes the sustained work of PPFP:

The University of California President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (UC-PPFP) was founded in 1984 as a program designed to promote the diversity of the UC faculty through support of talented postdoctoral scholars in all fields whose research, teaching, and service will contribute to diversity and equal opportunity at UC. The program provides fellows with two years of postdoctoral training under a UC faculty mentor, offers guidance in career preparation, and promotes the hiring of fellows within the UC system. In support of the UC-PPFP, individual UC campuses also support highly ranked candidates using local funding sources, and these are referred to as Chancellors Postdoctoral Fellows (CPF). As one of the largest public educational institutions in the U.S., UC recognizes this pool of outstanding talent and scholarship within the UC system as an important resource for increasing diversity of the UC faculty ranks. Indeed, the UC-PPFP contributes to the national pool of university faculty candidates who advance equity and equal opportunity and is a model program for supporting scholars aspiring to academic careers (p. 2).

There were two major updates to the program in its early years. First, after California Proposition 209 became law in 1996—prohibiting State of California governmental institutions from considering race, sex, or ethnicity in public employment, contracting, and education—several PPFP elements were modified so that it would be aligned with the new state law. Second, in 2003, to increase the effectiveness of the program and to ensure that academic departments recognized the high quality of the fellows as potential candidates for faculty positions, the Faculty Hiring Incentive Program (FHIP) was initiated. This expansion of the program provided significant funding to help the transition of PPFP fellows onto the UC faculty. This incentive has motivated departments and schools to get to know the research produced by PPFP scholars and to look for opportunities to incorporate such expertise into department/school research and teaching.⁴

4. I am presenting only a brief summary, not a full history, of the continuing importance of PPFP for UC. Additional information, including the latest annual report, is available on its website.

8 The Art of Diversity

The PFPF was well established before the programs featured in Chapters 3 through 6 of this Chronicle. Yet the fortunes of PFPF were on a roller-coaster before and even during the period of 2010–2022. For example, during the 2008–2009 academic year, the administration of the program was moved (as noted above) from UCOP to UC Berkeley, as a part of major restructuring and downsizing of UCOP. The operating budget was reduced, and staff (less than 2 FTE) and operations were transferred to the campus. Administration of the FHIP budget remained at UCOP, however, given the FHIP’s unique funding mechanism for supporting faculty hiring. During the next few years, the PFPF operating budget was further reduced, and a cap was placed on the number of new faculty hires supported by the FHIP. As a consequence, both the number of new fellows and of hires of fellows into the UC faculty declined. But campus support for the program remained strong; due to the efforts of chancellors, campus executive vice chancellors/provosts, and the Academic Senate, successive Presidents (Yudof and Napolitano) were convinced, after 2012, to restore and then increase funding—both operating budget funding and FHIP funding. In addition, PFPF Director Sheila O’Rourke established new UC campus partnerships through the creation of the Chancellors’ Fellows Program (CFP). As noted in the Annual Report summary above, these fellowships are awarded through the PFPF review process, with the distinction that funding for the CFP fellows comes from the campuses (not UCOP). As of 2019, all ten campuses were funding CFP postdoctoral fellows. In 2011, partnerships with non-UC universities were also established, with eleven non-UC universities signed on as partners as of 2023.

When Director O’Rourke stepped down, a national search for her replacement was conducted. Professor Mark Lawson (UC San Diego), a former PFPF fellow himself, was appointed in 2015. While the fortunes of the program were already on the upswing at the time of his appointment, having a director who had a faculty appointment, as well as someone who was a former fellow himself, enhanced the credibility of the program on the campuses. Lawson engaged broadly with the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE), the campus executive vice chancellors/provosts and campus academic personnel/academic affairs vice provosts/vice chancellors. He has also enhanced the program’s national visibility through his outreach efforts.

When the UC budget improved after the great recession, so did the PFPF program budget, with President Yudof partially restoring the budget. This improvement was followed by President Napolitano’s PFPF Presidential Initiative (2014–2016), which increased the FHIP budget and created the first STEM start-up funding for the program.⁵ The cap on FHIP hiring was also

5. The PFPF Presidential Initiative’s “Inclusive Excellence Seminars” are detailed in Chapter Four.

dropped and the FHIP was extended to hiring of fellows into UC's professional schools, including those in the health sciences. By academic year 2021–2022, the PFPF operating budget had grown to \$5.4M.

Over its nearly four decades, PFPF has been an effective and still innovative resource in faculty recruitment, with the number of PFPF hires onto the faculty exceeding 30 in the most recent years (the annual low had been 8 hires during the great recession). PFPF has also provided a model for newer programing, including several components of the Advancing Faculty Diversity (AFD) recruitment interventions (details in Chapter Six) and has been an essential partner in AFD design and assessment.

“Faculty Profiles for the 21st Century”

Given the instability in PFPF's budget and in UCOP leadership just prior to my arrival in 2010, I immediately undertook my own review of these recent efforts so I could re-establish a pathway for UC to resume its systemwide attention to the diversity of the faculty. I wanted to ensure that this work was seen as a part of and not as distinct from other efforts to enhance faculty excellence. Specifically, my goal was to consider the diversity, equity, and inclusion commitments in the context of other key issues related to faculty recruitment and success, issues like expectations among new faculty for flexibility in their career paths; the changing nature of course delivery (in 2010 there were fierce debates about online instruction); more expansive definitions of scholarship and research, including interdisciplinary and team-based research; and lack of clarity about the reasons for faculty resignations. In March 2011, I circulated a white paper, “Faculty Profiles for the 21st Century,” summarizing the issues I had identified and suggesting items for further consideration. My goal was to ensure that as we resumed the focus on faculty diversity, we connected that work to ongoing UC attention to innovation in faculty roles and rewards. Put simply, all of this was to enable UC to recruit and retain the accomplished faculty that would distinguish the University of California in the 21st century.⁶

Two sections of the white paper detail hallmarks of UC's attention to issues of faculty welfare and the faculty's demographic composition: in the first I highlighted the continuing importance of a 1990 Task Force report, and in the second I summarized UC's continuing leadership in national conversations on such issues.

6. The white paper is available in Appendix A.

1990 Task Force on Faculty Rewards

In 1990, UC President David P. Gardner appointed a “University-wide Task Force on Faculty Rewards,” with 13 faculty members and chaired by Dr. Karl Pister (Pister had several significant leadership roles at UC, including chancellor at UC Santa Cruz from 1991 to 1996). While the focus was not on faculty diversity, the report contained the genesis of the 2005 revisions to APM sections 210, 240, and 245. The report also took on an issue sensitive both then and now—the possibility that changes in our definition of research excellence might improve UC’s eminence and innovation. Dr. Pister’s letter of transmittal to President Gardner summarizes this issue: “If I were to paraphrase our recommendations, it would be this: we must restore a more appropriate balance among the traditional categories of scholarly activity of the faculty, and we must exercise more judiciously the flexibility in evaluation of faculty performance that is currently available in our Academic Personnel Manual, yet infrequently utilized” (Task Force letter of transmittal, 26 June 1991). “Flexibility” was a pivotal word in the report and a guiding principle threaded through all report recommendations: “We cannot over emphasize and we insist on implementing the flexibility which is written into University policy” (p. 1). The focus on a more expansive definition of research and innovation has continued to be a key issue in UC’s work on equity and inclusion for its faculty.

UC Leaders as National Leaders

The white paper includes a “snapshot” of sorts, a list of three types of leadership that had contributed to UC’s readiness to engage the issue of faculty diversity as a system: 1) three UC chancellors participated in important national conversations on women in science and on creating flexibility in tenure-track faculty careers; 2) systemwide Academic Senate committees issued reports and pushed for action on part-time faculty appointments and possible inequitable advancement for those in book-based disciplines; and 3) UC faculty researchers were funded by the NSF, the NIH, and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation in support of research and programing in faculty diversity, flexibility in academic policy, and work-life management (pp. 3–5). Not coincidentally, UC was a national leader in research on all of these issues, in particular researchers in UC Berkeley’s Office of Faculty Equity and Welfare (OFEW) and UCLA’s Higher Education Research Institute (HERI).

The 2011 white paper reflects my view that to make progress in the diversity of the faculty, UC must also, simultaneously, deal with issues of faculty performance expectations. I will address this need to scrutinize how we judge faculty performance in the coming chapters.

Chapter Two

Contributions to Diversity and APM 210-1-d, 2005 and After

As I have recounted, the APM policy on contributions to diversity has been the rock-solid foundation of innovations and interventions in faculty recruitment, retention, training, and programing since 2005. Now more commonly referred to as “contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion” (C2DEI), the policy language draws its authority from UC Regents Policy 4400; and, as noted in Chapter One, the seeds for the APM policy go back as far as 1990. All of the activities reviewed in this Chronicle have key connections to the APM policy language. Accompanying the omnipresence of APM 210 has been continued discussion of how to implement the policy as well as questions about its scope. The ongoing deliberations are to be expected with such an important and transformational policy.

The C2DEI language in APM 210 was originally issued in 2005 and revised in 2015. In the decade between these policy revisions, there were continual discussions and sometimes heated debates about its implementation. Initially, much of the discussion focused on how (and whether) faculty under review would be invited to supply information about their C2DEI in merit and promotion reviews. Most UC campuses use what is called a “BioBib” (biography and bibliography) template for faculty to report on their professional activities and accomplishments during standard reviews. On the BioBib template, campuses provide sections for categories of information to be reported—in other words, for teaching, for research and creative work, for professional competence and activity, and for university and public service (the four categories of faculty responsibilities outlined in APM 210). BioBib templates vary from campus to campus. Some campuses ask faculty to

12 The Art of Diversity

report on C2DEI activities, if any, separately in each of the four categories. Other campuses provide a single location for information on C2DEI during the review period. Still other campuses use a hybrid of these two methods for reporting. It is important to recognize that, regardless of the format, reporting is more heavily encouraged on some campuses than on others. The Berkeley campus was among the first to tie achievement in C2DEI to clear advancement rewards; for example, commendable C2DEI could lead to an additional half-step advancement during a merit review.

Several groups were involved in this ongoing, multi-year systemwide conversation about how to implement the C2DEI policy in APM 210. These groups included the Academic Senate (at the systemwide level, this activity was the business of the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity, UCAADE, and the University Committee on Academic Personnel, UCAP); the faculty and staff in charge of campus academic personnel offices (APOs); the campus affirmative action and equal employment opportunity offices; and, increasingly during the period, the chief diversity officers on the campuses. After the 2015 policy revisions were issued, there were two additional developments: 1) C2DEI statements were increasingly requested from applicants in faculty recruitments, and 2) C2DEI statements were increasingly expected in merit and promotion reviews of all faculty. Both of these developments were hotly debated and managed differently from campus to campus.

The most prominently discussed policy language on C2DEI is in the initial section of APM 210-1-d. The 2015 language reads as follows:

The University of California is committed to excellence and equity in every facet of its mission. Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process, and they should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs of California's diverse population, or research in a scholar's area of expertise that highlights inequalities. Mentoring and advising of students and faculty members, particularly from underrepresented and underserved populations, should be given due recognition in the teaching or service categories of the academic personnel process (APM 210-1-d).

When this language was originally added to the APM in 2005, there was also new language on contributions to diversity, equity, and equal opportunity added in the four APM 210-1-d sub-sections on Teaching, Research and Creative Work, Professional Competence and Activity, and University and Public Service. In other words, since 2005, the APM has called out the specific contributions to diversity and equal opportunity that faculty can make in these

four areas of responsibility. Thus, by policy, activities that support and analyze diversity, equity, and inclusion are defined as integral to all areas of faculty responsibility. To underscore the prominence of C2DEI in all areas of faculty activity and responsibility, my office put together a document with guidance on the kinds of activities that might be considered as C2DEI, “Evaluating Contributions to Diversity for Faculty Appointment and Promotion Under APM-210.” Our intention was to assist faculty in recognizing the many ways in which they were already making contributions or might consider making contributions. This guidance was last updated in 2017, after the most recent revisions to the APM policy.

Since 2005, the C2DEI language in APM 210-1-d has been a primary focus of often contentious discussions and debates about diversity, equity, and inclusion. Let me provide some additional examples of this push-and-pull: first, by outlining the contours of the debate during the revisions developed and reviewed from 2012 to 2015, including some of the fears that the policy has elicited; and second, by describing a singular debate at the UC Davis campus.

APM Policy Revisions and Debates

Debates about the APM policy almost always focus on the initial language, quoted above, on UC’s missional commitment to diversity as the basis for C2DEI. The placement of that language at the beginning of APM 210-1-d is crucial. Here’s why. APM section 210-1-d is especially important because it contains the criteria used to evaluate the performance of Ladder-rank faculty under review for hiring, merits, promotion, and advancement. The individual sections that follow—sections on Teaching (APM 210-1-d(1)), Research and Creative Work (APM 210-1-d(2)), Professional Competence and Activity (APM 210-1-d(3)), and University and Public Service (APM 210-1-d(4))—each provide detail about expectations for performance in the individual categories. These focused discussions, however, are preceded by overarching statements about two issues. First, the policy specifies the intellectual contributions that are expected of all faculty: “Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions. Insistence upon this standard for holders of the professorship is necessary for maintenance of the quality of the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.”

Second, and immediately following the language about “superior intellectual attainment,” the policy specifies that faculty who provide contributions to equal opportunity and diversity should be rewarded for that work: “Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and

14 The Art of Diversity

diversity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process, and they should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements.” Thus “superior intellectual attainment” and contributions to “equal opportunity and diversity” are two overriding expectations for Ladder-rank faculty, linked together by their proximity in APM 210-1-d. These two expectations are ever-present in the extended review process of potential APM 210 revisions, beginning in 2012.¹

The policy revision process that took place from 2012 to 2015 is a useful case study of the intense conversations that surrounded the policy in its first decade. I was counseled in 2012, for example, not to take up the Academic Senate’s request for policy revisions; this counsel (mostly from faculty administrators) was based on the fierce nature of the initial debate over the original 2005 policy additions. The administrators feared that we might lose the policy language altogether if we reopened the discussion. However, the Senate had asked for the review, making a strong case for needed refinement, and I felt that further discussions of such an important policy were a necessary way to keep it aligned with the experiences of faculty and faculty administrators. So we began a review process that lasted three years. Much of the review was conducted within the Senate, through a partnership between UCAP and UCAADE. There were also two systemwide reviews of potential APM revisions that involved not just the Academic Senate governing bodies and committees, but also campus academic administrators and others who were invited to submit comments. From the Academic Senate, I received three official sets of comments on the policy revision over the course of three years, including one from Council Chair Robert Powell (11 April 2013) and two from Council Chair Mary Gilly (3 May 2015 and 28 May 2015). Together they demonstrate the evolving nature of the debate among Senate members.

During the long process of refining the proposed revisions, the more subtle but important disagreements were between the two Academic Senate committees, with UCAP more focused on ensuring that the excellence expected of UC faculty members was maintained and UCAADE more focused on ensuring that C2DEI were appropriately rewarded. At the end of the intense review, revised policy language was issued in 2015 and has remained unchanged through 2022.² The process was contentious, but the results have been enduring.

What was clear to me in the careful, passionate policy review during these years was that the greatest opposition to the revisions was rooted in fears that the university’s foundational focus on research might be diluted through addi-

1. Research and analysis of faculty diversity often refers to this topic as the “excellence versus diversity” debate.
2. In April 2023, APP circulated proposed changes to APM 210-1-d. The focus was on adding substantial new language on mentoring. But importantly, changes were also proposed for the core description of contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

tional recognition of C2DEI. In other words, the focus of the critique was not on UC's missional commitment to diversity and equity, but on the need to maintain the priority of the UC research mission. While those reviewing the policy change were generally comfortable giving credit for C2DEI in teaching, mentoring, and service, resistance to the policy and proposed revisions focused on fears about what was perceived to be a threat to research at UC. I have identified seven inter-related fears that were present in conversations, as well as in the written comments submitted from 2012–2015. These include fears that

- UC was elevating one particular kind of research and thereby impinging on academic freedom
- All faculty would be expected to do such research
- Faculty doing such research might get double credit for the research category in evaluation
- UC was collapsing the categories of research, teaching, and service, thus losing key distinctions
- STEM disciplines were being devalued
- Faculty would be held responsible for the diversity of their students, and
- A “fourth leg” of evaluation would be created and contributions to DEI would be required.

In sum, respondents worried that we were undermining the quality of UC research as well as the priority of the UC research mission.

In one comment circulated during the systemwide review, the author draws from several of these interrelated concerns, noting that the proposed language “compromises the integrity of the scientific process by favoring a certain outcome of research over others, it infringes on academic freedom by singling out one research topic over others, and it is sufficiently ambiguous to potentially allow to count contributions in the service area as contributions in research. . . . [Consequently] adoption of this language would in time result in substantial erosion of the University of California status as the top public university system in the world.”

Such policy debates are a hallmark of the APM and crucial to the continuing relevance of the policy manual. In my view, the debates are also a well-documented indicator of a fundamental resistance to C2DEI that continues to exist. In short, some still see principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion as peripheral rather than integral to the research mission of the University of California. The sophisticated nature of this discussion led me to understand

that “due recognition” of C2DEI is best thought of as a component of “superior intellectual attainment” rather than a recent addition to understanding faculty achievement.

UC Davis Discussions on the Implementation of APM 210-1-d, 2019–2020

A few years after the revised APM 210-1-d was issued (2015), there was an intense debate about the use of C2DEI at the Davis campus. Just as the APM policy revision process provides important information about UC attitudes towards C2DEI on all of the campuses, this Davis debate provides an instructive set of statements about how this policy functions among the faculty who use it. While there was not a single cause for the 2019–20 debates at Davis, the increasing campus focus on C2DEI was at issue. At this time, innovations in recruitment that were part of the UC Davis Advancing Faculty Diversity (AFD) recruitment program focused attention on use of statements of diversity, equity, and inclusions (information on AFD follows in Chapter Six of this Chronicle). The local debate at Davis entered the national spotlight as well. Here are two statements published in the *Wall Street Journal* that map the range of fiercely held views on C2DEI. The first comes from UC Davis Mathematics Professor Abigail Thompson, who characterizes C2DEI as an inappropriate political litmus test. The second comes from UC Davis Chancellor Gary S. May and Vice Chancellor Renatta Garrison Tull, who counter that C2DEI are central to the core mission of UC:

- . . . rather than helping achieve inclusion, these DEI rubrics act as a filter for those with nonconforming views Mandatory diversity statements can too easily become a test of political ideology and conformity (Abigail Thompson, *Wall Street Journal*, 19 December 2019).
- We strongly disagree with this premise [that C2D is a new loyalty oath]. It is inaccurate, at once illogical and rhetorically inflammatory, and reminiscent of historical attempts to blunt substantive actions aimed at desegregation and broadening participation Indeed not asking questions about a candidate’s readiness to serve the diverse population of students in California, the most diverse state in the nation, would be negligent (Gary S. May and Renatta Garrison Tull, *Wall Street Journal*, 26 December 2019).

In the months immediately following these public statements, Davis Academic Senate members formally took up the conversation about the use of C2DEI, as codified in APM 210-1-d and implemented in UC Davis Academic Senate Bylaws. Their vigorous debate over the issue created a detailed, sometimes contentious record of various positions on the appropriate use of contributions to diversity statements in hiring and review.

As a part of this debate, and during the winter and spring quarters of 2020, Senate faculty at UC Davis voted on two resolutions about the campus Academic Senate Division Bylaws which were based on the language in APM 210-1-d. Here is the language of the two resolutions as it appeared on two separate online ballots:

- **First Resolution on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Statements:**
 “We, the undersigned members of the UC Davis Academic Senate, petition for a ballot on the following resolution, according to the procedure described in Davis Division Bylaw IV.17: Resolved: ‘Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Statements shall not be mandatory for the appointment or for the advancement of faculty.’”
- **Second Resolution on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Statements:**
 “We the undersigned members of the UC Davis Academic Senate, petition for a ballot on the following resolution, according to the procedure described in Davis Division Bylaw IV.17: Resolved: ‘Statements describing Contributions to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion are a useful part of a holistic review in the appointment of new faculty.’”

In two close votes, the faculty voted in favor of the use of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Statements; in other words, they voted against the first resolution and for the second one.³ A detailed analysis of the UC Davis debates—both the hyper-visible exchange in the *Wall Street Journal* and the two Academic Senate resolutions—has been published by UC Davis Professor of Law Brian Soucek, in a law review article that puts the UC APM policy and use of C2DEI in a legal context. He summarizes the issues this way:

Universities increasingly require ‘diversity statements’ from faculty seeking jobs, tenure, or promotion. But statements describing faculty’s contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion are also increasingly under attack. Criticisms first made in tweets and blog posts have expanded into prominent opinion pieces and, more recently, law review articles. And the attacks are having an effect. Within universities, faculty-wide resolutions for and against mandatory diversity

3. Additional information is archived in the UC Davis Academic Senate Office.

18 The Art of Diversity

statements have been called and academic freedom committees have been asked to intervene. Outside universities, lawyers are recruiting plaintiffs to challenge diversity statement requirements in court.

Behind all the rhetoric, the arguments made about diversity statements are, at heart, legal claims—and serious ones at that. Critics allege that universities are engaging in unconstitutional viewpoint discrimination, violating their faculty’s academic freedom, and imposing political litmus tests akin to the loyalty oaths struck down during the Cold War era. Yet evaluating these as legal claims requires grappling with complicated, often unsettled doctrine regarding the First Amendment and higher education—something that, unsurprisingly, hasn’t been done on the comment threads, opinion pages, and faculty committees where this discussion has largely played out until now. This Article does that work, fleshing out the criticisms and developing a framework to address them and guide universities on how they can require and evaluate diversity statements—should they want to—without violating either the Constitution or the academic freedom on which their mission depends (pp. 1989–1990).

Soucek further addresses these issues in a 2021 presentation to the UC Center Sacramento speaker series, available online from Professor Soucek’s web page.

Academic Senate Engagement with Implementation of APM 210-1-d

This chapter’s look at the history and reception of APM 210-1-d and its language on C2DEI is not, of course, a comprehensive review. The discussion of APM 210-1-d implementation and practice remains ongoing. However, this Chronicle seeks to underline how central the policy has been and continues to be in faculty recruitment, evaluation, and advancement. The Academic Senate role in these debates has been important, with official statements from the systemwide Senate and its leaders almost always supportive of the APM policy. Here is a salient example of such statements from the Council Chair Robert May in 2019, a few months before the intense conversations at UC Davis:

DEI statements foster productive discussion on how faculty, both current and prospective, can shape and improve the overall learning and working environment in higher education. By encouraging both faculty and faculty applicants to discuss their awareness of and to think intentionally about how they can contribute to diversity, equity, and inclusion, DEI statements can inspire pedagogical and research innovation as well as deepen engagement with these values in all aspects of their work. The systemwide implementation of the use of these statements both affirms DEI as core values of UC and reinforces the expectation

that all faculty are responsible for diversity, equity, and inclusion, thereby ensuring that this work is shared broadly and recognized appropriately (25 February 2019).

The statement was updated in May of 2022 and recapitulated in another letter to UC Provost and Executive Vice President Michael T. Brown, this one from Council Chair Robert Horwitz. This excerpt suggests continuing refinements in how faculty engage with the C2DEI language in the APM:

The revised recommendations include a new best practice emphasizing that questions put to faculty members and applicants about DEI contributions should focus on the actions, experiences, or plans of the individual and should not assume that there is a correct point of view or “right answer.” A second new best practice emphasizes that faculty have the primary responsibility for evaluating contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion within their discipline; that faculty hiring and review committees, not administrators, should create and employ the rubrics to judge DEI statements; and that neither the administration nor Senate should establish fixed DEI rubrics and numerical grading systems for search and review committees (4 May 2022).

The engagement by the UC faculty and others has continued to the present, as seen in the UC Regents November 2022 meeting, when the Regents had discussions with leaders of UCOP Academic Affairs about C2DEI and APM 210-1-d in an item titled “Statements Describing Faculty Contributions to Inclusive Excellence.”

In the next four chapters of this Chronicle, I turn to a series of activities, programs, and collaborations we facilitated out of the Office of the President to support the University’s commitment to diversity. Our success in these efforts was never guaranteed. But both UC Regents policy and APM policy provided all of the efforts with a common ground from which we could move forward. They provided statements of community values and priorities from which we constantly drew.

Chapter Three

“Meeting the California Challenge”: UC ADVANCE PAID, 2011–2014

In the fall of 2010, and at the urging of the ten UC chancellors, UC submitted to the National Science Foundation (NSF) a proposal in response to the NSF ADVANCE Partnerships for Adaptation, Implementation and Dissemination (PAID) call for proposals. The goal of all ADVANCE awards is to increase the participation and advancement of women in academic science and engineering careers and to address barriers for women from under-represented groups. In line with this purpose, the goal of UC’s program was to “leverage an established 10-campus structure at the University of California (UC) to enable campuses to recruit, retain, and advance more women and under-represented minority women faculty in STEM.” An award was granted on September 6, 2011; the NSF awarded \$322,081 for “UC ADVANCE PAID: Meeting the California Challenge—Women and Under-represented Minority Faculty In STEM,” effective from 1 September 2011 through 31 August 2014 (NSF Award #1106712). I served as the PI, and was advised by both a Steering Committee and a Research Scholars Advisory Board (more on these below). Substantial information about the program—including the proposal, the annual reports, events, products, and evaluation—can be found online.

The program was an exciting opportunity to rebuild the systemwide community that had been assembled through the 2006 Task Force Report and Presidential Summit on Faculty Diversity. The UC ADVANCE PAID program was immensely successful in reviving systemwide conversations that engaged chancellors and provosts alongside faculty, faculty leaders, and chief diversity officers. It also established systemwide agreements on data collection to ensure we could track UC’s progress in diversifying the faculty, and it

built explicitly on UC's research expertise. All of these qualities—a powerful combination—facilitated the informed establishment of other programs that followed in the next decade.

The program had two parts. The first part, the “Recruitment Data Analysis Project,” had as its goal to “design ways to collect and aggregate data that are transportable not only across 10 campuses, but potentially across broader subsets of universities or disciplines and to use this data to pinpoint roadblocks to recruitment of women and under-represented minorities in STEM” (“Project Outcomes Report”). The second part was a series of five systemwide Roundtable meetings, on five different UC campuses. Involvement of faculty and administrators, including those active in shared governance, meant that the Roundtables could facilitate conversations across groups, campuses, and disciplines, conversations that would lead to effective attention to diversity in the peer-review process, in both recruitment and advancement. Program design also ensured communications with the President's Council on Campus Climate, Culture, and Inclusion (CCCI), the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP), and the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE). In other words, the design of the program built on existing networks and partnerships.

The Recruitment Data Analysis Project

This focus on recruitment data included two systemwide seminars and led to the establishment of UC Recruit.

First Data Seminar

On 8 February 2012, APP sponsored a full day seminar, “Designing, Collecting and Analyzing Data on the Faculty Recruitment Process,” in Oakland. Over 70 people attended, including faculty, deans, vice provosts, department chairs, affirmative action/equal opportunity and diversity officers, information technology experts, and institutional research experts. For the first time, UCOP analysts shared information about the gender and race/ethnicity of faculty search committee members, information not previously put together systemwide. In addition, a data group was created to provide recommendations on key data issues, including definitions of STEM disciplines, race and ethnicity categories, citizenship status, and waivers to recruitment.

Second Data Seminar

On 6 February 2013, the second seminar was held, titled “Increasing UC’s Faculty Diversity through Robust Data Collection and Recruitment Practices.” Over 40 attendees continued the discussion from the prior year and heard about the collection of data on recruitment and retention at UC Berkeley and UC Santa Cruz. The discussion of retention data was the first in a series of conversations that would lead to the multi-campus Faculty Retention and Exit Survey, first conducted in 2015 (see Chapter Five). Also, for the first time, UCOP Academic Personnel and Programs began what has become an annual report on the status of UC faculty in terms of gender and URM status in comparison to the “Peer Eight,” those public and private universities against whom the UC system compares itself: Michigan, Virginia, Illinois, SUNY Buffalo, Harvard, Yale, Stanford, and MIT. For example, in the fall of 2011, UC had 30.5% women, and 8.6% URM; that put UC in second place among the Peer Eight in terms of representation of women and tied for second in URM presence. There was broad agreement, however, that such ranking was small consolation for percentages that fell short of what UC aspired to.

Campus/UCOP Partnership on Establishing UC Recruit

During this time, I also worked with the vice provosts/vice chancellors of academic personnel from all campuses on the establishment of UC Recruit on UC’s 10 campuses. The VP/VC group requested that UCOP coordinate the process, and UC Provost and Executive Vice President Larry Pitts committed funding beyond the campus shares to jump-start the all-campus implementation of the recruitment system that had been created at UC Irvine. The development of UC Recruit was funded by the campuses and UCOP, but the UC ADVANCE PAID award and the data seminars in particular provided the forum for refining the expanding system. Notably, there was significant overlap between those designing the UC Recruit platform and those leading the grant work—thus the two projects were entwined from the start.¹

A key goal in the development of UC Recruit was to promote the collection of comparable data systemwide to enable a better understanding of when departments and campuses succeeded in recruiting more diverse faculty and what we could understand from such successes. As summarized by program evaluator Dr. Marc Goulden, “this effort is attempting to look in the black box of the faculty hiring search process to better understand the underlying dynamics at work” (“Annual Report: Year 1,” p. 26). UC Recruit remains a key tool in UC’s continuing efforts to analyze faculty recruitment. Future sec-

1. See the UC Recruit Project Site for additional details of the development of UC Recruit.

tions of this Chronicle will detail how UC Recruit has played a key role in UC's ability to measure and analyze faculty recruitment decisions and outcomes. In particular, UC Recruit was essential to the establishment of the Advancing Faculty Diversity program initiated in 2016 (see Chapter Six).

A direct outcome of UC ADVANCE PAID's involvement in the implementation of UC Recruit was the Search Committee Chair Survey. Based on the information gathered at the first Roundtable, researchers at UC Berkeley took a survey piloted on their campus and developed this survey for systemwide use through UC Recruit. The key was to determine whether the "best practices" for recruiting a more diverse faculty that were widely touted in the literature (but rarely measured) actually worked. (See additional details on Roundtable 1 below.)

Five Systemwide Roundtable Convenings

UC ADVANCE PAID or "Meeting the California Challenge" was most visible on the campuses through its five Roundtable convenings. Detailed information about the Roundtables is available on the APP website. Below, I provide introductory information about the design of the Roundtables, evidence of their success, and how they have provided the groundwork for subsequent efforts to both diversify the faculty and manage issues of inclusion and equity.

Why Roundtables?

The Roundtables were seen as a way to build on UC's tradition of multi-campus conversations about the challenge of diversity, such as the 2006 President's Summit. As outlined in the program proposal, the Roundtables would take advantage of UC's unique structure in two ways: 1) there would be post-meeting follow-up through already established multi-campus groups—the executive vice chancellors/provosts, the vice provosts/vice chancellors of academic personnel, the chief diversity officers, etc. and 2) each Roundtable would be based, in part, on relevant systemwide data. As Dr. Goulden put it in his summative evaluation, "Since the UC system maintains particular strength in the area of empirical approaches to equity-related work, these new initiatives should at a minimum feature data-driven advocacy and interventions that can help us to realize our shared vision of blending all phases of diversity and excellence throughout our world-class institution" ("Final Evaluation," p. 44).

Goals and Key Features of the Roundtables

Each Roundtable was designed around a common set of components: a planning committee with representatives from APP and from the host campus(es); goals tailored to the specific Roundtable; greetings from key campus and systemwide leaders; a research-based keynote address; a data-driven set of presentations, in both panels and breakout sessions; opportunity for conversation and networking among participants; accompanying documents, distributed in advance of the events, including a detailed agenda, a list of attendees, a bibliography of research relevant to the Roundtable topic, and selected research readings. The planning for these Roundtables, therefore, involved complex prior arrangements and careful coordination. In fact, over 70 individuals took part in planning the events (two data seminars and 5 Roundtable seminars). Attendee lists record 595 attendees. The Roundtables began with 60 attendees at the first one and built to 115 (Roundtable 4) and 119 (Roundtable 5). I attribute the increase in participation to the quality of the events and our ability to build a committed systemwide network willing to devote time to the diversity work. Participation was also facilitated by having the travel costs covered by the NSF award. What follows next is a brief overview of each of the five Roundtables. Hopefully this information can inform similarly complex efforts in the future.

Roundtable 1: 11 April 2012

“Using Research and Data to Improve the Faculty Search Process in STEM.”

Sponsors and location: UC Berkeley and UC San Francisco (event on the Berkeley campus). 60 attendees. Keynote: Leadership panel of Chancellor Linda Katehi (UC Davis), Chancellor Susan Desmond-Hellman (UC San Francisco), and UC Provost and Executive Vice President Larry Pitts (UCOP). Goals: 1) to learn how academic leadership can support efforts to diversify the STEM faculty; 2) to learn about empirically-based research on search practices; 3) to examine and evaluate a list of search practices from the time of the specification of the position to choosing a short list and a finalist; 4) to create a research plan to gather empirically-based evidence of best practices to improve search outcomes throughout the UC system; and 5) to take the key elements of the discussion back to campuses.

In the morning, sessions provided a blend of personal experience as well as “empirically-based research.” The keynote panel of leaders spoke of the role of diversity in their career paths as well as “success stories;” and, in another panel, three scholars, all of whom served on the Research Scholars Advisory Board (RSAB), synthesized current trends in the research on faculty hiring, covering a wide range of national studies (these scholars also provided par-

ticipants with a curated bibliography on search processes). The afternoon sessions were interactive, ending with the participants drawing up a list of next steps for UC ADVANCE PAID. These participants asked the program “to collect data on the effectiveness of various ‘best practices’ on diversifying the faculty,” reflecting the effect of particular interventions (“Annual Report: Year 1,” p. 17). The Office of Faculty Equity and Welfare at UC Berkeley took up this task, developing the list of possible interventions created during the day, and using the list to revise their pilot survey for search committee chairs for systemwide use. As of 2022, all ten campuses were participating in the use of this survey. In addition, each campus member of the Steering Committee filled out a post-Roundtable survey on how interventions in the search process were currently in use on their campus.

Thirty-eight of the sixty participants completed a brief evaluation of the Roundtable. When asked how informative the research-based panel was, 83% rated it excellent or above average. When asked for an overall rating of the day, 91% rated it as excellent or above average, with comments such as “Great opportunity to discuss the issues, review data, identify new data needs and opportunities to analyze information” and “There is clearly a strong need for more discussions like these” (“Annual Report: Year 1,” p. 18). Those of us organizing the day were very pleased with how well we had met our goals for the day; informal feedback let us know that attendees were already planning on attending the second Roundtable.

Roundtable 2: 17 October 2012

“Building Capacity for Institutional Transformation in the Twenty-First Century: Women of Color in STEM and SBS Fields.” Sponsor and location: UC Irvine. 99 attendees. Keynote: Dr. Cecilia Conrad, Vice President and Dean, Pomona College. Goals: 1) to provide a context for Institutional Transformation; 2) to equip faculty, administrators, and graduate student leaders to be agents on behalf of Institutional Transformation; and 3) to improve the recruitment of and climate for women of color in STEM and SBS (social and behavioral sciences) fields.

Attendance for Roundtable 2 was up 50% from that of Roundtable 1, as the process for communicating to targeted participants was refined in Year 2 of the program. This refinement included charging the Steering Committee member from each campus with putting together a campus delegation. Michael Drake, then the Chancellor at UC Irvine, gave welcome remarks, along with UC Provost and Executive Vice President Aimee Dorr.

For Roundtable 2, as well as Roundtables 4 and 5, there was a comprehensive report, synthesizing the various conversations and presentations of the day. This Roundtable 2 report was particularly well designed as it pro-

vided a summary around “the problem,” “the pipeline,” “definitions of STEM or STEM++,” and “solutions”—both those already tried and those proposed in the course of the day. The report, authored by UC Irvine graduate student Kelly Ward, is available on the Roundtable website. Details below draw from this report.

The day was built around two presentations; the first was by Dr. Yolanda Moses (Associate Vice Chancellor, UC Riverside) who framed the day by noting the importance of the focus on both race and gender. Key pre-readings also allowed participants to review the 1976 study “The Double Bind: The price of being a minority woman in science” by Malcolm, Hall, and Brown as well as the follow-up study from 2011, “Inside the Double Bind: A synthesis of empirical research on undergraduate and graduate women of color in science, technology, engineering and mathematics,” by Ong, Wright, Espinosa, and Orfield. Dr. Cecilia Conrad’s keynote—“What Does Science Tell Us About Broadening the Participation of Women of Color in STEM/SBS Fields?”—pointed to the importance of data in understanding the pipeline and provided a useful schematic of the barriers to progression at four decision points for potential under-represented faculty—the choice of a major, the move from the bachelor’s degree to the doctorate, the move to a faculty position, and the persistence to tenure and promotion.

The day also included concurrent breakout sessions and panels. Many of the issues under discussion were present in later Roundtables: the importance of addressing climate issues and white privilege; the importance of thinking about STEM in partnership with other disciplines, particularly SBS; ways in which attention to teaching can reduce barriers for women of color as well as under-represented students; the need to hear from graduate students and post-doctoral scholars; the importance of mentoring; and the need to reward translational research. Dr. Conrad underlined the importance of accountability in noting that responsibility for organizational diversity must be linked to real consequences.

Over the day, participants identified specific gaps in research (the report includes a list of twelve gaps). On the list are some of the issues pursued at later Roundtable convenings: the need to disaggregate data to look at the double bind of gender and race; studying the career arc and the possible presence of a “service burden”; and identification of what fosters resiliency for women of color (“Systemwide Roundtable [2] Report,” p. 7).

Evaluations were completed by 55 of the 99 attendees. Ninety-two percent ranked the day as excellent or very good; 93% rated Dr. Moses’s presentation as very or somewhat informative; and 100% of respondents rated Dr. Conrad’s presentation as very or somewhat informative (“Annual Report: Year 2,”

p. 4). From my perspective, the high quality of the keynote and the carefully organized day produced an awareness that constituted new territory for many attendees—the double bind.

Roundtable 3: 10 April 2013

“Mentoring Faculty in an Inclusive Climate: Supporting Women and URM STEM Faculty at UC.” Sponsor and location: UC Riverside. 89 attendees. Keynote: Dr. Shirley Malcolm, American Association for the Advancement of Science. Goals: 1) to understand the particular mentoring needs for women and under-represented minority faculty in STEM; 2) to learn about a mosaic of mentoring models fitted to various career stages in STEM fields (postdocs, assistant professors, mid-career faculty) and provide UC campuses relevant research and models to build effective mentoring programs; 3) to share successes and to identify gaps in current UC mentoring efforts; and 4) to establish mentoring as a tool for dealing with retention and climate issues in STEM departments, clarifying that effective mentoring benefits senior as well as junior faculty.

For Roundtable 3, materials were further refined for participants in advance of the event, including two new items—a Data Report and Speaker Biographies—in addition to the agenda, a bibliography on mentoring, pre-readings, and an attendee list. The documents underscore the UC ADVANCE PAID goal of being data-driven and research rich. The data report was prepared by APP; it included a census of faculty by race/ethnicity and gender and also introduced an expanded way of accounting for the citizenship status of the Ladder-rank faculty. Since nearly one quarter of such faculty are not US citizens, these expanded data were an important change in reporting on the identities of the faculty. In addition, the data report included information on the career arc of Ladder-rank faculty; in particular the time to tenure by gender and by race/ethnicity (the numbers were too small to present gender and race together). The day’s discussions were grounded in data that showed both female faculty and URM faculty advanced to tenure at slower rates than men or white and Asian faculty.

Dr. Shirley Malcolm’s keynote address began with a personal account of how she benefitted from mentoring in her own career. In turn, this discussion paved the way for an active learning session in which participants tracked their own mentoring “history.” It was disappointing that, in 2013, UC did not have a robust and comprehensive mentoring program, but participants did highlight the development of some successful programs on their campuses, including those in the health sciences. One session highlighted the built-in mentoring of the President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program, a process that remains a successful model not only at UC but nationwide. The focus on men-

toring has continued in the Advancing Faculty Diversity program where the focus on both recruitment and improved climate and retention has included mentoring as a necessary component of ensuring that early-career and mid-career faculty thrive.

Forty-four of the 89 attendees completed evaluations. Ninety-eight percent rated the overall day as excellent or very good. One hundred percent found Dr. Malcolm’s keynote as very or somewhat informative (“Annual Report: Year 2,” pp. 6–7). At the end of this third Roundtable, I could see the advantage of having a “formula” for organizing the day. That efficiency allowed the planning team to focus on content and what would encourage attendees to take part in productive discussion.

Roundtable 4: 23 October 2013

“The Role of Contributions to Diversity in Faculty Hiring and Academic Review.” Sponsor and location: UC San Diego. 115 attendees. Keynote: Dr. Pradeep Khosla, Chancellor, UC San Diego and Dr. Linda Katehi, Chancellor, UC Davis. Goals: 1) to discuss the relationship of academic excellence and contributions to diversity in STEM disciplines; 2) to develop well-grounded measures in evaluating and rewarding contributions to diversity; and 3) to gain a greater understanding of faculty roles in research, teaching, and service in building the pipeline of under-represented minorities and women in STEM.

Roundtable 4 took on the core issue of the relationship between excellence and diversity. Remarks by the two chancellors, including the keynote address by Chancellor Khosla, initiated this discussion with a focus on three benefits of diversity: the benefits of diversity to the US, the benefits of diversity to science, and the benefits of diversity to students. The chancellors both noted that a more diverse faculty leads to more innovation and scientific breakthroughs and stronger engagement with all students. Details of Roundtable 4 are found in the report written by graduate student Laura E. Rogers.

The Roundtable also drew heavily from various kinds of data and information. The Data Report for this Roundtable, compiled by APP and including information from UC Davis and UC Berkeley, had campus-level and systemwide information on the gender and race/ethnicity of members of the Committees on Academic Personnel (CAP). It also included information on promotion to full professor with disaggregation by discipline (UC Berkeley) and promotion to full as well as merit advancements by gender and race/ethnicity (UC Davis). Such information on faculty advancement through the ranks was paired nicely with a panel of current and former CAP chairs. Individual speakers also presented additional data, including climate assessments and the increasing rate at which faculty were submitting statements of contributions to diversity.

The day was a successful mix of comments from faculty, researchers, and academic administrators who spoke to the all-important issue of the criteria by which faculty are evaluated, both at the point of hire and throughout their UC careers. An experiential session had table-based discussion and ratings of sample statements of contributions to diversity; participation was lively. By the end of the Roundtable, there had been probing discussion of how contributions to diversity were used in recruitment, in merit review, and in the APM 210-1-d policy. This discussion of the use of contributions to diversity statements was among the most productive I have heard in the last decade. Its particular value lay in the broad range of participants—faculty, Senate leaders, researchers in faculty diversity, staff working in diversity, and academic administrators at all levels (chair, dean, vice provost, vice chancellor, provost, and chancellor). During the open discussion, both support of and resistance to the use of contributions to diversity statements were clearly articulated by participants.

As summarized in the Roundtable 4 report, there were three main priorities shared by the participants in assessing how to move this conversation forward: 1) the need to focus on contributions to diversity as more than an individual issue, but as a community issue; 2) the need to change questions and narratives around faculty diversity and to frame the conversation around compatible needs for excellence and diversity; and 3) the need to get to a place where valuing diversity is not simply incentivized but rather a matter of core daily business (“Systemwide Roundtable [4] Report,” p. 7). In looking back, what strikes me is that we all profited by being a part of a conversation where foundational issues came into sharper focus, because policy supporters listened to skeptics, and vice versa.

Roundtable 5: 23 April 2014

“Workplace Climate: Assessments and Interventions to Improve Diversity Among STEM Faculty.” Sponsor and location: UC Davis. 119 attendees. Keynote: Dr. Meg Urry: Professor of Physics and Astronomy, Yale University. Goals: 1) to examine the issue of workplace climate and the impact climate has on the recruitment, retention, and success of diverse STEM faculty; 2) to examine the varied dimensions of workplace climate, the factors that influence it, and how the experience of climate varies by gender and race/ethnicity; and 3) to equip participants with tools, resources, and strategies for assessing and improving workplace climate for STEM faculty.

Roundtable 5 took advantage of lessons learned in prior Roundtables and resulted in targeted readings and a carefully selected bibliography as well as both UC data (systemwide) and national data of several sorts. In addition to excellent UC presenters, the program included guest speakers from Yale,

George Washington, the University of Texas—Pan American, and Harvard. All documents, research, and data—as well as the Roundtable Report, written by graduate student Michelle Rossi—are available online. The Roundtable Report accurately described what had become a “template” for the events: “Roundtables have consistently provided a forum to debate research, define best practices, and build consensus on how to move forward as a system committed to the integration of diversity in the never-ending pursuit of excellence” (“Systemwide Roundtable [5] Report,” p. 2).

Before the keynote address, Chancellor Katehi and I also framed Roundtable 5 as an event informed by the prior roundtables. She credited UC ADVANCE PAID with providing “structure and focus in the systemwide UC effort to lead the nation in excellence” (“Systemwide Roundtable [5] Report,” p. 2). I added good news about the increase in the hiring of diverse faculty in the two years of the program and presented data from the 2012 UC Systemwide Climate Survey to show that women and under-represented faculty reported less confidence than men and white faculty that “tenure standards/promotion standards are applied equally to all faculty” (“Systemwide Roundtable [5] Report,” p. 3). Professor Urry, the keynote speaker, reported lessons learned in her decades of advocating for increasing diversity among scientists. In particular, she focused on the challenges of dealing with highly trained and successful people (senior faculty) in improving academic climate. She characterized this as the “25 Brain” situation in which a single “brain” appears to operate for 25 faculty members—“it does not occur to those in the historical majority to reflect on the privileges they have; they are less than reflective, fail to self-examine, and are thus unable to see their behavior in a pattern” (“Systemwide Roundtable [5] Report,” p. 4).

The bulk of the agenda was devoted to three panels whose members discussed “tools” that could be used to assess climate and interventions that might lead to improved climates. First was a panel focused on using quantitative and qualitative climate assessments. The panel made clear that climate assessments provide useful information, but all also stressed that such data is useless unless the institution devotes resources to addressing any negative indicators. Second was a panel focused on the use of interactive theatre in training faculty to recognize and respond to issues of bias. And third was a panel of those with experience in using department “site visits” to document and educate on issues of excellence and climate.

At the end of the day, participants developed a list of “take-aways” summarizing essentials for putting these tools and practices to work on UC campuses: vision, commitment, leadership, training, and accountability. Perhaps the biggest take-away from the day’s discussions was the importance of focusing at the department level and supplying department chairs with tools to improve climate. In the final sessions, the participants were also acutely

aware that this was the final Roundtable; and, in response, there was a vigorous call that the Roundtables continue. Participants noted that any costs for continuance would likely be a fragment of the costs of ignoring current issues in climate and inclusion. The Steering Committee did follow-up with a request to the President for the sustainability of UC ADVANCE PAID, as detailed in a following section.

It is notable that the core components of the next systemwide intervention in issues of diversity, equity, inclusion, and faculty were all present in Roundtable 5. Those core components included the focus on department chairs, the use of interactive theatre, and use of relevant data on local climate issues (see Chapter Four).

Online archives of UC ADVANCE PAID do not include the participant evaluations of Roundtables 4 and 5. The vigorous efforts to continue the program do, however, speak to the strong opinion that this series of Roundtables was exactly what the Office of the President should be doing to support campus efforts in faculty diversity, equity, and inclusion. Efforts to continue the work of UC ADVANCE PAID are detailed below in the section on “Sustainability.”

My own assessment of the Roundtables is that their unalloyed success was due to an iterative process that involved so many of those leading key efforts to build and retain a strong faculty on the campuses. While each Roundtable had a distinctive subject, conversations deepened in each succeeding event, as the community provided not only support (a very important result) but also new ideas and refined approaches to seeking change.

Governance and Evaluation

In addition to the Roundtables themselves, the success of UC ADVANCE PAID was due, in large part, to its two-part governance structure as well as to a careful evaluation and assessment plan.

Steering Committee

The Steering Committee was led by UC Davis Chancellor Linda Katehi and included one campus representative appointed by each UC chancellor. In addition, the chairs of two systemwide Academic Senate committees served as members (University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity [UCAADE] and University Committee on Academic Personnel [UCAP]). The campus representatives served as the key connection to the campuses and had responsibility for recruiting faculty and administrators for the Roundtables, as well as responsibility for supervising logistics for the

Roundtable on their campus. These representatives included vice provosts, associate vice chancellors, deans, and directors who collectively brought a wealth of experience in managing campus-based diversity initiatives. With one exception, the initial appointees were all tenured faculty members. The program co-PIs, UCOP support staff, and I served ex-officio.

The Steering Committee served an important advisory role for the project and met in person twice per year at the five Roundtables. Under Chancellor Katehi’s leadership, the committee took an active role in advising on the design of the Roundtables and in specifying the development of new data sets for UC. The Committee also played an important role in proposing a plan to President Napolitano for the sustainability of the program (details below). Having Chancellor Katehi take such an active leadership role also ensured that the UC chancellors were alerted to the UC ADVANCE PAID activities.

Research Scholars Advisory Board

To ensure the close connection of the program to current relevant research, UC ADVANCE PAID had a Research Scholars Advisory Board (RSAB) that met periodically throughout the life of the program and advised the program. There were two kinds of expertise needed: 1) scholars who could help develop appropriate methodology for analysis of the faculty recruitment data, and 2) scholars who could advise about developing Roundtable speakers, research-based readings, and goal setting for the Roundtables. Many of them were featured on the Roundtable agendas, presenting their own research or summarizing that of others. The RSAB members (1 or 2 per campus) were either UC STEM faculty or UC faculty with research expertise in gender, race, ethnicity and STEM issues, especially those with expertise in fields such as higher education, law, sociology, and psychology. Their full participation in the project ensured all discussions, especially those at the Roundtables, were research-based. The RSAB was chaired by Professor Judith Stepan-Norris (UC Irvine).

The Steering Committee and the RSAB were key factors in the high quality of the three years the program and provided a powerful voice in the campuses’ request for continuing funding when NSF funding ended in 2014.

Sustainability

On 22 July 2014, the members of the UC ADVANCE PAID Steering Committee and the Research Scholars Advisory Board wrote to President Napolitano, proposing a sustainability plan for the program. This was a follow-up to a joint meeting of the two groups earlier in the summer on the UC Davis

campus. The letter to the President runs over seven pages and makes four recommendations for sustaining the program, in addition to summarizing the accomplishments of UC ADVANCE PAID. This letter notes that “The UC ADVANCE PAID program has played a key role in building networks and tools to meet the core UC diversity mission and its achievements provide a powerful springboard for the next phase of institutional transformation” (p. 1). In addition, the authors find that UC ADVANCE PAID has achieved two important goals. First, it has established “a robust system of data collection and analysis within the UC Recruit application that promotes transparency and equity in faculty hiring”; and second, it has “established a collaborative cross-campus network of faculty and administrators to identify critical issues, evidence-based solutions, and implementation strategies for increasing equity in recruitment, advancement and retention of faculty” (p. 2).

These affirmations of the program’s success were followed by four recommendations: 1) continue to support and develop UC Recruit; 2) establish the UC Institute for the Faculty of the Future; 3) establish system-wide resources for improving climate in educational work settings; and 4) catalyze the system-wide adoption of evidence-based practices that promote equity and diversity in the hiring process for both ladder rank and non-ladder faculty (pp. 2–5). Especially exciting was the proposal for an Institute for the Faculty of the Future: “This system-wide research institute will search for answers to the questions that will define the future faculty of the Public Research University by facilitating theoretically grounded research, the application of research results to policy development, and the dissemination of research and policy innovations nationwide” (p. 3).

President Napolitano’s response, copied to the chancellors and Academic Senate leadership, accepted the shared goal of long-term commitment to “supporting efforts that would lead to a more diverse faculty” and focused on a response to each of the four recommendations:

- She highlighted Provost and Executive Vice President Aimee Dorr’s additional one-time funding of \$100K for increasing the capacity of UC Recruit.
- She asked for a budget that would support the Institute for the Faculty of the Future, for review through appropriate UCOP funding processes.
- She highlighted her new President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP) Initiative, including a theatre-based leadership seminar for chairs and deans, suggesting that after its initial year, such a training program could be considered for ongoing funding.

- She asked for additional information about what it would cost to fund an additional annual roundtable to build on the momentum of the UC ADVANCE PAID conferences.

Unfortunately, no additional funding was provided to extend the UC ADVANCE PAID program, even though Chancellor Katehi took a budget to the Council of Chancellors as requested. Perhaps the biggest loss was that an Institute on the Faculty for the Future was not funded; and sadly, momentum for systemwide partnerships in developing research about faculty has never been as strong as it was when the RSAB was active. However, funding for UC Recruit continues to this day, shared among the ten campuses, APP, and Agricultural and Natural Resources. Thus, the UC Recruit platform is clearly institutionalized for UC. UC Recruit also has a governing board designed to deal with operational issues. The Evaluating Equity in Faculty Recruitment project has continued the research-based analysis of UC Recruit data, through NSF and Spencer Foundation funding (additional detail in Appendix C). And UCOP funding supported the successful interactive theatre project (2014-2015) that the President mentioned and which will be summarized in Chapter Four.

Evaluation

Dr. Goulden (UC Berkeley) served as the UC ADVANCE PAID program evaluator. He provided both formative and summative analysis in a final report dated 15 November 2014 (this report was in addition to analyses from the prior two annual reports and reports for three of the Roundtables). This final report included analyses of the impact of all parts of the program, but especially the five Roundtables—and was based on input gathered from each campus as well as on other information collected during the life of the program. While Dr. Goulden acknowledges the difficulty of tracing exactly what changes in faculty demographics can be directly tied to the UC ADVANCE PAID program, he quotes from the conclusion of the Steering Committee/RSAB letter to the President that “the UC ADVANCE PAID Program generated the knowledge, organizational supports, and interpersonal networks that are essential prerequisites for significant institutional change” (“Final Evaluation,” p. 5).

He also speaks to the impact of UC ADVANCE PAID by summarizing how it embraces, simultaneously, two approaches in meeting its goals: the Problem-Solution Approach and the Vision Approach. In discussing the Problem-Solution Approach, he draws from program events, speakers, documents, and websites and lists six “problems” the Program revealed: implicit bias; chilly

climate and microaggressions; low levels of encouragement/support; lack of access to White/Male networks; and lack of true support for diversity efforts. He then summarizes the solutions proposed, discussed, analyzed, and—in many cases—implemented to address such problems: analysis of administrative datasets; climate surveys; interviews and focus groups; site visits; and experiments. This “problem-solution” framing of the program is especially helpful, when looking back on its effectiveness from the vantage point of 2023. Because of the community/network and knowledgebase established by UC ADVANCE PAID, UC moved more prominently into an “experimental” focus in the years after 2014.

Applying the second framework, the “Vision Approach,” Goulden is able to show that the UC ADVANCE PAID program allowed UC to adopt a leadership role and—as the letter to the President put it—to “establish UC as the national leader in achieving excellence and inclusion” (“Final Evaluation,” p. 19). Because of its unique system, UC could be ambitious about using its experiments and strategies to push for progress both inside and outside of UC. He notes, for example, that the last three Roundtables focused on interventions, enabled by the data analyses drawn from UC Recruit: “the new cross-campus tracking and hiring system initially developed at UC Irvine is unquestionably transforming the system’s approach to faculty hiring and analysis of data patterns and search practices” (“Final Evaluation,” pp. 21–22). Goulden also turns to the Steering Committee/RSAB letter for a succinct summary of what the “vision” of the program is/was: “This system-wide research institute will search for answers to the questions that will define the future faculty of the Public Research University by facilitating theoretically grounded research, the application of research results to policy development, and the dissemination of research and policy innovations nationwide. It will capitalize on two essential but scarce resources that currently are aligned in the UC: a rich stock of data and the human talent necessary to utilize it wisely” (“Final Evaluation,” p. 29; Katehi and Stepan-Norris letter to Napolitano, p. 3).

Goulden did an excellent job of synthesizing the way each campus characterized the impact of the program in their progress towards faculty diversity and academic climate, noting, among other findings, that 8 of 10 campuses had increased their programming in mentoring and that the conversation on use of contributions to diversity statements was generating increasing attention. He uses a comment from UC Riverside to summarize the broader impact of the Roundtables: “[the roundtables] . . . brought . . . people who had been toiling on their respective campuses, often in isolation, to make change happen together It was exhilarating and reaffirming to know that there are colleagues and allies on other campuses in the UC that are working toward the same common goals of access, inclusion and success for fac-

ulty in the STEM disciplines” (“Final Evaluation,” p. 38). He also summarizes the common campus response that the Roundtables were, in themselves, training events: “The roundtables were extremely well organized and carefully designed, providing attendees with high quality expert speakers with a range of different research and practitioner skills. Furthermore, a small subset of carefully chosen readings and data materials were circulated in advance, including lists of recommended additional readings, and most of the roundtables were summarized in reports sponsored by the grant PI and her office” (“Final Evaluation,” pp. 38–39). Such analysis highlights the substantial improvement in faculty attitudes towards diversity efforts engendered by the roundtables.

Finally, Goulden noted that the UC ADVANCE PAID program navigated the often tense relationship between UC campuses and UCOP: “There can be tension between central-sponsored efforts and local entities; but in this case there was an absence of any observable schism, fractiousness, or resistance. Given the considerable expertise with which this grant was conducted, the feelings of good-will and synergy seem intact and speak to the viability of future collaborative efforts that can result in long-term equity gains” (“Final Evaluation,” p. 41). APP took particular pride in having fostered this sense of a shared mission.

National Presence of UC ADVANCE PAID

The NSF support for this program allowed me, as the PI, and several campus representatives on the Steering Committee and RSAB the chance to share components of the program in national venues—including the NSF ADVANCE program annual conferences. Presentations connected to the program include the following:

- “Forging Partnerships to Achieve and Sustain Institutional Change.” Panel including Kim Shauman (UC Davis) and Susan Carlson (UCOP). Association of Public and Land Grant Universities annual convention, Orlando, FL. 2 November 2014.
- “Policies for Leveling the Playing Field.” Susan Carlson (UCOP). Women in Engineering Proactive Network Conference. Minneapolis, MN. 22 June 2014.
- “Meeting the California Challenge: The University of California’s Partnerships to Advance Faculty in STEM.” Panel including Susan Carlson (UCOP), Douglas Haynes (UC Irvine), Juan Meza, (UC Merced), Yolanda Moses (UC Riverside), Sheila O’Rourke (PPFP and UC Berkeley), and Mau Stanton (UC Davis). Keeping our Faculty of Color Symposium. Minneapolis, MN. April 2013.

- “UC ADVANCE PAID: Meeting the California Challenge.” Poster session. ADVANCE PI Workshop. Alexandria, VA. March 2013.

The dissemination of UC ADVANCE PAID activities and successes has been a major step for the University of California in claiming the role of a national leader in this vital enterprise.

Chapter Four

“Fostering Inclusive Excellence: Strategies and Tools for Department Chairs and Deans,” 2014–2015

Janet Napolitano was appointed President of the University of California in September of 2013, and one of her early initiatives was to support the existing President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP). Much of her \$5M initiative funding supported PPFP directly by endorsing additional hires of fellows onto the faculty. This initiative created—for the first time—STEM faculty start-up packages that included UCOP/PPFP contributions.

The initiative also promoted the success of PPFP fellows once on the faculty by providing mentoring resources as well as training for those leading academic units. There were two parts to the focus on success, both under the title of “Resources for Mentoring and Development.” First, the funding supported campus memberships in the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (NCFDD) and its “Faculty Success” bootcamp program. Both of these NCFDD programs focus on mentoring and coaching and provide a “safe” community to help new faculty succeed. Funding for these NCFDD programs for new faculty hired from PPFP went directly to the campuses to cover the membership costs. Second, initiative funding of \$207K was allocated to support a series of seminars for academic leaders, what became “Fostering Inclusive Excellence: Strategies and Tools for Department Chairs and Deans.” Members of the President’s Cabinet discussed the initiative in its early stage and reiterated the importance of creating inclusive academic environments for UC’s increasingly diverse faculty, including new PPFP fellows who were joining the faculty. This goal was summarized in President Napolitano’s 28 January 2014 letter to the UC chancellors about the initiative: “the

Initiative will develop training materials and facilitators to lead training on implicit biases, sub-cultural differences, and the role of departmental practices and cultures in academic success” (p. 3).

Academic Personnel and Programs was the natural home of the extensive initiative, because APP is also the home of PFP. The timing was fortuitous since APP was just concluding the UC ADVANCE PAID program (Chapter Three). With the last Roundtable in April of 2014, we had built an internal infrastructure to support systemwide diversity-related programming at campus locations. The PFP Initiative budget for “Fostering Inclusive Excellence” seminars for deans and chairs (just over \$207K) supported a half-time program director for the seminars (41% of the budget), but most of the work of coordinating the program fell to existing staff in APP, although additional funding for staffing was not part of the initiative budget. The rest of the budget went to support the “theatre intervention” at the heart of the training program, including support for the faculty artistic director and MFA and PhD students from UC San Diego (22% of the budget). Additional support went to support cost-sharing with the campuses on the food and rental costs of the leadership seminars (16% of the budget), and to other miscellaneous costs for printing, supplies and speaker honoraria (4%). As with the UC ADVANCE PAID program, significant programming was developed from a very modest budget (additional budget details in “President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (PFP) Initiative Report,” December 2015).

Germination of the Program: Why an Interactive Theatre Seminar?

As noted in Chapter Three, the UC ADVANCE PAID Roundtable in Davis was organized around a discussion of tools campuses could use to move the needle on faculty diversity efforts. UC Davis members on the planning committee were interested in featuring interactive theatre as one of these tools, as was Professor Emily Roxworthy (UC San Diego) who was serving on the ADVANCE PAID Steering Committee as the chair of the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE). The final program at Davis featured Jeffrey Steiger, Artistic Director of the Center for the Application and Scholarship of Theater at George Washington University, who offered a riveting presentation that included both video clips and live interaction—all demonstrating the compelling way in which theatre can be used to bring to life the daily presence in higher education of race- and gender-based bias as well as routine microaggressions that characterize the academic workplace. That session was highly rated by participants.

At this time, in 2014, the University of Michigan’s interactive theatre project, a part of Michigan’s Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT), was already well known throughout the national NSF ADVANCE community for its innovative and effective use of theatre in raising issues about bias, climate, and related matters with STEM faculty communities. Steiger was the Director of Michigan’s CRLT Theatre program for some years. He also played important roles in the development of interactive theatre programs at the University of New Hampshire, George Washington University, and other institutions. Cornell University was also known by ADVANCE participants for its interactive theatre, having made it available to other universities via CD for a small cost.¹ And at UC, the ADVANCE program at UC Irvine had also produced a theatre scenario along with training materials, available via CD. These materials were developed and copyrighted in 2007 as a part of UC Irvine’s “Equity Workshop Topics: New Materials for Mentoring” program to “increase mentoring at all levels within the academic environment” (CD cover jacket). In my role as the PI for the Iowa State University ADVANCE program (2006–2012), I had developed interactive theatre scripts and events, based on the interactive model of CRLT. Given my own background in drama and theatre, I was excited to include a UC production of interactive events as a part of the PFP initiative. All of this prior use of interactive theatre is relevant precedent for the UC “Fostering Inclusive Excellence” seminars, but the work of Michigan’s CRLT is clearly the most important background, given Steiger’s inspiration for the UC work. He and two colleagues, Danielle LaVaque-Manty and Abigail J. Stewart, have published a useful summary of the Michigan process, “Interactive Theater: Raising Issues about the Climate with Science Faculty.”

The Initiative had an advisory group consisting of PFP Director Sheila O’Rourke, Chair of the PFP Advisory Board and UC Berkeley Professor Patricia Baquedano-Lopez, and UC San Diego Professor Emily Roxworthy, in her role as chair of UCAADE. The design and implementation of the seminars fell to three people: Roxworthy, who took on the writing of the script and management of the actors; Edith Ng, a part-time appointee with expertise in diversity training who joined APP to direct the seminar development; and me, managing the connections to campus faculty and administration and working with the APP staff on logistics. Both Roxworthy and Ng had expertise crucial for the project, including prior experience with interactive theatre. Roxworthy, then on faculty in the UC San Diego Department of Theatre and Dance, was familiar with interactive theatre projects as a result of her scholarly work. She also brought to the program her experience of faculty meetings and merit review at UC. These experiences as a UC faculty member, her sys-

1. Roxworthy writes about the Michigan and Cornell programs in her book *The Theatrical Professoriate*, see pp. 13–14, 161–167.

temwide leadership in issues of faculty diversity, and her eagerness to involve UC graduate students in the project were critical in our ability to bring a high-energy live performance to each of the ten UC campuses in the course of a single year. Roxworthy's description of the interactive portion of the seminars is included in her book, *The Theatrical Professoriate: Contemporary Higher Education and its Academic Dramas*. Ng was in charge of curriculum development for the seminars, served as moderator for portions of the seminar, and had worked with Michael Mansfield (UC Berkeley) on interactive theatre developed for student and faculty audiences on the Berkeley campus. Mansfield was also an early advisor for the project.

Roxworthy began her development of the script by interviewing "current and former University of California faculty who were women and people of color" (*The Theatrical Professoriate*, p. 173). She and the group of UC San Diego MFA and PhD students she brought together worked from anonymized transcripts of these interviews to develop the performance script. Before the campus seminars began, the group performed previews before two key groups—a group of faculty leaders at UC San Diego (late spring of 2014) and a group with expertise in facilitating faculty diversity efforts and in performing interactive theatre at UC Berkeley (October 2014). With a script and apparatus adjusted in response to this feedback, the first performance of the theatre intervention, "Ready to Vote?," occurred at lunch, during the 9 October 2014 celebration of the PFPF 30th anniversary, at the Claremont Hotel near the Berkeley campus. In a hotel ballroom at the Claremont Hotel, the troupe of graduate students performed to an audience of over 200—including current PFPF postdoctoral fellows, PFPF fellows turned faculty at UC, and UC chancellors, provosts, deans, and faculty members. The response was enormously instructive.

In the evaluations of the performance, comments on the theatre intervention were a preview of the sensitive work we were undertaking. There were mostly positive and supportive comments, usually short, such as these: "very powerful and informative"; "very provocative and entertaining"; and "very insightful. I learned a lot about what goes on in those meetings!!" But for me the most reflective and useful comments focused on issues of audience and included some uneasiness with the project. Several respondents noted that this was not the right audience for such a presentation, since most attendees are subject to the microaggressions featured in the script on a daily basis and wouldn't profit from seeing them portrayed this way. (I also heard anecdotally that several new faculty members were horrified to think that their faculty community was known to have such inappropriate conversations.) One respondent felt that the theatrical intervention was "framed by a naïve psychological approach that discounted power and politics." Another respondent noted of the event—including the theatre intervention—"the people who

speak need to be held to the minimum standards of academic discourse, where the norm is the rigorous and critical contestation of ideas. This event did not live up to those standards, and because it didn't, it quietly affirmed those things that the interactive drama presentation on Thursday was attempting to contest—the idea that when we talk about diversity, that concept is held to a lower standard of knowledge than other ones in the university.” The performance at the PFPF 30th anniversary meeting included only a small portion of the full seminar design—a design intended to encourage and respond to such critique.² But the full array of responses did remind us of how sensitive this topic is; and, as a result, it set the stage for significant revisions before we took the performance to deans and chairs.

Design of the “Fostering Inclusive Excellence” Leadership Seminars

While the interactive theatre portion of the seminars was the highlight for most attendees, the seminars were carefully designed to fit efficiently into less than four hours, including—along with the interactive theatre portions—a “mini lecture” on microaggressions, discussion of how to address microaggressions as they occur, and a brief primer on campus-level demographic data on faculty as well as systemwide demographic data on UC academic leadership (including deans and chairs).

From the beginning, we decided that the campus-based seminars would be no longer than a half-day, so that busy academic leaders would be able to make time to attend. The seminars ranged in length from 2 hours to 4 hours, with some break for refreshments in the longer, four-hour events (the one two-hour seminar did not provide sufficient time, but was a concession to the campus as the seminar was part of a full-day retreat for all deans, department chairs, and other academic leaders). For most of the seminars, there were 3 hours and 15 minutes of programming. Almost all seminars included a continental breakfast and most also included lunch, usually at the end or in the middle of the event. All but one began in the morning. Beginning in the afternoon was not successful the one time we tried it, as we seemed to catch these leaders with too much else on their minds, and evaluations of the afternoon seminar were the lowest of the ten.

We also took special efforts to highlight the President's support of the seminars. The campuses used a letter from President Napolitano inviting participants—primarily deans and department chairs—to attend the event, and while attendance was not “mandatory,” the President made clear that she and the chancellors expected the deans and chairs to make time for this event. As

2. Evaluations of the event are on file with the PFPF Office.

summarized in the final report, there were a total of 551 attendees on the ten campuses, including 77 deans, 254 chairs, and other academic leaders (executive vice chancellors/provosts, vice provosts, vice chancellors, associate/assistant vice provosts/vice chancellors, associate deans, vice chairs, Academic Senate leaders, and faculty equity advisors).

The format of the leadership seminars was developed in partnership with Academic Personnel Offices and those responsible for leadership in faculty diversity on the campuses. Each campus was responsible for finding the right venue that would facilitate community discussion and could accommodate an actual performance. While the goals of the seminar were altered somewhat to fit the situation of each campus, the goals as stated for the UC Davis seminar on 20 April 2015 are representative: “Seminar Goals: 1) Help participants gain a better understanding of implicit bias and microaggressions and their impact on departmental/school climate; 2) Increase participants’ effectiveness at recognizing and interrupting/addressing microaggressions when they occur; 3) Discuss tools and strategies for developing an inclusive departmental/school climate. Follow-up Goal: Provide online access to tools, resources, and promising practices for developing inclusive departmental/school climates.” With input from the Initiative Advisory Group, we made the decision to offer the seminars in the course of a single year, with the final schedule as follows:

Location	Date
PPFP 30 th Anniversary Celebration Claremont Hotel, Oakland	9 October 2014
UC San Diego	20 October 2014
UC Riverside	29 October 2014
UC Irvine	17 November 2014
UC Santa Cruz	3 December 2014
UC Santa Barbara	23 February 2015
UC Los Angeles	2 April 2015
UC Merced	6 April 2015
UC Davis	20 April 2015
UC San Francisco	4 May 2015
UC Berkeley	21 August 2015

Research-based and Data-driven Foundation: Agenda, Materials, and Tools

The agenda laid out six interlocking components of the “Fostering Inclusive Excellence” leadership seminars:³

- Welcome from campus leader(s), usually the executive vice chancellor/provost or vice provost and a UCOP welcome from me. One campus included a welcome from the Academic Senate.
- Data and research on faculty diversity and academic climate at UC
- Interactive theatre scenario “Ready to Vote?” and discussion
- Subject matter expert mini lecture on microaggressions in the academy
- Small group problem solving (case studies) and discussion
- Conclusion, next steps, and program evaluation.

Additionally, and just as with the UC ADVANCE PAID roundtables, the “Fostering Inclusive Excellence” seminars supplied attendees with selected research on issues of diversity, climate, implicit bias, and microaggressions—both in the course of the seminar and in the materials and tools included in a seminar folder, individualized for each campus. We intended to send a clear message that we were making efficient use of the deans’ and chairs’ day. Materials distributed in the folders included the following items.

A handout with substantial data about the diversity of UC academics. I included in my initial welcome/comments some highlights of the data handout that had been prepared by APP. Here is a summary of the information included in the four-page handout:

- Faculty composition. Systemwide data on Ladder-rank and equivalent faculty (10,186) including breakdown by race/ethnicity and citizenship status, showing “domestic” and “international” breakdown for American Indian/Native American, Black/African American or Black/African, Asian American or Asian, Chicano(a)/Latino(a)/Hispanic, and White. Overall there were 9% URM faculty and 31% women. (For each seminar, the equivalent faculty data was also supplied for faculty at the individual campus. Fall 2014 seminars used fall 2013 numbers and spring 2015 seminars used fall 2014 numbers. Numbers in this example are from fall 2014.)

3. Materials on file with APP and with the author.

- Deans and department chairs composition. Systemwide data on the race/ethnicity and gender of deans (108) showed that deans were 78% White, 8% Black/African American, 7% Chicano(a)/Latino(a)/Hispanic, and 5% Asian American or Asian. For department chairs (461) the breakdown was 81% White, 11% Asian American or Asian, 5% Chicano(a)/Latino(a)/Hispanic, 3% Black/African American, and 0.2% American Indian/Native American. Deans were 28% women and department chairs were 27% women.
- Campus climate. Selected data from the 2013 UC Campus Climate Survey included information on tenure/promotion standards and exclusionary behavior. This information showed that URM faculty were less likely than white faculty to believe that tenure/promotion standards are “applied equally to all faculty.” In addition, one in four faculty respondents reported personal experience with exclusionary behavior, with 57% of those experiencing such behavior citing other faculty members as the source. Women experienced such behavior three times more frequently than men.
- Hiring. A summary of Ladder-rank and equivalent faculty hiring for five years (2009–2014) offered detail on the demographics of those recently hired. URM made up 13.2% of new hires, compared to 9% URM in the overall faculty (fall 2014 data).
- Policy. The handout also reminded attendees that APM policy establishes the importance of “contributions to diversity” in review and hiring and that deans and department chairs have stated responsibilities for diversity, affirmative action, and climate (APM 210, 240, and 245).

In sum, the data provided ample rationale for the seminars and significant incentive to work energetically for change.

Introduction to microaggressions. Seminar materials also included a three-page “definition” of “Microaggressions, Racial” from the *Encyclopedia of Diversity in Education*. The authors were Professor Daniel G. Solorzano (UCLA) and Professor Lindsay Perez Huber (California State University, Long Beach), who alternated in offering a “mini lecture” on microaggressions during the seminar. Given the condensed nature of the overall program, the lectures were limited to 20 minutes, including Q&A, but they clearly demonstrated the kind of research that informed the design of the seminar. Participants found the definition of “microaggressions” useful:

Racial microaggressions are one form of systemic everyday racism used to keep those at the racial margins in their place. Racial microaggressions are (a) subtle verbal and nonverbal assaults directed toward people of color, often carried out automatically or unconsciously; (b) layered assaults, based on a person of color’s race, gender, class, sexuality, language, immigration status, phenotype, accent, or surname; and (c) cumulative assaults that take a psychological and physiological toll on people of color (Solorzano and Huber, p. 1489).

“Tools for Department Chairs and Deans.” This seven-page handout was developed as the seminars were rolled out and was finalized in time for the Santa Barbara seminar in February 2015. Drawing from research on implicit bias and on microaggressions, the handout was designed to give the chairs and deans examples of implicit bias and microaggressions and examples of how to interrupt instances of such destructive comments and assumptions. For example, drawing from the influential research of Derald Sue and others, the charts in the handout name a kind of microaggression, like “myth of meritocracy” or claims of “color blindness” and then supplies “examples” of the microaggressions and the message they send, followed by possible interventions to counter the negative effects of the microaggression. This handout was requested by attendees in all of the fall 2014 seminars: participants felt that they did not leave the seminar with enough in hand to actually do the work of intervening and improving the climate in their unit. Surprisingly, such a tool was not easily available, so Ng took the lead in developing a thoughtful and useful guide to action that was available for the spring 2015 seminars.

These additions during the 2015 seminar process highlight our ongoing effort to provide seminars responsive to the needs of our audience members. We made every effort to make the information relevant and timely.

Annotated bibliography. A two-page annotated bibliography included selected references on Implicit/Unconscious Bias, on the Causes and Consequences of Negative Work Climates, and on Microaggressions.

Other informational items. The participant folders also included a theatre program for “Ready to Vote?” including the cast list, actor bios, and brief information on implicit bias and microaggressions. There were also problem-solving handouts developed in concert with each individual campus to meet campus goals for the seminar. At UCLA, for example, the handout focused on the use of contributions to diversity statements. Other materials included a summary of the President’s 2014 PFP Initiative that had funded the seminars; brochure on the PFP; brochure from the NCFDD (National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity); and an evaluation form.

Concluding the seminar. As the seminar director, I brought the proceedings to an end by pointing to research by University of Michigan scholars that measures change in department climate. The findings of Abigail Stewart and her colleagues are that lasting change can easily take a decade and that departments able to improve climate had common elements. These commonalities include a chair ready to make change in department climate a priority; a critical mass of faculty who had a collective sense of responsibility and wanted change; admission of past mistakes; and a way to neutralize toxic individuals. These findings were based on the 2012 Faculty Climate Survey at the University of Michigan as well as on comparisons to a baseline survey conducted at the beginning of their ADVANCE program, established in 2001.⁴

How the Theatre Intervention Worked

The research-based materials detailed above and the discussions based on them were meant to extend the effect of the interactive theatre intervention beyond the half-day seminar. The star of the “Fostering Inclusive Excellence” seminars, however, was the “Ready to Vote?” scenario and the direct interactions about the scenario with the audience. In her book, Roxworthy provides a succinct summary of the “Ready to Vote?” scenario itself:

Ready to Vote stages an interactive microcosm of academic life: an ad hoc committee meeting of faculty in a fictional UC computer science department tasked with deciding whether their junior colleague (an Asian American woman named Felicity) should be put up for tenure in the fall. This scenario is readily recognizable to faculty audiences, interpellating them as experts who can take on an active, participatory role by questioning the characters (and often the moderator), giving them advice, and interpreting the structural and psychological motivations behind their behavior (*The Theatrical Professoriate*, p. 165).

In the course of the committee meeting, key areas of controversy surfaced: diversity versus merit; implicit biases around race, gender, and ability; the role of department chairs; and department and campus commitments to diversity. Once the scenario had been performed—it took about 20 minutes—various kinds of interaction between and among the cast, the attendees, and the moderators followed. Here is a summary of the interactions from the December 2015 report on the initiative:

4. It is important to note that the University of Michigan 2017 Faculty Climate Survey did not document additional improvements in climate; the report available online does not provide detailed analysis about what the causes of that decline might be. Also see Stewart and Valian, *An Inclusive Academy*, pp. 259–272, for related research on academic climate.

After the scenario is performed, the actors remain in character as the academic administrator audience, with the assistance of the facilitator (both Professor Roxworthy and Coordinator Ng), has the opportunity to ask the characters questions about their behavior, feelings, and motivations. At the end of the Q&A period, the actors step down and the facilitator asks the audience members to imagine themselves stepping into the shoes of each character. . . . The process allows participants to experience empathy for all of the characters, think through what actually happened, identify problems, and consider solutions and strategies to perceived problems.

Two innovative pieces were developed to further enhance the theatre experience: 1) a set of monologues from the perspectives of the characters in the scenario, who reflect on their situation two years later; and 2) volunteer faculty actors recruited from each campus to perform in the scenario and participate in the Q&A. . . . The recruitment of volunteer faculty actors added to the credibility of the faculty committee scenario, including lending more expertise during the Q&A period.

In February 2015, Jeffrey Steiger served as a consultant to evaluate the program and recommend other possible strategies to engage interaction with the participants. He also introduced “switch” to the spring program. In the “switch” portion of the program, actors changed roles so the audience could explore what might have been different given different race/gender and (dis)ability identities (“President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP) Initiative Report,” p. 4).

Participants rated the “interactive theatre method” the most highly effective of any portion of the seminar. I believe that high rating is due, in part, to the great care we took with the interactive segment of the program. For example, we found, after the first couple of campus seminars, that we needed a frame for the intervention to keep the audience focused on issues, instead of seeking ways to discredit the very presence of such issues in academic review and evaluation. Thus a part of Roxworthy’s moderation of the intervention was to frame the experience by noting, before the scenario, that invariably some audience members at each performance would find the dialogue to be simplistic and overdone while others would find the dialogue to be frighteningly accurate and triggering. Here is some of the key text she used to make these important points:

In theatre we’d say that the performance is not meant to be a realistic “slice of life”: instead, it’s meant to be a theatrical intervention. Through witnessing a theatricalized faculty meeting that goes very wrong, we can be awakened to an awareness and recognition that we can all do better in our daily lives as academic administrators.

If you find yourself saying “that would never happen” or “a faculty member would never say that” or “a department chair would never do that,” take a step back. This scenario and the characters are all based on interviews with current and former UC faculty, so in a very real sense these things did happen and were said and were done.

But more than that, today's seminar is about cultivating a diverse climate through recognizing that race, gender, and other identity categories confer differential experiences of reality. We experience "reality" differently depending on our race, gender, class, disability status, etc.

To deny the realities of the scenario you're about to see is akin to denying the different experiential realities of your diverse colleagues and students. Today is about acknowledging those differences, not dismissing them ("Facilitator Guide: Ready to Vote? UCB Leadership Seminar," p. 4).

In addition, one of the components of my introduction/welcome was to remind the department chairs, in particular, that they have clear responsibility (via APM policy) to be leaders in calling out issues of bias and in working with the department to address these. Having two of the characters played by faculty volunteer actors on the campus was also a way to interrupt various realities and assumptions. The volunteer actors (a total of twenty on the ten campuses) added faculty voices to those of the MFA and PhD actors (who were amazingly good at "acting" faculty). The disciplines of the faculty volunteer actors was extensive, including physics, sociology, medicine, music, engineering, enology, dentistry, biology, psychology, theatre, and Chicano/a studies. Moreover, engagement with these critical issues was common across all disciplines.

Additions that Steiger made to the interactive portion of the event were especially potent, beginning with the Santa Barbara event in February 2015. The "switch" and "freeze" provided effective prods that kept audience members from drawing simplistic conclusions about the issues, especially the presence of microaggressions and how to address them. Steiger's expertise also led him to recommend that the UCSF seminar "tone down" the more blatant language of microaggressions in the scenario, arguing that the audience would still see the aggressions in less explicit text. His approach was validated by performance of the revised script, particularly in one section where he argued that the actors could drop the use of the word "boy" as a potential description of a male character who was African American. Indeed, the audience "heard" the offensive language anyway, without the direct prompt.

The actual combination of interactive components that were used varied from campus to campus, depending on a variety of factors—how early or late the seminar was in the scheduling of the 10 campus seminars; specific goals set for an individual campus seminar; and the time set aside for the interactive theatre segment. The various interactive segments planned for the UC Berkeley seminar, our final performance, is captured in the "Facilitator Guide" for this seminar:

- Q&A between characters and audience. First, each audience member is part of a dyad and each has a minute to talk about their initial

reactions to the scenario. Then audience members have the chance to ask the six cast members (including the volunteer actors) questions. 15 minutes

- Switch. The actors assume a frozen image that captures a key gesture unique to their character. Then two of the actors change places and take on the gesture of the character whose place they are taking. Switch one is between Judy and Glen. Switch two is Kyle and Polloa. 15 minutes.
- Replays. During this segment, the actors reprise short sections of the scenario (one on “excellence vs. diversity” and one on “invisible service burden”) followed by audience input on what one of the characters could do to address the issue better. 19 minutes.
- Actor introductions. 1 minute.

All such interventions were facilitated by Roxworthy and Ng and the variety and range of interventions grew in the course of the year. Because Roxworthy, Ng, and the actors were all reading current research in issues of implicit bias, microaggressions, and faculty diversity, they were invariably able to engage in open and revealing conversation with the seminar participants about issues of particular relevance in specific settings.

Moderating and Leading the Seminars

During the course of the seminars, we refined the “moderation” duties in response to audience feedback. The formula that worked the best included these three roles: 1) I provided the opening and closing framework, including a welcome focused on the data-driven and research-based approach and a conclusion, also research-based, which reminded the deans and department chairs that they should be active, not passive, participants in interrupting bias-based actions and microaggressions. 2) Roxworthy focused on the performance components of the seminars, including movement through the post-performance interaction with the actors. Her status as a faculty member gave her particular credibility as did her ability to interact productively with audience members, including those who were resistant and had concerns about the underlying assumptions regarding microaggressions. 3) Ng focused on ways to moderate discussions of the performance through group discussion, drawing from the work that she had previously done in diversity training and interactive theatre. Ng managed parts of the seminar that focused on the handouts and tools the deans and chairs could take back to their leadership positions.

The team was able to take a promising idea—theatre-based intervention—and give it substance in training academic leaders to “lead” by creating a welcoming and supportive community in their units.

Evaluation

The evaluation of the program took two forms: participant evaluations for each of the ten campus seminars and a mid-course review by interactive theatre expert Jeffrey Steiger. For each of the 10 campus seminars, we gathered input from the attendees through an eleven-question evaluation. To allow us to understand how the seminar worked for various intended audience members, participants provided information about their position as dean, continuing chair, new chair, or other. Attendance rates in these categories was as follows: deans (71% of UC deans attended); new chairs (62% of new chairs attended); and continuing chairs (52% of continuing chairs attended). Overall, 57% of deans and chairs attended and represented 331 of the 551 attendees. These healthy participation numbers were crucial if the intervention was to have its anticipated effect. Other attendees were executive vice chancellors/provosts, vice provosts, associate/assistant deans, vice chairs, Academic Senate representatives, faculty equity advisors, and academic and staff administrators. We were careful to ensure that the attendees were predominantly deans and chairs, so we only approved attendance by others to meet specific campus needs. The goal was to create an environment of peers in which the deans and chairs could have honest conversations about sensitive issues.

Evaluations were distributed to 551 participants with a completion rate of 70% (385 of 551). Response rates by campus ranged from 56% to 89%. The December 2015 report contains an excellent summary of the input, including the following key points of analysis:

- On a five-point scale (1—strongly disagree, 5—strongly agree), the average scores per question ranged from 3.7 to 4.3. As a group, deans consistently rated the program higher than the other groups and continuing chairs rated it the lowest.
- The highest ratings were for the interactive theatre portions of the program: 4.3 (the highest overall ratings) for question #7, “I could empathize with some of the characters’ concerns and perspectives,” and for question #8, “I found the interactive theater method to be an effective tool to increase cultural awareness and understanding.” Question #3, “This seminar helped me gain greater understanding of microaggressions in the academic work environment,” received the next highest average score.

- The lowest overall score was 3.7 out of 5 in response to question #5: “This seminar provided me with tools and resources to address academic workplace issues.” The scores for the spring 2015 seminars were significantly higher than the scores for the fall 2014 seminars on this question; this turnaround is likely a response to the additional materials created for the spring and, in particular, the seven-page handout, “Tools for Department Chairs and Deans.” The questions about the overall effectiveness of the seminars (#8 and #10)—for all attendees—also produced higher scores in the spring than the fall.
- The last two seminars in spring 2015—UC Davis and UC San Francisco—had the highest ratings, ranging from 4.1 to 4.7 at Davis and from 4.4 to 4.9 at UC San Francisco. The final seminar at UC Berkeley had slightly lower scores but was also only two hours long and was affected by some external factors described below.
- One of the most instructive takeaways from this systemwide data was that the department chairs consistently gave lower evaluations than other attendees; and continuing chairs gave lower scores than new chairs. My anecdotal experience of the seminars is that it was often department chairs who exhibited the most resistance to the goals of the seminar during the open discussion sessions: was this seminar worth their time? Did the seminar really understand the way these issues played out at the department level? Chairs are truly on the front lines in managing issues of department culture and climate and while most accepted that there were climate issues in their department, some did not.

Attendees provided significant qualitative responses as well. We reviewed them as the seminars transpired and made efforts to be responsive, constantly adjusting the interactive theatre portions of the seminar as well as other components.

- Attendees were asked what “two things” they would do differently as a result of the seminar. As summarized in the December 2015 report, 58% of attendees answered the question, and “The responses fell along a continuum with the following three categories cited as the most frequent: identifying, recognizing, and interrupting microaggressions (21% of responses); better meeting facilitation, including making intentions/expectations clearer and setting ground rules (16%); and self-reflection and greater awareness of assumptions and biases (15%)” (p. 8). This question was one of many ways the seminar stressed the importance of deans and chairs taking action on these issues after the seminars.

- When asked about the highlights of the seminar, the vast majority of the comments focused on the theatre intervention; it was at the top of the list of highlights, with 47% praising the use of interactive theatre.
- Perhaps the most telling qualitative feedback came when attendees offered suggestions for improving the seminar. Here are two comments that focused on the issue of “excellence v. diversity”:
 - “The seminar entirely dodged the question that is at the heart of the issue: how should we handle the tradeoff between diversity and quality WHEN IT EXISTS.”
 - “While I agree with [the goal] to prohibit microaggression and the other wrong behavior, the heart of the matter is excellence versus diversity and I found the discussion on that topic to be superficial and lacking.”
- Several comments captured the participants’ willingness to engage with the complexity of these issues, as this one does: “Some of the most painful ‘cuts’ are made by people who see themselves as sympathetic but who are unconsciously insensitive. Especially when discussing cases where issues of diversity are present, one needs to weigh one’s language and mode of speaking with great care. The issue of ‘climate’ is real, and improving the climate is possible, though change will probably take years.”
- A range of comments were contradictory, with some praising the scenario’s portrayal of common behavior during review of faculty performance and others citing what they experienced as exaggeration of faculty interaction: “Most faculty that I have met may have strong feelings about colleagues (for whatever reason/motivation), but many are far more discrete, clever and manipulative than the clod-like portrayals to which we were treated. Thus, I would’ve benefited from a presentation that involved subtly discriminatory behavior, rather than a display of calling women ‘girls’ and the crassness of remarkably and transparently discussive boors. In my view, the major problem these days is not overt and obvious discrimination and marginalization, but far more subtle and underhanded influences on workload, personnel processes, and so forth (but perhaps I just lack boors in my Department and have plenty of junior-league Machiavellis).”
- Finally, a few comments challenged the premise of the seminar: “The failure of the conference was multiple. First, there are many

thoughtful people who do not share the premise of microaggression. No data links it to increased skepticism. If we are truly interested in diversity, then many opposing viewpoints should be presented.”

The substantive response in these evaluations underlines the shared understanding that the issues in focus during the seminar need attention. However, the responses—which capture the variety of live participant responses and much of the give-and-take on display during the seminars—also document that these seminars were anything but “preaching to the choir.” This educational aspect—new insights for academic leaders—made the seminars all the more important.

The Academic Personnel Office on each campus received input from their individual seminar evaluations. In this way, we sought to build multiple feedback loops into the process to encourage a continuing dialogue among those who had attended.

Plans for Development of Online Resources and Continued Programming

As summarized in the December 2015 report, a webpage with seminar materials and additional resources was developed in March 2015, and a link was shared with campus contacts after each seminar to allow access to the variety of materials. Roxworthy and the graduate student actors also produced a professional videorecording of the “Ready to Vote?” scenario, with the assistance of UCTV, located at UC San Diego. Ng took the lead in developing materials for campuses to use the video and other materials on their own. We felt it was essential that the video of “Ready to Vote?” only be used with the framing and apparatus provided in these resources. Ng and others developing the on-line resources also linked the theatre program to the similar efforts of UC ADVANCE PAID to share “promising practices” across campuses. The plan was to use the UC ADVANCE PAID materials and the “Fostering Inclusive Excellence” materials—including the interactive theatre component—to build a repository of tools that campuses could continue to use in their diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts. The title of the resource was “This actually works: Promising practices from UC campuses that build and sustain a culture of inclusion” (“President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP) Initiative Report,” p. 9). The title captures our goal of expanding the effectiveness of the half-day session beyond the initial attendees.

The work on these systemwide resources was interrupted and eventually curtailed, however, by high profile national press coverage of a very few comments in the “Tools for Department Chairs and Deans” handout. More details follow below.

After the ten campus seminars were completed, Roxworthy and her students “were invited for encore performances requested as interventions for University of California academic units in crisis, such as UC Berkeley in the wake of physics and astronomy professor Geoff Marcy’s sexual harassment scandal, where faculty in the troubled departments were required to attend” (*The Theatrical Professoriate*, p. 165). As Roxworthy notes, there was significant interest in a return visit of the seminar to specific units on several campuses. We had every reason to believe that future seminars would have produced additional chances for faculty to discuss issues of academic climate.

Program Termination

In the short time during which the program website was active in the spring of 2015, the targeted audience was those who had attended the seminars. The goal was to encourage further engagement with the issues through the resources available on the website. As noted in the final report, there were 372 page views in the first month and 117 in the second month. As context, the last spring seminar was on 4 May 2015, at UC San Francisco. Then, during the period from 21 May 2015 to 21 June 2015, “1600 unique page views were recorded after media coverage on one of the tools used in the seminar was cited in various media outlets. The discussions centered on specific research-based examples of microaggressions in the taxonomy developed by Dr. Derald Sue (Columbia University), specifically in the categories of ‘myth of meritocracy’ and ‘colorblindness’” (“President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP) Initiative Report,” p. 9). The media coverage directly linked the discussions of microaggressions in the “Tools for Department Chairs and Deans” document with UC President Napolitano whose initiative sponsored the seminars. Nearly all of the media coverage was negative and criticized the President for details of a handout that she had not written. Also notable was that almost all of the critique focused on two among ten kinds of microaggressions drawn from Dr. Sue’s taxonomy and represented a small portion of the six-page document.

Given the national profile that the President brought to UC from her position as the former US Secretary of Homeland Security, such close scrutiny by the press was regular. In general, the media coverage on this issue took the lead of Fox News and derided several of the items on the list of microaggressions listed in the Tools document as actions to be avoided, like asking someone “where are you from?” or “where were you born?” or saying, “America is

a melting pot” or “America is the land of opportunity.” The Tools document attracted the attention of mainstream press for some time, including a piece by Fred Barbash in *The Washington Post* entitled “The war on ‘microaggressions:’ Has it created a ‘victimhood culture’ on campuses?” (28 October 2015). Barbash cites research and commentary with multiple points of view about the existence or importance of “microaggressions,” noting at one point that the debate is “all the rage”: “Once kids were taught about ‘sticks and stones,’ which break their bones, but that ‘words will never hurt me.’ Now on some campuses, they and faculty as well are being taught the opposite, innocently uttered words can and do hurt, and speech codes and guidelines about what to say and what not to say, are all the rage.”

One response that carried significant weight for UC audiences was an editorial in the *LA Times*, “What’s a microaggression?; The University of California’s memo on unacceptable phrases and questions goes too far,” published on 24 June 2015. The editorial labels the work of the Tools document “heavy-handed sensitivity training about so-called microaggressions” and admonished the University: “UC officials should . . . stop trying to defend their over-the-top, politically correct list of unacceptable topics and questions.” The editorial notes that “the material posted on the UC website discourages faculty members from expressing legitimate political opinions” and concludes with this sentence: “We’re all for sensitivity and we are against racism and sexism. But colleges have always been bastions of free expression because the learning process requires students to debate controversial and occasionally disturbing ideas. UC has done a disservice to that noble academic goal.” Needless to say, the comments showed no indication that journalists and commentators had reviewed the entirety of the seminar materials, which did invite discussion and analysis. More disturbing, however, was the lack of recognition that the microaggressions under scrutiny were seriously impeding UC’s attempt to address an all too real problem in its academic community.

This criticism of UC and President Napolitano resulted in my being informed by the President’s staff that the program should not continue. This national critique happened after nine campus seminars, but before the final one, already scheduled at UC Berkeley. We were allowed to go forward with the Berkeley seminar because the campus had already built our program into its “Deans and Chairs Annual Retreat,” which also meant that the seminar was already shortened to fit into a two-hour slot. We did not include the now controversial “Tools” document in the materials for this campus and we prepared a new document to accomplish some of the same work. The new document, “Strategies to Foster Inclusive Excellence,” listed actions and strategies for fostering inclusive excellence, actions and strategies that had been suggested on evaluations by deans and chairs attending the nine earlier seminars.

The idea was to show that our work in these seminars had been both instructive and appreciated by UC deans and chairs. Additionally, in my opening comments to the UC Berkeley audience, I defended our focus on microaggressions, in light of the media pressure. My comments included the following: “You will find a definition of ‘micro-aggressions’ in your playbill; the use of ‘micro-aggressions’ to think about climate issues and interpersonal relations is hardly new, and is a proven heuristic device. Nevertheless, our use of ‘micro-aggressions’ in this seminar series recently had its moment in the glaring light of Fox News scrutiny. As a result, we are, indeed, seeking the best way to deliver seminar materials on-line. But through this attention, we have also re-affirmed the power of working through such issues in a ‘live’ seminar situation like this.”

So yes, the tenth campus seminar did take place at UC Berkeley, on 21 August 2015. Ironically, we finally delivered it in space actually designed for theatre (the Joseph Wood Crutch Theatre). And then, with completion of this final campus seminar, I wound down the project, as I had been directed. That meant we could not accept invitations for additional performances on UC campuses, invitations we had already received; we could not discuss the successes and challenges of the “Fostering Inclusive Excellence” seminars at national conferences; and we could not make available our online resources. I deeply regret the loss of such a successful project, fully in line with the University’s values and mission and overwhelmingly welcomed by its campus leaders.

I have done a good deal of reflecting on this dark turn in our work to support equity and inclusion in academic departments. I understand the President’s concern about the negative impact of one small aspect of the seminar on the University’s image. But I continue to think that the better course would have been for all of us in leadership at UCOP to more publicly stand behind the documented success of the seminars, including the focus on microaggressions, and to stress that the seminar was structured around input, discussion, and questioning. The seminars were about *awareness* of speech and not *restriction* of speech. The seminars advanced rather than stifled critique. What we say is protected by the First Amendment and, at the University, we value academic freedom as a vital tool in both research and education. Faculty have a special responsibility to uphold this right to academic freedom. These seminars sought to extend that right to everyone and refuse it to no one, as fits the public mission of the University of California.

In particular, the seminars addressed the difference in meaning certain phrases can have for different groups and individuals. “America is the home of the free” means something different to NFL quarterback Colin Kaepernick (he took his initial kneeling “stance” shortly after these seminars, in 2016) than it does to other Americans. Indeed, an overwhelming majority of the

people at the seminars felt they had been educated in the nuance of language, to the point that they could better serve all our faculty, students, and staff, as well as our neighbors and fellow citizens. The seminars themselves provided a sustained experience in the plurality of positions that is the goal of UC to acknowledge and defend. I believe the seminars served the University in an exemplary manner and I remain exceedingly proud of the results.

Chapter Five

Faculty Retention and Exit Survey, 2015 and After

In academic year 2015–2016, UC undertook a “pilot” project to create the first multi-campus study of faculty who have considered leaving the university. There was some precedent for this attention to faculty retention and departure. For example, for several years after the 2008 financial crisis, UCOP asked campuses to report faculty separation and retention numbers quarterly, prompted by fears that the difficult financial times might encourage faculty to leave the university at higher-than-normal rates. Such information was collected by campus Academic Personnel Offices (APOs) quarterly and collated for the President, Provost, and UC Regents. It was difficult to gather consistent data, however, since most of the information was available only at the department level (and thus quite decentralized), and campuses who already had a system for collecting such information had their own definitions, questions, and calendars for compiling the information. In addition, the “reasons” why faculty left were supplied by department chairs and staff (and not the faculty members themselves), based on their understanding of departing faculty members’ decisions. Since the multi-campus data was incomplete and difficult to collate, we ended the quarterly collection. However, the need for reliable information about resignation and retention continued. As I put it to several of my colleagues, why would you *not* want detailed information about the departure of the university’s most valuable asset—its faculty.

In parallel fashion, the systemwide conversations about faculty diversity enabled through UC ADVANCE PAID and the “Fostering Inclusive Excellence” seminars had considered issues of retention alongside issues of recruitment, yet it was persistently clear that we had largely anecdotal information about why faculty chose to leave the University. It was difficult to verify

whether there were differences in the rates of departure by gender and/or race/ethnicity, although many campus leaders reported that they faced disproportionate challenges in retaining under-represented minorities. We also had insufficient information about issues of retention and diversity to fully answer questions from the UC Regents or state leaders in Sacramento.

As a result, at this time I began a series of conversations with leaders of the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE), based in the Graduate School of Education at Harvard University. The result was a research partnership, funded equally by COACHE and Academic Affairs at UCOP, to pilot a multi-campus study on faculty retention and exit. COACHE had proven its ability to manage complex multi-campus data in its long-standing faculty satisfaction survey, administered since 2005 at hundreds of US campuses and state university systems, including some UC campuses. COACHE would bring to this collaboration its expertise in the issues at the national level. Our UC commitment to research-based work meant we joined COACHE in envisioning a project that was based on the latest research about faculty departure. We at UC also understood that a study administered outside of UC and by a reputable and experienced organization would enhance the response rate, because faculty respondents understood that their honest responses would be held confidential.¹

UC worked as an equal partner with COACHE researchers in the development of the study, and Dr. Kiernan Mathews, the COACHE Executive Director and Principal Investigator, led the effort. Study development was an iterative process that began with Mathews interviewing all ten UC vice provosts/vice chancellors for academic personnel/academic affairs, and, importantly, reporting back to the vice provost/vice chancellor group on what they had said. This reporting was crucial in building confidence in the study development process. In parallel fashion, an Advisory Group was put together to provide input at various stages in the development of the pilot; eight campuses agreed to participate in the Advisory Group, along with APP and COACHE representatives. In addition, a systemwide Academic Senate committee, the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), participated in developing the design and scope of the study.

At the same time, COACHE staff conducted a review of relevant research literature, with a couple of notable findings that helped to define the project: “the literature taught us that most research has been qualitative or has focused on faculty members’ intent to leave rather than actual experiences of changing institutions. From our review of existing exit surveys, we learned the types of questions that were important to institutions and that these surveys often resembled workplace satisfaction surveys and did not include retained

1. The COACHE website has additional background on their Faculty Satisfaction Survey as well as the Faculty Retention and Exit Survey developed in partnership with UC.

faculty as a comparison group” (“Instrument Development and Administration Process”). Consultation with researchers in the Office of Faculty Equity and Welfare at UC Berkeley, who had conducted previous studies of faculty retention and departure, convinced us that a study including not just those who actually left the institution, but also those who chose NOT to leave (e.g. those who were actively retained) would help clarify the findings about those who left the institution.

Six UC campuses agreed to participate in the first pilot round of the study covering retentions and exits that had occurred in one complete academic year, July 2014 through June 2015. The other four campuses chose not to participate: two campuses expressed concern that having a systemwide survey would be significantly less useful for them than the campus-based survey that they were already using, and several campuses were concerned about the workload on their end to gather the personnel data needed for the administration of the study. Indeed, since most campuses did not keep data on faculty retention at the campuswide level, there was a significant new burden in administering the study, especially in the first year. All campuses understood that a driving factor for a university-wide study was the need by the Office of the President to report on issues of faculty retention and exit systemwide, but some campus academic personnel partners feared that they would not draw the same benefits from the study findings as would UCOP.

The collection of consistent data on faculty retention and departure turned out to be a major hurdle and, notably, a major accomplishment of this study. While there had been collection of the basic numbers on faculty departures, since those were personnel actions that had to be recorded, comprehensive information on “retention” actions were rarely complete and usually minimal. Some campuses had never collected campus-wide information, and executive vice chancellors/provosts and vice provosts only had information on the cases that had come to them for co-funding of the retention costs. Information often remained with deans and department chairs. Indeed, there was plenty of anecdotal knowledge among those dealing with retention issues, but that often disappeared with administrative turnover. Thus a somewhat invisible but game-changing part of this study was the development of a detailed process for collecting information about faculty who departed and who were retained. The information began with details like hiring date, rank at hire, year of birth, year of terminal degree, year of promotion(s), current rank and step, current salary, gender, and race/ethnicity. Over the years, campuses also increasingly supplied information on the retention negotiations: name of universities making offers to our faculty, details on the outside offers (salary, start-up, partner accommodation, etc.) and details on UC counter offers. In other words, the norms for recording information about retention changed in a significant way.

The pilot study survey was administered between 29 March and 29 April 2016, with invitations sent by COACHE to 188 potential respondents; ninety-five completed the survey for a response rate of 51%.

Beyond Anecdote: New Tools to Decipher the Causes and Costs of Faculty Exit, *Roundtable (June 2016)*

On 28 June 2016, APP and COACHE co-sponsored a Roundtable, hosted by UC Irvine, to present and discuss results of the pilot study. There were five objectives for the Roundtable as captured on the day's agenda: 1) brief participants about the causes, costs, and leadership challenges of faculty departure and the "counteroffer culture"; 2) invite critical input on a faculty exit survey piloted by COACHE at UC; 3) identify evidence-based practices for better data collected about and better outcomes in faculty retention and exit; 4) equip participants with tools, resources, and strategies for assessing and reducing faculty turnover; and 5) launch a research-practice partnership of academic leaders who wish to improve faculty exit and retention outcomes.

Over 80 participants gathered on the UC Irvine campus for a full day meeting. In addition to those participating from the UC campuses, UCOP, and COACHE, there were academic leaders from other universities interested in participating in future surveys: this included those from both public universities (Wisconsin, Penn State, Iowa State, Michigan State, Virginia Tech, Arizona, Maryland, Indiana, and Ohio State) and private universities (Dartmouth, Yale, Northwestern, Brown, Southern California, Chicago, Rochester, and Emory).

Following the model of the roundtables/seminars for UC ADVANCE PAID and "Fostering Inclusive Excellence," the day included research presentations, data-based analysis, interactive sessions, and supporting materials. To support the objective of launching a broader initiative, the day began with a networking session and concluded with a reception. In our morning "ice-breaker" we offered "fortune" cookies to our attendees. Each received a fortune related to success or failure in efforts to retain faculty. The unpredictability of our fortune-telling exercise started the day with a sense of camaraderie—we all shared the goal of improved understanding of retention and understood that we would profit from hearing one another's experiences and wisdom.

Research-based and Data-driven Roundtable Materials

Substantial materials were developed for participants, providing background to those unfamiliar with the research on retention and exit. Materials were also meant to aid attendees who would be reporting back to their campuses. The following materials were distributed to participants:

- Agenda, presenter bios, and a list of participants.
- “Existing Faculty Departure Surveys and Relevant Literature,” by Brent Maher of COACHE, an 11-page analysis of the current literature about faculty departure.
- “Pre-reading Abstracts” of two articles by Dr. KerryAnn O’Meara, the keynote speaker. Both articles were available to participants ahead of the roundtable.
- “Pre-roundtable Reflections,” a 12-page compilation of pre-roundtable thinking on the topic by participants, who responded to four questions and prompts: 1) What is currently being done at your institution to understand the numbers of faculty leaving? 2) What is currently being done at your institution to understand the reasons why faculty leave? 3) Describe two to three particularly innovative and/or interesting policies or programs to improve faculty retention and exit outcomes; and 4) What are two or three of the most pressing challenges concerning retention actions and faculty exits at your institution?
- “Faculty Retention & Exit Survey: Pilot Study Briefing,” by R. Todd Benson, Paromita De, Brent Maher, and Kiernan Mathews (all from COACHE). This was a 30-page report on the pilot study, a report that was the basis for additional analysis presented during the day. As a companion document, there was a separate two-page overview detailing the collection of data: “Instrument Development and Administration Process.”
- A “worksheet” that participants filled out at five strategically placed moments during the day’s events. The participants were asked to reflect on panels and presentations and, at the end of the day, to reflect on how they would take the day’s conversations back to their own campuses. The worksheet, designed only for the individual participant’s use, also provided additional citations of research literature about faculty exit.
- An evaluation form.

- Information sheet on COACHE, on the ongoing Academic Workplace Survey and on the new Faculty Retention and Exit Survey.
- Information sheet on the work of Academic Personnel and Programs (APP).

Shaping a Day for Discussion and Analysis

After the initial time for networking, Dr. KerryAnn O'Meara (University of Maryland) offered a powerful keynote address in the morning, establishing the issue of "faculty exit" as one best understood through research, data, and analysis. This focus on what information we can collect, how we might use it, and how to practically address issues of faculty exit and retention continued throughout the day. Two panels provided opportunities for participants to hear from practitioners who had experience in managing faculty retention and exit. Panel participants included representatives, most of them faculty administrators, from Penn State, Maryland, three UC campuses, UCOP, and COACHE. They focused on the practical: for example "Current Institutional Practices in Evaluating Faculty Departure" was a session in which panelists discussed various ways in which they had managed these retention and exit issues as academic administrators. A second panel, "Implications for Research & Practice: from Researchers & Practitioners," focused on findings in the pilot study that pointed to the need for changes to current practice.

The centerpiece of the Roundtable was the Pilot Study itself. Participants were able to read the 30-page report before the meeting and the four authors of the pilot study spoke in two different sessions about the findings. Their presentations included not only details in the published report but also additional underlying data and analysis.

During the final hour of the day, small groups discussed moving forward in what we framed as a national partnership. The key prompt to participants was to continue the Roundtable discussion with colleagues on their home campus, colleagues who could be partners in improving data on faculty exit and retention as well as on efforts to improve relevant policy and practice. A reception followed, allowing more informal conversation and connection for these administrators and researchers from across the country. Once again, UC was taking a national leadership role on an issue relevant throughout the entire academic community.

The Pilot Report

The report on the pilot study, “Faculty Retention & Exit Survey: Pilot Study Briefing,” was unveiled at the Roundtable. The careful design of the study—which had developed out of conversations among COACHE, UC’s vice provosts/vice chancellors for academic personnel/academic affairs, UC’s campus Academic Personnel Offices, Academic Senate leaders, and APP—allowed for a report that focused on the many stages of faculty retention and exit, not just on the “reasons” someone might consider a career move. This element of survey design was reflected in the report’s seven chapters: 1) The Search; 2) The Nature of the Offer; 3) Weighing the Factors; 4) Spouse and Partner Career; 5) The Counteroffer; 6) The Transition; and 7) Work Environment. In other words, the report demonstrated the often-long arc of the retention/exit process. To those responsible for faculty success, the report delivered extensive information about why faculty left or stayed and the various ways in which a campus could strengthen its retention efforts. When you know, for example, that 47% of those surveyed had never actively searched for a new position (that is, the courting institution made the first move), you understand that preemptive retentions are as important as making counter offers (Chapter 1, p. 3). When you know that “Nearly one in three departures are professors who originally sought an offer only to help renegotiate the terms of their employment,” you consider whether long-standing practices and policies are meeting today’s faculty employment conditions (Chapter 1, p. 4).

The “Executive Summary” offers four key findings:

Salary is important, but is only one of several factors that faculty consider to be compelling in their decision to stay or leave. Respondents noted a range of factors that would compel them to stay at their home institution or to accept an external offer, including the quality of their colleagues and research support. University leaders should think beyond base salary when preparing counteroffers and consider the full range of retention tools at their disposal.

Institutions should take all external offers seriously. Of the respondents who searched for outside offers primarily as leverage to renegotiate the terms of their employment, half decided to leave. Policies (tacit or otherwise) that require written offers to renegotiate salary pose a retention risk. University stakeholders would be wise to assume that faculty who present an external offer could be convinced to accept it.

Institutions have a home field advantage for retaining dual-career couples. Faculty that cited employment opportunities for a spouse or partner as being important in their decision elected to stay more often than to accept an external offer. Finding two satisfactory jobs in a new location is likely difficult, so universities

might increase the likelihood of retention by ensuring that both partners are satisfied with their career options. Otherwise, these faculty are likely to reengage their search for employment elsewhere soon in the future.

Institutions should value faculty members with transparent processes, thoughtful and clear responses during negotiation, and a smooth transition for those who choose to accept an external offer. Faculty read their institutions' responses in the counteroffer phase as a signal of their own value to the institution and appreciated when communication was timely and clear. Also, supporting departing faculty in their transition process ensures they leave with a positive impression of the institution. (p. i)

In both the Roundtable meeting as well as in key discussions that have followed, the initial focus has invariably been on Chapter 3 of the report, Weighing the Factors, which offered a nuanced analysis of reasons survey respondents gave for remaining at or leaving their institution. I would say that the data on reasons for faculty decisions confirmed what we had been experiencing at UC: "The items ranked most frequently as compelling factors were *Salary* (73% of faculty), the *Quality of colleagues* (67%), *Departmental or institutional reputation* (55%), *Proximity to family* (48%), and *Quality of Graduate Students* (41%). The sixth most common factor chosen was *Employment opportunity for spouse or partner* (37%)" (Chapter 3, p. 9). Such confirmation was a huge step forward. Chapter 4: Spouse and Partner Career also confirmed what academic administrators had long experienced: the need to put extra effort into recruiting and retaining couples. In addition, the data revealed the positive side of this situation, that "institutions have a home field advantage for retaining dual-career couples" (p. i). Chapter 5: The Counteroffer and Chapter 6: The Transition also shaped the conversation in important new ways, by providing data that clarified how academic administrators can positively affect faculty mobility decisions through transparent and speedy responses at various decision points of the retention/exit dialogue. This focus on those involved in efforts to retain a faculty member, in addition to the focus on the faculty member, was this study's novel, worthwhile, and important redirection of institutional attention.

The Pilot Study report did not contain much detail on differences by race/ethnicity or gender, in large part due to insufficient numbers of respondents. However, that demographic analysis has increased with the subsequent administrations of the survey and has proven the centerpiece in reports to the UC Regents.

Institutionalization of the Faculty Retention and Exit Survey at UC

The Pilot Study and the initial results released in June 2016 changed the course of how the UC system gathers and uses data about retention and exit and, importantly, about how it uses this information to inform decision-making and reporting to key stakeholders, especially the UC Regents. As of 2022, the survey is still being administered. The Pilot Study covered one year and was followed by a series of three single-year studies, with reporting on all three years at the end of the period. The 2019 report on the three-year study was shared with systemwide leaders in the Academic Senate and with academic personnel leaders on the campus in the fall of 2019. That 2019 report covering three years of survey data was followed by a survey administered to faculty who had left or been retained over a two-year period. The 2021 report on the two-year study was shared with the same stakeholders in November of 2021. As had been the goal since 2016, the 2021 report includes data from all ten UC campuses as well as comparisons to over 30 other research universities participating in the COACHE survey.

When the Advancing Faculty Diversity (AFD) program initiated its focus on faculty retention in academic year 2017-2018, the management of the Faculty Retention and Exit Survey became a part of the AFD program administration in APP. Those campuses who accepted funding awards for Improved Climate and Retention from AFD agreed to take part in the administration of the survey during the life of their awards. In effect, all ten UC campuses were taking part in the study. There have been several difficult conversations, however, about whether or not UC should continue to administer the survey. In a conversation I had with the campus vice provosts/vice chancellors of academic personnel/academic affairs in January of 2020, the vice provosts/vice chancellors acknowledged that there is systemwide value in collecting this data through the COACHE-administered survey and that valuable disaggregated data by gender and race/ethnicity is only available at this level. They affirmed that they could support continuation of the survey administration with all costs centrally funded and with a continuing conversation about the value of the effort, both the value to the campuses and the value to UCOP. But they also expressed concerns about the burden on the campuses collecting information about retention and exit of faculty, asking whether the resulting analyses are actionable for them, at the campus level. In other words, some felt that a campus-controlled survey might be of more direct assistance.

Meanwhile, the information has been an effective and welcomed part of UCOP's reporting on faculty retention issues to the UC Regents. During 2020, several reports to the UC Regents included data on faculty retention issues drawn from the Faculty Retention and Exit Survey. For example, in

March 2020, an item titled “Faculty Recruitment, Retention, and Diversity” included a section—“Retention of Ladder-rank Faculty”—based largely on data from the Retention and Exit Survey (see pp. 9-11). We reported to the Regents on top factors in faculty decisions to stay or go, including differences by gender and race/ethnicity. The item also let the UC Regents know that results of the first survey helped to convince President Napolitano to provide funding to address issues of academic climate and faculty retention. She made such funding available, for the first time in 2018–2019, to support campus retention efforts, through the AFD funding commitment. In September 2020, data and analysis from the Faculty Retention and Exit Survey 2019 report was again included in a Regents item, “2020 University of California Accountability Report: Highlights and UC 2030 Updates,” and the focus was on specific results disaggregated by gender and race/ethnicity.

After the 2021 report on the Faculty Retention and Exit Survey was available, it was similarly shared with the Regents in May 2022, as a part of a Regents item on the Advancing Faculty Diversity program (pp. 18–19). It is my judgement that since UC has had results from the Faculty Retention and Exit Survey, reports about faculty to the UC Regents have been much more complete. In parallel fashion, those of us working at UCOP have found it easier, with the survey information in hand, to respond to information requests about faculty departure from UC leadership, the UC Regents, and the state legislature.

The full 2021 Faculty Retention and Exit Survey report, as well as a six-page summary, were shared with systemwide Academic Senate committees and with the campus vice provosts/vice chancellors for academic personnel/academic affairs in May 2022. Since the full reports have been well over a hundred pages, the short summary was an important step forward in UC’s use of the retention and exit data. APP has not, however, had sufficient staffing to do extensive analysis of the full survey data set. With the addition of a new AFD staff member in 2022, there may be more capacity for such analysis in the future. Making survey results more easily available will be increasingly important as long as the AFD funding for projects in Improved Climate and Retention continues.

The partnership with COACHE on the development of the survey has also been a part of the national profile of the work done in Academic Personnel and Programs. In January of 2017, Kiernan Mathews and I presented information from the survey and on related issues of faculty turnover to the American Association of Colleges and Universities conference in San Francisco. This presentation is just one indicator of the national impact of UC’s initial decision to partner with COACHE. Because of the initial research-pilot phase of the study, UC can now draw from a national database of those universities participating in the survey, a database we helped generate. Data on reten-

tion that used to be isolated or even secret has now been replaced by an open process of compiling information on retention processes, both those resulting in keeping faculty and those that result in faculty departure. The goal is to create an equitable and information-based process for dealing with the university's most precious resource—its faculty.

Chapter Six

Advancing Faculty Diversity (AFD), 2016 and After

With little fanfare or forewarning, the Advancing Faculty Diversity (AFD) program was born as a part of the State of California budget for FY 2017. The 2016 Budget Act, Provision 4.2 (d)(SB826, Chapter 23, Statutes of 2016) included the following appropriation:

(1) \$2,000,000 is included on a one-time basis for a program for best practices in equal employment opportunity. (2) No later than December 1, 2016, the Regents of the University of California shall submit to the Director of Finance and the legislature, in conformity with Section 9795 of the Government Code, a report that includes the number of ladder-rank faculty, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, and gender, and a description of the specific uses of these funds to support equal employment opportunity in faculty employment, including any systemwide training, monitoring and compliance.

Unanticipated State of California Funding for “equal employment opportunity in faculty employment”

For some time, several members of the California legislature had been unhappy with the lack of diversity in the faculty of the UC, the California State University system, and the California Community Colleges. As a result, in the FY 2017 budget the state allocated to each of the three systems \$2 million in one-time funds to support new efforts in what they labelled “equal employment opportunity.” The message to UC was that it needed to take these

one-time dollars, spend them in the course of a single year, and demonstrate progress in building the diverse faculty that the legislature wanted to see for California's public research university.

All of the initial UC conversations about how to meet these expectations began with phrases like “this is an impossible task” (referring to the one-year time frame for results), or “they don't understand the faculty hiring process.” But UC faced up to the challenge of using the money in a single year to produce measurable results with a program designed to fit UC.

The executive vice chancellors/provosts decided against distributing the funds in ten equal shares to the campuses, noting that such a modest amount would be diluted if spread so widely. Instead, they endorsed funding a small number of new programs with \$500–600K through a competitive process that could produce positive results in faculty recruitment within the legislature's one-year timeline. Provost and Executive Vice President Aimee Dorr sent out a call for proposals in August of 2016, with three important criteria: 1) the proposed program should demonstrate a need in the funded “unit” to make progress in faculty diversity; 2) the PIs and unit leader(s) should document the campus-wide and unit-specific commitment to improve faculty diversity; and 3) the campus should demonstrate the capacity to develop practices that could be adopted more broadly with sufficient future funding. She also asked the campuses to develop strategies that would help UC make progress in the recruitment of more diverse candidates—including African-American, Latino(a)/Chicano(a)/Hispanic, and Native American candidates—within the restrictions of state law.¹ Proposals from the campuses were due to UCOP on a very short timeline and reviewed by a panel of faculty and academic administrators with expertise in issues of systemwide programs, equal opportunity, and faculty initiatives.

The program was administered by my office, Academic Personnel and Programs. APP was the natural choice, given our prior work on faculty diversity, including UC ADVANCE PAID and the “Fostering Inclusive Excellence” seminars. However, all of the funding went to the campuses (and, on purpose, none to UCOP). In addition, an advisory and evaluative structure was set up that has now lasted into the seventh year of the program. A systemwide program Advisory Group was established, with campus representatives named by each of the executive vice chancellors/provosts, with systemwide Academic Senate representatives, with the PIs of the current pilot programs for the year, along with UCOP representatives. I chaired the group with staffing provided by APP. The initial Advisory Group met monthly and helped develop the metrics for evaluating the success of the pilots. Members of the Advisory Group also helped to keep their campuses updated on the program throughout

1. These and other details are contained in the Year 1 Report to the state government, “Final Report on the 2016–17 Use of One-Time Funds to Support Best Practices in Equal Employment Opportunity in Faculty Employment.”

the year. The Advisory Group included members who had been active in systemwide faculty diversity initiatives in the prior decade, so this group became a next-generation reincarnation of networks that had developed with UC ADVANCE PAID and “Fostering Inclusive Excellence.”

The program was overseen at multiple levels. Since pilot program PIs had to report on their progress and challenges monthly to the Advisory Group, accountability was intense. The Advisory Group also approved a plan to evaluate the recruitment results of the pilot units by measuring pilot-unit hiring against the hiring in a “comparator” unit from another campus and also against the hiring of the pilot unit in the two previous years. For example, the award to the engineering college at UC Riverside had its hiring outcomes for the pilot year compared to hiring outcomes in that same year from a “comparator” college at another UC campus. The Riverside pilot unit also had its hiring outcomes for the first year compared to its own hiring outcomes in the two previous years. The analysis of these comparisons was managed centrally in APP with data drawn from UC Recruit and validated by the hiring units (both the pilot units and the comparators). This data development was labor intensive, but once established it served as the standard for nearly all Recruitment pilots in the first six years of AFD. In addition, each of the campuses with funding had to document current diversity, equity, and inclusion activities campus-wide as well as in the funded unit. APP, with the assistance of UCOP’s Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP), developed profiles of the pilot units and the comparators to ensure that the units were indeed comparable in terms of demographics, size (student and faculty numbers), research profile, etc.

Based on the reporting requirements that came with the state allocation, APP prepared two annual reports on the program: 1) a preliminary report (November 2016) that included the demographics on Ladder-rank faculty required in the Budget Act, and “a description of the specific uses of these funds to support equal employment opportunity in faculty employment, including any systemwide training, monitoring and compliance” and 2) a “Final Report on the 2016-17 Use of One-Time Funds to Support Best Practices in Equal Employment Opportunity in Faculty Employment” that was submitted to the state by President Napolitano on 22 November 2017. The program continued to produce these two annual reports through 2022, even after they were no longer required by the state. Much of the information in my summary of the program in this Chronicle derives from these reports.² During that first year, I was also asked to appear before the Assembly Subcommittee on Education on 29 March 2017 to provide preliminary information on the pilot programs.

2. The APP web page for AFD is the best resource for program information.

All of this activity and reporting during Year 1 was undertaken without our knowing whether the program would be extended beyond the initial year. Happily, there was additional state funding in Year 2 (2017–2018), Year 3 (2018–2019), Year 4 (2019–2020), and Year 6 (2021–2022).³ For the first four years, the state provided a total of \$8.5M to AFD, and members of the legislature touted the UC program design to UC’s colleagues at the California State University. By the time President Napolitano committed ongoing funding during Year 3, the program processes and management had been further refined. More details on these changes will be detailed below.

Recruitment Pilots, Years 1 (2016–2017), 2 (2017–2018), and 3 (2018–2019)

The first three years of AFD established a program with innovative interventions in the recruitment process, interventions that fit UC’s values and academic mission and whose results were measurable. Looking back from what is now the eighth year of the program, it is clear how much campus enthusiasm and creativity was unleashed to support the University’s mission to create a diverse and vibrant academic community. I remain grateful to the State of California for promoting this program. These first three years created a sturdy foundation for the continuing program.

Year 1 (2016–2017)

Three awards were made in the first year, with the expectation that each of the three colleges/schools with awards would make interventions in the recruitment process, as outlined in their proposals, and have hiring results to report and funds expended (or committed) by July of 2017. The pace was furious, especially in the fall of 2016.

The pilot that had the biggest impact, both in the unit and in later AFD pilots around the system, was in the Bourns College of Engineering (BCOE) at UC Riverside, under the leadership of Interim Dean Sharon Walker. The program had two distinguishing features. First was the “Provost’s Diversity in Engineering Fellowships” (PDEF), fellowships awarding a post-doc year of salary to use at UC Riverside or at any institution in the country, designed for applicants just finishing their PhDs. Those applying for the PDEF Fellowships, which would precede the beginning of the assistant professor position, responded to ads with this language about the mission of the campus, “Its [UC Riverside’s] mission explicitly states the goal of providing routes to edu-

3. It is unclear why the state decided not to allocate funds in 2020–2021, although this was a time of great disruption due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

cational success for underrepresented and first-generation college students. A commitment to this mission, such as engagement with diverse populations of students, role modelling and mentoring is a preferred qualification” (Year 1 Final Report, p. 20).

Second, the Riverside pilot had an applicant review process in which the contributions to diversity statements (C2DEI) were evaluated from the beginning of the evaluation process, not only near the end. This second practice became a part of many subsequent AFD Recruitment pilot programs, with different campuses and units prioritizing the contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion statement in customized ways that fit the unit processes. As reported to the legislature, the UC Riverside “focus on the diversity statement in the longlist stage produced a group of extremely high-quality researchers with equally impressive credentials supporting diversity” (Year 1 Final Report, p. 20).

In a recruitment process that included these two major innovations, three scholars were hired as new assistant professors, all of whom were women of color. The results in the pilot unit were compared to the “comparator” at another UC campus and were also compared to the hiring of the prior two years, as became the practice for nearly all recruitment pilot programs in the following years of AFD. The results of the PDEF program were also compared to the other hiring done in the Bourns College during the pilot year. The Interim Dean summarized the project this way, “The college’s commitment to diversity combined with a competitive hiring package led to all three of BCOE’s top-choice candidates accepting positions within our college, despite their receiving competitive offers from other top universities” (Year 1 Final Report, p. 21).

The Year 1 pilot at UC San Diego was also in engineering—the Jacobs School of Engineering. This program had different interventions and a separate set of comparators reflecting its demographics and size. Dean Albert Pisano and the school’s equity advisor, Professor Pamela Cosman, both played important roles in broadening the pool of applicants, using rubrics in candidate evaluations, and enhancing mechanisms for recruiting partners and supporting the cohort of new hires. The hiring results were notable, with the percentage of under-represented minority (URM) faculty hiring increasing from 10.7% to 20.8% in comparison to prior years and, with the percentage of female faculty hires increasing by 10% to 37.5%. Both hiring results were above the national availability and higher than the hiring in the comparator engineering school at UC. Two interventions used at the Jacobs School were adopted by many of the pilot projects in subsequent years, including the use of rubrics in evaluation and the awarding of start-up funds designated specifically to support the newly hired faculty members’ outreach activities in the initial years at UCSD (\$40K was dedicated to each new hire).

Schools and colleges in engineering were principal participants in pilot projects in the first three years, with six of the eleven pilots being either solely or partially located in engineering. Ten of the eleven were solely or partially in STEM. Most of these pilot units had faculty who had been participants in or studied the NSF ADVANCE program, in which the NSF had invested significant funding into improving the diversity of the STEM faculty workforce across the country.

The third pilot program in the first year of AFD was in the UC Davis College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, also with some experience in prior efforts in faculty diversity. The program was ambitious, with over 30 hires proposed and a major commitment from the dean to fund two offers from a single search when candidates met certain criteria. However, the one-year timeline of the program proved to be a challenge and the hiring results appeared to be only marginally affected by the program. The Dean did report, however, that the AFD Recruitment pilot had elevated “the conversation around diversity and inclusion to a new level, increased understanding among our faculty search committees about the need and resulting gains from the college, UCD, and the students. Our search committees will be more comfortable and more knowledgeable on how to reach out to encourage outstanding diverse applicants to consider UCD in their career plans” (Year 1 Final Report, p. 15).

The extra accountability involved in the monthly reports to the systemwide Advisory Group was especially effective in establishing the AFD network. The seven interventions that were most successful in the three Year 1 pilot units became a continuing part of the program in future years: 1) enhanced outreach; 2) use of PFP/CFP⁴ recruitments; 3) targeting potential faculty earlier in their careers; 4) leadership from the dean; 5) rubrics for evaluation; 6) use of contributions to diversity statements; and 7) investment in partner recruitment (Year 1 Final Report, p. 4).

In addition, the Council of Vice Chancellors (COVC) was directly involved through regular updates on the program. All of the executive vice chancellors/provosts took part in a full-day retreat in Oakland on 4 April 2017. The event was sponsored by AFD and managed by APP and UCOP’s Office of Equity and Outreach. Each executive vice chancellor/provost led a delegation of faculty and academic administrators from their campus and participated in a series of presentations and small group discussions all focused on issues of faculty diversity as a part of the UC’s mission. There was an especially stimulating poster session over lunch, with posters prepared by the three Year 1 pilots as well as by other UC faculty-led research in the issues of faculty diversity and recruitment. For example, there was a poster from Berkeley’s Office of Faculty Equity and Welfare on findings from the Search Commit-

4. President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program and Chancellors’ Fellowship Programs.

tee Chair Survey. The event was also a reminder that AFD was only one of many ways in which the campuses were working on issues of faculty diversity. Indeed a key component of the AFD program was that it would provide funding for new efforts only. This enhanced the ongoing commitments and programs already in place on the campuses.

Year 2 (2017-2018)

The year-end Final Report on Year 2, submitted by President Napolitano to the State of California on 9 November 2018, summarizes the leap forward in AFD's second year. While the program goals and application/evaluation process remained the same as in Year 1, the campus proposals were full of new and significant campus commitments (including FTE) as those awarded AFD funds in the second year capitalized on the successes of Year 1. At least some of this acceleration is likely due to the increased time campuses had to plan a pilot and to build a campus team to lead it. The funding in the second year was limited to \$500,000 per pilot as a maximum, so that four programs could be funded. It felt to me that it was a "bargain" to incentivize major changes in the recruitment process with a relatively small amount of funding, most of which was committed to start-up packages for new faculty. Four new campuses received awards—UC Berkeley, UC Irvine, UC San Francisco, and UC Santa Barbara—while the size of the pilot programs ranged from a single department (Economics at UC Santa Barbara) to multi-school, multi-disciplinary groups (STEM at UC Irvine and Biomedical Sciences at UC San Francisco).

The same UC Recruit-based metrics of hiring from Year 1 were used to assess the outcomes of the pilots, with UC comparator units carefully chosen and endorsed by the Advisory Group. The hiring outcomes in the pilots were notable, as reported in the Year 2 Final Report: "There was a substantial increase in the percentage of underrepresented minority (URM) and female faculty as finalists in three pilot units and of those hired in all four pilot units. The four pilot units averaged a 30.7% increase in URM faculty hired and a 12.0% increase in female faculty hired compared to the hiring over the prior two years. In the meantime, the comparator units, who did not receive any additional funding, averaged a 9.2% increase in URM faculty hired and a 12.1% increase in female faculty hired compared to the hiring over the prior two years" (Year 2 Final Report, p. 2). The list of "best practices" in the annual report includes the seven items from Year 1, and these four additional best practices: 1) accountability at the systemwide level; 2) campus commitment of funding and strategic involvement of a range of campus academic leaders (department chair, deans, vice provosts, vice chancellors); 3) strength-

ening the use of faculty equity advisors; and 4) establishment of centralized hiring review committees outside of the department (Year 2 Final Report, p. 4).

The pilot at UC Berkeley was located in the third AFD school of engineering, following two in the first year, with hiring results that continued to outpace the school's prior efforts to diversify the faculty. The hiring of URM was 20% more than in the prior two years and also 20% more than the comparator school in the pilot year. The Berkeley pilot program also led to the funding of a new full-time staff position, the Director of Faculty Engagement in Equity and Inclusion, and to a new partnership with the University of Michigan to build a diverse pipeline to the professoriate.

A notable part of the pilot at UC Irvine was the focus on recruitment of past PFP and CFP fellows; and, as a result, eight STEM hires were made from this recruitment group. This affirmation of the quality of PFP/CFP scholars has continued to be a part of most AFD recruitment pilots. The hiring results were diverse: "there was a 35% increase in the percentage of URM hired, exceeding the national availability of URM STEM PhDs by 29.7 percentage points" (Year 2 Final Report, p. 19). This pilot also looked forward to support and mentoring for the new hires through a Society of Inclusive Excellence Fellows, managed through the Office of Inclusive Excellence and Vice Chancellor Douglas Haynes (currently the Vice Provost of APP).

The pilots at UC Santa Barbara and UC San Francisco added some important "firsts" for AFD. The pilot at UC Santa Barbara's Department of Economics was the first of several pilots in a single department. This pilot modeled, for the first time, how a unit as small as a department could design a revamped recruitment practice that would work in the discipline of Economics, where recruitment timing and protocol is highly nationalized. The Economics Department used the strategy of the UC Riverside pilot in Year 1 to offer a post-doc year to those hired at the assistant professor rank. For hires at the associate level, the campus dedicated endowed chairs as a part of the recruitment package. The endowed chair for one associate level hire sought candidates who could establish a new diversity-rich leadership center on campus. Hires during the pilot year included 50% URM, exceeding national availability by 40.5%; hiring of female faculty was 16.7%, below the national availability.

Also during this second year, UC San Francisco's pilot was the first award in the health sciences: since Ladder-rank faculty make up a small percentage of the UCSF faculty (just over 10%), interventions in this pilot were distinct from those in non-health sciences disciplines. A key best practice was a multidisciplinary review committee and leadership at the Vice Chancellor level, under Vice Chancellor Renee Navarro. Some of the barriers to change for this pilot in health sciences led to revisions in the future AFD Requests for Pro-

posals, to encourage additional health sciences pilots. While hiring of Ladder-rank faculty had been required in the first two years of the program, future proposal PIs had the option to make the case that the recruitment of faculty in other title series (professors in residence, professors of clinical X, etc.) also needed the incentive of AFD funding.

Year 3 (2018-2019)

Funding for Year 3 again came from the state, an allocation of \$2,000,000 “for the creation or expansion of equal employment opportunity programs.” As required, UCOP submitted a preliminary report on 7 November 2018, and a year-end Final Report on 18 November 2019. Provost and Executive Vice President Michael T. Brown sent out the Request for Proposals substantially earlier than in prior years, on 12 July 2018, so that awards could be made earlier, ensuring that a full complement of recruitment innovations could be used, starting with the position descriptions and advertising placements. Such early interventions had not consistently been possible for the majority of pilots in Years 1 and 2, given the date that awards were announced. The proposals for Year 3 were evidence of a maturing AFD program, one now clearly drawing from the national research on efforts to diversify the faculty while building on the prior AFD years at UC.

These third-year proposals were bold. Pilots in this third year were still only given a single year to complete their programs and, in spite of this, they put together interventions that transformed some of the most basic components of the faculty recruitment process. For three of the four programs, a UC comparator on another campus was developed as in Years 1 and 2; and for the fourth program, the comparator remained other recruitments on the same campus, as will be explained below. Year 3 was also the first year in which UCOP funded a companion program for Improved Climate and Retention pilot programs, which I will discuss in the next section of this chapter.

As a group, the four recruitment pilots in Year 3 succeeded in attracting a diverse pool and making diverse hires: “there was a substantial increase in the percentage of underrepresented minority (URM) and female faculty as finalists and of those hired in all four pilot units. The four pilot units averaged a 38.8% increase in URM faculty hired and 30.7% increase in female faculty hired compared to the hiring over the prior two years. In contrast, the comparator units, which did not receive any additional funding, averaged a 13.3% increase in URM faculty hiring and a 6.2% increase in female faculty hired compared to the hiring over the prior two years” (Year 3 Final Report (Recruitment), p. 2).

The list of “best practices” for AFD recruitment pilots was expanded beyond the Year 1 and 2 lists to add three new interventions: 1) redacted candidate materials and search committee training on implicit bias; 2) standardizing job advertisement texts across departments and schools; and 3) leveraging knowledge and leadership by faculty equity advisors.

The Year 3 pilots at UC Riverside and at UC Merced took the design of prior years’ pilots and honed them to fit local unit situations. UC Riverside focused its efforts in the Department of Mathematics, where the ambitious chair, Dr. Yat Sun Poon, and other senior faculty took on the difficult task of diversifying the faculty in the discipline of mathematics. Across UC, most mathematics department hires were less diverse than the availability pools in their discipline, where representation of URM and female candidates is among the lowest of any academic discipline. In addition, UC mathematics departments had been resisting directives to do their recruiting through UC Recruit, opting instead for “Math Jobs,” a national recruitment platform used by many peer mathematics departments around the country. After a difficult back and forth between Provost and Executive Vice President Brown and mathematics department chairs and faculty, Provost Brown required all mathematics departments to manage their recruitments through UC Recruit and not through their national disciplinary Math Jobs platform. His decision to make this requirement reflected a concern that mathematics departments had too little information about why they remained below national averages in the diversity of their faculty and that Math Jobs was not set up to collect and manage the data needed for such analysis. All chairs of mathematics departments wrote to the UC President to protest the requirement, but UC Riverside took an alternative route and saw the opportunity to use UC Recruit to its advantage in serving its students and the mathematics department mission. The use of UC Recruit for their pilot period was a key innovation in the UC Riverside plans.

Indeed, the data compiled for the AFD Year 3 Final Report are evidence that using UC Recruit is correlated with increasingly diverse hiring outcomes in the department. Both the UC Riverside pilot and its comparator department had no URM hires in the prior two years and the comparator had no female hires in those same two years (the pilot unit had 16.7% female hires). The UC Riverside mathematics pilot drew heavily from interventions tested by the UC Riverside engineering college in Year 1 and from the UC Santa Barbara economics pilot in Year 2 (a pilot also at the department level). Thus, in the Department of Mathematics, contributions to diversity statements were evaluated in the initial round of review, hires received a full-year post-doc at UC Riverside or elsewhere in the country, and the department redesigned several stages of its recruitment process to make it more equitable and welcoming to all candidates. For example, the department hosted a “Riverside Mathe-

ematics Workshop for Excellence and Diversity” conference in October 2018 and invited graduate students from across the country to network and hear a keynote address from a nationally prominent female senior mathematician. The pilot plan also included mentoring for the newly hired faculty to ensure they had well developed skills for teaching math to a diverse student body. The hiring results were promising in the pilot with URM hiring moving from 0% to 16.7% and female hiring moving from 16.7% to 50%. These powerful results were encouraging to many across UC.

Merced’s first pilot also drew heavily from successes in Years 1 and 2. Focused in the schools of engineering and of natural sciences, the pilot adopted interventions that had correlated with diverse hiring in the prior two years of AFD: creation of a central “Leadership Council” to oversee the hiring and ensure equitable processes; early review of contributions to diversity statements; use of the PFP/CFP and faculty equity advisor programs; and attention to training during the recruitment and to mentoring after the hire.

The other two pilots in Year 3—life sciences at UC Berkeley and campus-wide at UC Davis—built comprehensive and transformative recruitment structures that were extensive interventions in the status quo. The Berkeley life sciences pilot is notable for its ambitious—and ultimately successful—strategy to build a cross-school collaboration in which departments ceded final hiring decisions to a central “Life Sciences Initiative” (LSI) Committee to manage the “open-field faculty recruitment” process. The LSI Committee included 22 faculty and staff members and met 19 times during the year (Year 3 Final Report (Recruitment), pp. 14–19). Five additional FTEs were committed to the pilot recruitments, and the LSI Committee and faculty colleagues from the participating departments took part in a newly designed recruitment process that included redacted candidate statements and rubrics; campus visits with new elements, like a job talk that included ideas for advancing equity and inclusion at Berkeley; continual monitoring of the inclusiveness and equity in the process; and a year-end “Life Sciences Symposium on Integrating Research with Education and Outreach” with participants from across UC campuses, the first of several such systemwide convenings by AFD awardees. In addition to the evaluation of hiring outcomes through UC Recruit data, the pilot leaders conducted a survey of chairs and deans who had participated in the recruitments and of symposium participants. The Final Report included a comment from a graduate student at the symposium, a comment that captures the strong collaborations of the pilot:

It was thrilling and extremely heartening to see this as a faculty led effort but one in which a huge range of people from administrators to grad students to postdocs were involved . . . it was just so clearly stated across all speakers that diversity,

equity, and inclusion are not just extra things we do—the frosting on the cake per se—but actually make research more innovative and teaching more effective. (Year 3 Final Report (Recruitment), p. 18)

I had the opportunity to meet with the LSI Committee in person in April 2019 and experienced firsthand the high energy and commitment of those involved in this project. They reported on the way this pilot had strengthened their units and encouraged commitment to lasting changes in recruitment protocols.

The UC Davis pilot was equally bold in having the central Academic Affairs office coordinate a series of eight “open searches,” one in each of eight different schools and colleges. The standard comparator process that had proven a useful metric in all other pilots to date did not work well with this design; and instead, these eight hires were compared to all other recruitments in the eight schools. At the core of the pilot was a collaboration between Academic Affairs and eight deans’ offices which, as with the UC Berkeley life sciences pilot, moved final decision-making out of the department. The UC Davis Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor also committed up to \$500,000 to each participating school/college. In addition to the review of anonymized contributions to diversity statements, other interventions included the use of confidential faculty advisors who helped finalists navigate the interview and offer process, transition support for new faculty and their families, and mentoring committees. The eight hires were all URM, compared with 2.3% in the comparator group of hires. In addition, 87.5% of the hires were female. This Davis pilot also became Phase 1 of a two-phase program, with Phase 2 coming in a Year 4 recruitment award.⁵

Reporting on Years 1, 2, and 3

At the September 2018 UC Regents meeting, the annual “Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity” focused on faculty and was the first summary of the AFD program for the UC Regents. In the short summary of the program, we emphasized the program design: “The program is designed so that the University can measure the effectiveness of the expenditures and determine whether expansion of the recruitment interventions would be warranted” (p. 15). Some of the interventions that had been tested in Years 1 and 2 were summarized. In the following years, several other Regents items contained additional information about the program. These public reports suggest that AFD had joined PFP as an essential systemwide program to enhance UC wide efforts to build a strong faculty with commitments to powerful research, and

5. As detailed in Chapter Two, in the spring of 2020, an intense discussion about the use of contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion statements at UC Davis led to Academic Senate resolutions both for and against the use of such statements.

to inclusive teaching and outreach. Together, they make a forceful statement about UC's steadfast and well-conceived commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Adding Improved Climate and Retention Pilots, Beginning in Year 3

In the third year of AFD, President Napolitano approved the allocation of over \$7,000,000 to several programs that supported faculty diversity efforts either directly or indirectly. This ongoing support added \$2,000,000 to the PFPF budget permanently, to support additional postdoctoral fellows and related programming. It also established ongoing funding of \$3,000,000 for the AFD budget. Thus, after three years in which the program was in tentative status, with one-time funding never certain until the next state budget was finalized, the program was fully budgeted, and planning a multi-year future was possible. The ongoing funding indicated the University's priority of building a strong and diverse faculty, and it took the commitment of both President Napolitano and Provost and Executive Vice President Brown to build the program in a time of tight budgets at UCOP. The President and Provost also made clear that going forward the program should support retention as well as recruitment efforts, as the campuses had requested.

During Year 3 of AFD, the full amount of the President's \$7M commitment was not yet available, so the Recruitment program continued to be supported by the state's \$2,000,000 allocation; and, as detailed above, four recruitment pilots were supported. In addition, there was sufficient funding from the President to fund the six Improved Climate and Retention pilots awarded in Year 3 (more on this below). The next year, in Year 4, there was a fourth allocation from the state, for \$2,500,000. In addition, there was also available the President's \$3,000,000 allocation, for a total of \$5.5M.

As a consequence, in Year 4, AFD funded five Recruitment pilots and nine Improved Climate and Retention pilots, with the largest annual commitment of funds to date. In Years 5 and 7, there was no additional state funding. In Year 6, there was a one-time state allocation of \$5,000,000, a portion of which went to AFD. Of the \$5 million, \$2,000,000 went to the campuses to support their participation in the SEA Change Initiative sponsored by the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), and \$3,000,000 went to support efforts in faculty diversity and equity. The additional \$3,000,000 in state support was used in three ways: to fund additional AFD projects on the campuses, to fund start-up packages for PFPF STEM faculty hiring, and to expedite changes to UC Recruit that would support AFD efforts.

In the first year of the Improved Climate and Retention program (Year 3, 2018–2019), awards were limited to \$75,000 each, with the expectation that the funds would be expended in a single year. The RFP also expanded the scope of people who might benefit from the interventions. While the first years of AFD were focused on faculty, almost exclusively Ladder-rank faculty, the Improved Climate and Retention awards invited a broader focus: “Proposals addressed issues of climate and retention faced by underrepresented faculty (by race/ethnicity and gender), although other retention and climate issues could be included as part of the proposals. The RFP noted that proposals should focus on ladder-rank faculty but encouraged projects that focused on other populations within the department” (Year 3 Final Report (Improved Climate and Retention), p. 2). The six pilots represented a wide variety of programming, including projects in the humanities, in the arts, and in disciplines where research was focused on issues of race, equity, and social justice.

The pilots included three narrowly defined programs: the School of Public Health (UC Berkeley), the Center for Ideas and Society (UC Riverside), and engineering and mathematics departments (UC Santa Barbara). Two other programs encompassed multiple disciplines—the arts and humanities (UC San Diego) and STEM (UC Irvine). And a final program was campus-wide with affinity groups focused on gender and race/ethnicity (UC Santa Cruz). In each of the programs, there were multi-pronged plans to improve faculty retention and to deal with climate issues. For example, the Riverside “Faculty Commons” pilot included the building of research groups; community building events; outside speakers; manuscript development sessions; and mentoring networks. The UC San Diego effort sponsored workshops for mid-career faculty; public forums and lectures to engage issues of the day; a mentoring structure across divisional boundaries; and an annual event to showcase major research contributions by early-career faculty. The “Final Report on the 2018–19 Use of Funds to Support Improved Workplace Climate and Faculty Retention Outcomes” (referred to as “Year 3 Final Report (Improved Climate and Retention)”) summarizes the first year of this program in more detail.

In the “Challenges” section of this final report on the Improved Climate and Retention programs, the single-year length of the program was identified as inhibiting, because of what turned out to be an unrealistic expectation that progress on retention and climate issues could be put in place and measured in less than a full academic year (p. 14). Three of the programs requested no-cost extensions, all of which were approved, and one received a second award in Year 4 to continue its work. It was also clear that nearly all of the programs had difficulty in putting together data that could help measure the success of the programming, and all felt that the \$75K awards were not large

enough to support programming and interventions that could lead to measurable changes in retention or climate. Consequently, in Year 4 of the program, the awards were increased in amount and lengthened to two years.

Engagement of a Senior Scholar and a Junior Scholar to Further Define the Improved Climate and Retention Program

The Request for Proposals for the first round of Improved Climate and Retention pilots in Year 3 had to be assembled quickly, without time to lay substantial groundwork for program design and evaluation. This compressed timeline, along with the issues of funding amounts and award length, led to a major redesign of the program. The redesign resulted from extensive consultation, including two external scholars and campus stakeholders.

During the course of Year 3, I secured funds from Provost and Executive Vice President Brown to support the engagement of two consultants: 1) a senior scholar to survey the latest literature on academic climate and faculty retention and advise on the best design of the Improved Climate and Retention program going forward, and 2) a junior scholar to take the senior scholar's report and help us build an RFP to guide development of Improved Climate and Retention proposals for Year 4 and beyond.

Dr. Kiernan Mathews, then the Executive Director and Principal Investigator of the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) at the Harvard School of Education, served as the senior scholar, drawing from his engagement with faculty satisfaction issues across the nation, through COACHE, and his knowledge of the relevant research literature. We asked him to provide a bibliography of relevant literature and to provide recommendations for the re-design of the AFD Improved Climate and Retention program going forward. As a part of his review, he conducted interviews with more than a dozen scholars and practitioners nationwide. These interviews provided a useful external view of the AFD work. As Mathews summarizes: "They were enthusiastic about this study because of UC's scale, its diversity (institutionally and demographically), and its position as a leader in American higher education. It is a system animated to meet the demands of diverse students with greater energy than most, if not all other states in the nation. It also has more experience in this work than most state university systems, whether one measures by its track record or by its assembled talent. Across its ten campuses and in many disciplines, UC employs many of the world's best scholars of equity and race in higher education" ("Scaling Opportunity," p. 1).

The forty-plus page report, “Scaling Opportunity: Systems Thinking on Academic Climate and Faculty Retention,” provided a foundation for choices we subsequently made about shaping the Improved Climate and Retention part of AFD. The report’s bibliography provided an up-to-date scan of current research, while Mathews’ analysis of this literature repeatedly notes that there is not a ready-made theoretical framework on which to build the new AFD focus. In fact, he encouraged APP to dedicate a portion of the AFD effort to propose “something that is really foundational” (p. 26). The input from the national experts and UCOP partners clarified as well that this program represented a notable opportunity for UC, and that it might also serve broader retention and climate efforts across the country. Mathews summarizes this ambitious opportunity at the end of the report:

The thrust of these recommendations should encourage UCOP to think of scaling not the size or quantity of its faculty retention activities, but of scaling their impact by, for example, using data and talent throughout the system to shift mindsets and engage the UC as a network. How can the next generation of AFD grantees go beyond what the original teams accomplished? How can UCOP build grantees’ capacity as co-evaluators, co-designers, and co-scalers? How can grantees form a “community of practice” that helps answer questions about scale? (p. 37).

Mathews also delivered five recommendations that have shaped AFD since Year 3: 1) Define the problem (before funding solutions); 2) Incent use of existing data and better data collection; 3) Seed new research on the climate for and retention of faculty; 4) Engage new networks through improvement science; and 5) Prioritize engagement of systems over individuals.

The junior scholar, Amal Kumar, who was then a PhD candidate at Harvard, took up the next stage in the shaping of the AFD Improved Climate and Retention program. In an iterative process with APP that followed immediately after Mathews’ work, Kumar helped put together a detailed “Request for Proposals” (RFP) document as well as an internal guide and timeline for administration of the two RFP programs and related work. The RFP for the second year of the Improved Climate and Retention option (Academic Year 2019-20, Year 4 of the overall AFD program) laid the foundation for the program to increase its scope and improve its efficacy going forward.

The lengthy RFP document included discussion of the UC retention gap as reported by campus faculty and academic administration, and research linking retention issues to climate factors. Also addressed were three kinds of Improved Climate and Retention awards (Interventions, Data Leadership, and Research) that teams could apply for, and a brief Annotated Bibliography meant to assist PIs and their colleagues in putting together proposals. The bibliography was described this way in Year 4 and subsequent years: “this bib-

liography is intended to be a jumping-off point for project teams to develop a strong argument for why and how your project is likely to be successful and what your unit or other units within the UC system may learn from its implementation about improving climate and retention for faculty who hold minoritized identities” (Brown, 2020-2022 Improved Climate and Retention RFP, p. 19). The idea was to encourage proposals not only from those who were steeped in the relevant research, but also from any potential faculty team that wanted to address these retention and climate issues in their department or school. The message was that they didn’t have to start from scratch but could draw from existing, research-based frameworks for change that might fit their retention and climate challenges.

The work of senior scholar Mathews and junior scholar Kumar set the Improved Climate and Retention program on a firm, research-based foundation that fit the needs of the UC system. Their work also amplified the importance of using both qualitative and quantitative data to measure the effectiveness of funded programs. Mathews’ report, with the support of national experts, urged UC to make better use of being a system—“system-ness”—to shape AFD much like a federal agency’s funding programs; NSF’s ADVANCE program may be the best analogy. He further suggested that the system-based goals of AFD could create transformational change not just in individual units, but across campuses: “Scholarship and expert commentary converged in a consensus that future efforts to improve the retention of diverse faculties, rather than fund programs that focus on the *individuals* UCOP is seeking to retain, must prioritize strategies to change the *environments* meant to retain them” (“Scaling Opportunity,” p. 30).

Consultation with UC Campuses and Academic Senate in February and March 2019

At the same time that APP consulted with the senior and junior scholars, I travelled to all ten campuses, spending a day at each, to consult with stakeholders on systemwide engagement in issues of faculty recruitment, retention, equity, and diversity. Between 5 February and 20 March, I met with over 300 faculty, administrators, staff, and students. Participants included a wide array of interested parties: a chancellor; all executive vice chancellors/provosts and vice provosts/vice chancellors for academic personnel/academic affairs; chief diversity officers; divisional Academic Senate leaders and committee chairs; deans and department chairs; academic personnel directors/assistant vice provosts/assistant vice chancellors; leaders of diversity efforts, committees, and programs; those involved in AFD pilot programs, including new faculty hired through AFD; faculty equity advisors; and those involved

in researching and/or assessing all such efforts. PFPF Director Mark Lawson joined me for eight of the visits, and UCOP Vice Provost Yvette Gullatt for two of them. In addition, during this time, I consulted with various systemwide administrative cohorts: the chief diversity officers, the Advisory Group for AFD, and key Academic Senate committees, including UCFW and UCAADE.

The visits were timed to ensure we had stakeholder input as we assessed two systemwide programs—AFD and PFPF—in light of the ongoing funding that the President had made available. To clarify, at this moment we had the President’s new commitment of ongoing funding to faculty diversity efforts, including AFD and PFPF, as well as other pipeline efforts, including UC’s HBCU initiative and what has become the UC-HSI Doctoral Diversity Initiative. The campus visits were meant to ensure that we had up-to-date input from our partners and collaborators as we augmented systemwide programs with the ongoing funding. I completed a twelve-page report on the visits in April 2019 and shared the report with UCOP leaders as well as campus academic leadership. Details from that report, “Advancing the Intellectual Work of the University,” have been included in this summary. The report is included in Appendix B.

One campus administrator offered a useful characterization of the work at hand, a phrase that has stuck with me and one I have adapted in the title of this Chronicle—“the structure of diversity work is an art” (“Advancing the Intellectual Work of the University,” p. 2). In other words, there is no formula or template, but creativity is required to successfully shape something appropriate for the hierarchies of the academy. Just as important was a theme woven into so many of the conversations—the foundational belief that diversity, equity, and inclusion work is an essential part of the UC’s missions of teaching, research, and service. I summarized it in my report this way:

[...] this work on faculty diversity, equity, and inclusion IS the intellectual work of the university. We heard again and again that diversity and inclusion should not be seen as a moral issue separate from quality and excellence. In addition, we were reminded that we should not make diversity a “branding issue” only. When administrators are perceived to be “performing diversity,” skepticism about programs and commitments grows. (“Advancing the Intellectual Work of the University,” p. 11)

An additional overarching takeaway was that we needed to maintain vigilance over the appropriate role of a systemwide office. At the Office of the President, we were urged to encourage and support cross-campus and multi-campus efforts and to focus on what we do best at the systemwide level: funding pilot projects; collecting and analyzing data from all campuses; curating and

sharing best practices via meetings and websites; and building and maintaining community. This emphasis on “systemness” complements the emphasis of Mathews’ report.

Specific recommendations for the AFD program, both the Recruitment option and the Improved Climate and Retention option, were also very much in harmony with the recommendations that came from the two external scholars. Thus, it’s important to note that as the AFD program moved into Year 4, it was framed by multiple sets of input. In addition, looking back at the 2019 summary of my campus visits now, I can see how the campus discussions led to the next three years of AFD in two notable ways:

- Several issues that were of concern on multiple campuses became the focus of later funded AFD projects: the “invisible labor” by those faculty who do diversity work and the disproportionate service burden that falls to faculty of color and women; the “epistemological exclusion” of certain kinds of research in merit review, particularly that devoted to issues of equity and justice or, within the sciences or social sciences, research that is qualitative in nature; the eagerness to build training processes and toolkits across campuses; the need to enhance work in ethnic and cultural studies; and the possibility of cluster hiring as a major recruitment intervention.
- There was consistent support for using research-based frameworks for the AFD projects and for funding UC research into issues of DEI, particularly in the processes of the academy (the faculty review process, the use of teaching evaluations, paths to leadership, etc.).

In addition, the campus visits affirmed the value of online platforms and data collection and analysis already in place: UC Recruit, the Faculty Retention and Exit Survey, the Survey of Search Committee Chairs, and faculty salary equity studies. The campus stakeholders also recommended that RFP guidelines for AFD allow for focus beyond the Ladder-rank faculty, specifically to support more diversity, equity, and inclusion in all faculty series (especially those in the health sciences), and to develop the graduate student pipeline. There were also “robust conversations” about PFP on all the campuses we visited. It became increasingly clear that what works in PFP “teaches us what will work in all searches in which we value contributions to diversity: broad, open searches work; because they provide flexibility, clusters of hires work; strategic planning over several years enables a more flexible approach to individual hires” (“Advancing the Intellectual Work of the University,” p. 5).

Finally, many of the conversations included a “big picture” component, an understanding that succeeding in the efforts to recruit, advance, and retain a diverse faculty meant cultural and structural change. Participants recognized the heavy lifting involved in changing cultural norms and improving climate as well as the importance of both a sustained commitment and sufficient funding. They recognized the importance of the APM in these efforts, and one specifically recommended a “blue-ribbon panel” be established to consider major policy changes in redefining what constitutes excellence in position responsibilities, particularly those responsibilities in teaching, mentoring, and service. They discussed (and many endorsed) the use of contributions to diversity statements in merit and advancement reviews, not just recruitment. There was also broad recognition that it would take a coalition of leaders across academic units—including executive vice chancellors/provosts, academic personnel vice provosts/vice chancellors, Academic Senate chairs, and chief diversity officers—to effect the structural changes needed to realize our ambitions. The “big picture” thinking also included support for participation in the APLU’s iChange initiative and the AAAS’s SEA Change program. Both of these national networks have been increasingly important to UC in the years since these 2019 conversations. I served on the first advisory board for the APLU iChange effort; and as iChange has developed, UC’s efforts have provided a model, with particular interest in UC Recruit.

Structure of AFD Recruitment and Improved Climate and Retention Programs from Year 4 through Year 6

Year 4 of AFD (2019–20) was marked by significant changes in the structure of the program. Not only was there substantial funding to support even more campus projects, but my February and March 2019 campus visits had increased the visibility of the programs and strengthened the cross-campus network. Key changes included are described in the following sections.

Accountability

Administration of the program included more regular and better-defined reporting to APP by the active programs. This included budget updates twice a year by each pilot/program, in addition to APP approvals of any re-budgeting, to ensure funds were spent in alignment with the proposal and AFD goals. Pilots/programs also submitted progress reports several times a year. By year six, these reports were shared with all active programs during the two systemwide convenings. And finally, each academic year, the PIs and pilot leaders had two to three individual calls with APP to report progress,

but especially to allow discussion of challenges. By Year 4, this protocol involved a total of over 30 calls, each of which was individually scheduled for a specific program. As a consequence, we moved to a variable and more manageable cadence for the calls: pilots and programs in their first year had individual calls with APP, and pilots and programs in their second or third year were part of multi-team check-in calls with APP. The calls were particularly important for us at UCOP to identify issues we might need to address. For instance, there were a few cases in which I needed to contact executive vice chancellors/provosts and deans to help resolve administrative hurdles facing PIs.

I believe this several-part accountability to the system and to UCOP was a key factor in the success of the program, although it was clearly labor intensive. However, this strong central role did have one downside for some programs: because the campus knew we were paying close attention at UCOP, that sometimes meant that very few on the campus, especially relevant administrators, knew much about the successes and challenges of the programs. We attempted to counteract this by requiring each proposal to include a campus “sponsor,” someone at the campus-wide level, like an executive vice chancellor, vice chancellor, or vice provost, in order to ensure that the sponsor would be briefed on the progress of the pilot/program and advise the PIs as needed.

AFD Advisory Group

Because of the growing size of the program—moving from three active awards in Year 1 to ten new awards in Year 3—the constitution of the Advisory Group was adjusted. Each campus continued to send one or two campus representatives appointed by the executive vice chancellor/provost, but each active pilot was no longer represented—there were now too many active projects to allow for reporting at the meetings. The Advisory Group did continue to include Academic Senate and UCOP representatives. From this point on, the PIs’ involvement in the systemwide conversations took place at the new convenings. APP continued to manage the Advisory Group as well as the convenings, and I would argue that the experience and expertise of this centralized administration was crucial to the success and visibility of the program.

RFP Information Meetings

Based on input from the Advisory Group and the chief diversity officers, we began offering RFP “information meetings” to help campuses prepare new proposals starting in Year 5. These online sessions included advice from recent awardees as well as information from those of us in APP. The sessions were well received by those who attended and have continued

Building Systemwide Data

Based on the support of our campus partners, we required participation in data collection from two surveys for those campuses awarded funding through AFD. For those with awards in Recruitment, the Search Committee Chair Survey (administered through UC Recruit) was required; while those with awards in Improved Climate and Retention used the Faculty Retention and Exit Survey (administered by COACHE). Most campuses were already participating in both, but these new requirements allowed UC to collect more comprehensive data from all campuses.

Expanding Demographic Categories

As the Improved Climate and Retention program grew, campuses were invited to address issues of building inclusive climates by addressing issues beyond race/ethnicity and gender—notably, LGBTQIA issues, issues for parents and other caregivers, and recognition of service obligations that fall unevenly on sub-categories of faculty.

Convenings

Beginning in Year 4, AFD hosted two systemwide convenings each academic year, one in the fall term and one in the spring. The convenings have become a critical means by which AFD has built the “community of practice” recommended by senior scholar Mathews (“Scaling Opportunity,” p. 27).

The first of the systemwide convenings was held in-person at UC Davis on 21 and 22 November 2019 and was summarized in the Year 4 Final Report this way: “The event included over 60 attendees, including most campus Chief Diversity Officers. The program included comments from then UC Davis Provost Ralph Hexter, a panel of ‘veteran’ AFD PIs, panels of all new PIs, and time for small group discussion of common challenges and successes” (Year 4 AFD First Year Report, p. 5). This convening set a framework for all future meetings, including some sessions that distinguished

Recruitment pilots from Improved Climate and Retention projects; some that presented systemwide data to help frame issues (in the case of the first convening, this was data from the 2016–19 Faculty Retention and Exit Survey); and some that focused on relevant recent research. In addition, there were presentations by ALL new PIs and some “veteran” PIs; involvement of campus leaders (including executive vice chancellors/provosts, vice provosts, chief diversity officers, and vice chancellors); and time for networking.

The second convening for Year 4 was held on 16 and 17 April 2020, through Zoom, roughly six weeks after the first “shelter in place” orders necessitated by the COVID pandemic. There was shared nervousness about how useful the two days of Zoom presentations and discussions would be in the midst of COVID chaos and uncertainty; but ultimately there was palpable satisfaction from PIs and others in the outcome. Discussion was not always easy, as AFD participants were open about the new challenges imposed by COVID, coming on top of already thorny issues of diversity, recruitment, climate, and retention. An important part of these Year 4 convenings were the materials: detailed agendas, attendee lists, and key documents. In the April 2020 materials, each project leader provided succinct advice to other project leaders, including strategies for dealing with skeptics and resistance.

The convenings in Years 5 (2020–2021) and 6 (2021–2022) were all via Zoom, which had become the standard for almost all systemwide meetings. These convenings all included, as well, prominent UC administrators and researchers: UC Provost and Executive Vice President Michael T. Brown on “UC’s Commitment to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion” (8 October 2020); Professor Kyle Lewis (UC Santa Barbara), on “Micro-experiments and experimental design in work to measure and assess climate and diversity in academic units” (8 October 2020); Professor Brian Soucek (UC Davis) on “Using DEI Statements in recruiting a diverse faculty—Issues to Consider” (14 June 2021); Chancellor Juan Sanchez Munoz (UC Merced) and Provost and Executive Vice President Brown, “Where have we been and where are we headed in UC’s efforts to advance faculty diversity, inclusion, equity, and belonging” (15 June 2021); and Professor KerryAnn O’Meara (University of Maryland), “Equity Matters: Advancing Full Participation in Discretionary Spaces” (2 November 2021).

At the end of Year 6, there were three half-day convenings, one for the active Improved Climate and Retention programs (8 April 2022), a second for the active Recruitment pilots (25 May 2022), and a third for all programs and stakeholders, focused on data about the first six years of AFD (13 May 2022). In the third program, APP presented a summary of information that was also presented to the UC Regents the following week (more on this Regents presentation below).

In addition to these three spring 2022 convenings, two of the campus-based programs put on daylong, in-person events for the AFD community; these were the first in-person meetings since November of 2019. The appetite for these meetings was strong. Because they were in-person, the two campus meetings were energized by face-to-face discussion and collaboration, energy hard to unleash on Zoom. Here are details of these two on-campus, in-person meetings:

*Creating Relevant Equity Advisor Tools to Empower (CREATE). UC Irvine Beckman Center. 27 April 2022. Symposium at UC Irvine, a partnership between UC Irvine and UCOP, with funding by AFD in Year 6, “CREATE (Comparing Relevant Equity Advisor Tools to Empower) at UCI.”*⁶ This daylong symposium had originally been planned for June of 2020 but was postponed due to the COVID pandemic. UC Irvine answered a call for proposals to put on the summit and hosted the first ever systemwide symposium for faculty equity advisors (or the equivalent) from all ten UC campuses. The event was hybrid (about half of attendees online and half in-person at UC Irvine) and was composed of a series of expert panels and small group discussions. Vice President Pamela Brown (UCOP) and I provided a data framework for the day’s conversations in the opening session, looking at UC’s 2030 goals and the ways in which faculty recruitment and faculty diversity factored in. A recording of the day’s welcome and our presentation is available online. Events also included a keynote from Professor Sylvia Hurtado and Postdoctoral Scholar D. White-Lewis (UCLA); a session on PFPF with Director Mark Lawson; and a look forward to UC’s membership in the AAAS’s SEA Change initiative with Dr. Shirley Malcolm (AAAS), Vice Chancellor Douglas Haynes (UC Irvine), Vice Provost/Vice President Yvette Gullatt (UCOP), and Associate Vice Chancellor Marguerite Bonous Hammarth (UC Irvine). Those in attendance were grateful for the chance to network and share best practices. UC Irvine has posted online the agenda as well as resources shared at the event.

UC Summit: Sharing Best Practices for Faculty Climate and Retention to Advance Faculty Diversity. UCLA Luskin Conference Center. 5 May 2022. Event supported by UCLA and UC Irvine and partially funded by AFD Year 6 award, “Multi-pronged Initiatives to Address URM Faculty Retention and Climate.” The Summit was carefully planned by PIs Associate Vice Provost Chris Dunkel Schetter (UCLA) and Associate Vice Provost Nina Baldelj (UC Irvine). They developed an innovative program with the help of a planning committee that included representatives from all campuses. The day included a powerful keynote from former UCLA Dean of Life Sciences Victoria Sork as well as four panels: “Efforts to Increase Service Equity”; “Chair Training: Some UC Campus Models”; “Looking Forward: Impact of COVID on Under-represented Faculty”; and “Mentoring Under-represented Faculty: Different Campus Models.” These were followed by breakout group discussions on “Community Building,” “DEI and the

6. The project always had the acronym CREATE, but the “C” sometimes stands for “Comparing” (the original meaning) and sometimes stands for “Creating.”

Promotion and Merit Processes,” and “Leadership Development.” I was asked to offer closing remarks on the AFD program. The sixty-six attendees/presenters enjoyed an exciting day as UC’s powerful work in the realm of equity, inclusion, and diversity was on display. Most of the featured work had been supported, at least in part, by grants from AFD. Conference materials are available online.

COVID

It was COVID, however, that left the greatest mark on the activities of Years 4, 5, and 6. In the initial months of the pandemic, it was unclear how campuses and their faculty would find the time to continue the active pilots and programs. But because COVID only seemed to underscore the inequities AFD had set out to interrupt, commitments to the AFD work remained strong. Most of the programming was severely delayed, and most pilots added at least a year to their timelines, but the work continued. At the beginning of Academic Year 2020–2021 (Year 5), campuses reported that their faculty hiring would be severely limited, due to COVID-related budget uncertainties, and UC Recruit numbers from December 2020 also indicated that a reduction was likely. Yet, by the end of the year, faculty hiring was strong and the AFD Recruitment pilots were making notable progress. Two of the Improved Climate and Retention programs reported the pressing nature of their work in COVID times, as captured in the “Year 4 AFD First Year Report”:

- UC Davis’s “Faculty Retention and Inclusive Excellence Networks Designing Solutions (FRIENDS)” project leaders reported that, “we initially questioned this project’s place during a devastating pandemic, only to find it more relevant than ever, as those inequalities lurking just below the surface rose into sharp relief. Our four themes were so prevalent in the news that our team leads could barely keep on top of the number of news articles, high-level dialogues, and research that have emerged” (Year 4 AFD First Year Report, p. 6).
- The UC Berkeley Link Program reported the following: “The pandemic and spotlight on police brutality and institutionalized racism have greatly affected campus climate. While our goals of promoting faculty success, satisfaction, and belonging remain the same, we must take into consideration the current events and their disparate impact on our underrepresented faculty in order to accomplish them. Consequently, our events will not only be changing in format (from in-person to online), but also in focus, we are rethinking our event topics as we plan our fall programming and will seek to address the relevant issues that are most impacting faculty in this new reality.... Our Core Advisors will also need additional support as they take on

the task of advising during an unprecedented time. The range of issues they may be asked to advise on has broadened beyond the expertise they're expected to carry" (Year 4 AFD First Year Report, p. 6).

New Themes and Patterns in the Funded Work of Years 4 (2019–2020), 5 (2020–2021), and 6 (2021–2022)

In addition to the challenge of COVID, as well as the increased community orientation of the program, there was also an evolution in the funded awards themselves and in the conversations and actions AFD brought to the campuses. To begin with, the number of newly funded programs ratcheted up with the increased amount of available funding: during Years 4, 5, and 6 there were 16 Recruitment pilots and 22 Improved Climate and Retention programs funded. The campuses showed great ingenuity and engagement in designing interventions, training, and programming that fit the situation of particular populations, departments, schools, colleges, and campuses. While there were some PI teams with names familiar from prior awards, there was a continual stream of new faculty and staff eager to undertake the challenge of addressing issues of climate and retention and committed to designing novel recruitments to attract faculty and enhance academic excellence.

These 38 pilots and programs were varied: some primarily adapted interventions that had worked in prior years and fit them to their units, but many designed ambitious and sometimes risky efforts to transform their academic workplace.⁷ I cannot, of course detail all these efforts, but I can share the most notable themes (and patterns) of the funded projects in these three years.

Theme 1: Adding to the research on diversity, equity, and inclusion

As befits a world-class research university, several of the programs had the goal of adding to the research record. In Year 4, two research teams answered the call for research projects as a part of the Improved Climate and Retention program. The first was an effort at UC Santa Barbara that sought to “address why URM faculty are leaving UC Santa Barbara, why some are staying and what resources and strategies the campus can use to more efficiently address faculty diversity issues.”⁸ The second was an effort at UC Santa Cruz using surveys and interviews to “examine how URM faculty view transformative

7. Additional information on the projects mentioned here is available on the APP AFD website.

8. Details in this section are included as Attachment 1 in a report to the UC Regents, “Status Report on the Advancing Faculty Diversity Program,” 18 May 2022, p. 13. Referred to as “Attachment 1” in citations.

leadership—leadership designed to validate and bolster the critical contributions of URM faculty” (Attachment 1, p. 13). Based on this research, PI and Professor Rebecca Covarrubias and her student Katherine Quinteros wrote an essay for publication now posted online, “Calling out Whiteness: Faculty of Color Redefining University Leadership.”

In Year 6, three campus scholars (Vice Provosts Phil Kass [UC Davis], Dan Jeske [UC Riverside], and Herbie Lee [UC Santa Cruz]) collaborated to “investigate the degree of bias in written comments [on student evaluations of teaching] with respect to the gender, ethnicity, and rank of the instructor, and compare the findings to a parallel bias study of the corresponding numerical scores [on the student evaluations of teaching]” (Attachment 1, p. 16). This research into how an instructor’s identity might factor into student responses was eagerly anticipated, especially since so many AFD pilots and programs in these years had components focused on UC’s teaching mission.

In addition to these three research-focused awards in the Improved Climate and Retention program, several Recruitment awards also included significant research components. The Year 5 UCLA pilot in the Division of Life Sciences outlined a research project that would explore the hiring outcomes of eight years of recruitment in the division, comparing departmental-level to division-wide recruitments, drawing from data in UC Recruit and other divisional records.

Two Year 6 Recruitment projects similarly sought to improve hiring outcomes in concert with producing research about issues of diversity and equity. At UC Santa Barbara, a Recruitment pilot in the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education paced its recruitment efforts slowly and deliberately so that the first year of the pilot created an environment that would nourish new scholars researching racial trauma in Black communities. A novel Year 6 Recruitment project at UC Davis focused on analyzing faculty attitudes to statements of contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion. And finally, in the Year 5 Recruitment pilot at UC Santa Cruz, PIs of “Institutionalization of Inclusive Hiring Best Practices” put together several inventively curated documents on hiring, documents that amounted to an expansive literature review—a “Common Sense and Equity” primer, a “Top Twelve” annotated bibliography, and four other curated bibliographies on the hiring process, service work, recruitment, and retention. In addition to such research, nearly all of the proposals for funding in Years 4, 5, and 6 had extensive bibliographies of research that stood behind their proposed projects.

Theme 2: Focus on engaged pedagogy and serving students

During this three-year period, more funded projects made explicit the ways in which the proposed recruitment or retention projects would serve the diverse students enrolled at UC. They shared a recognition that attention to the diverse population of UC students was necessary for the faculty to succeed. One standout project was a shared “faculty learning community” involving a cohort of early-career faculty at both UC Merced and UC Davis; the two-campus group focused on pedagogies that work for diverse student learners.

Two examples of the ways in which UC’s teaching mission became central to the design of many Recruitment pilots were at UC San Diego and UC Riverside. In Year 5, UC San Diego proposed a broad hiring initiative across several units that do research in “racial/ethnic disparities in health, medicine, and the environment,” units in pharmacy, public health, biological sciences, oceanography, and other disciplines. But the common teaching focus of the ten-plus recruitments was that each new faculty member would be teaching in the African American Studies minor as well as in the home department (Attachment 1, p. 6). In Year 6 at UC Riverside, a Recruitment pilot was part of hiring in new departments of Black Study and of Environment, Sustainability, and Health Equity. As noted in the pilot abstract, “The proposed cluster hire will promote interdisciplinary collaboration in developing new curriculum, advancing creative and community-engaged activities, and promoting hiring and retention of Black Study faculty” (Attachment 1, p. 8).

Theme 3: Envisioning major hiring initiatives with centrally funded FTEs

Most of the Recruitment pilots funded in Years 4, 5, and 6 involved “cluster-hiring” with funding for new FTEs pledged by the campus executive vice chancellor/provost and/or the chancellor. The number of pledged FTE ranged from 3 to over 10. It had become standard practice for campus central administration to see that the goals of such targeted pilot recruitment programs were important to campus strategic plans.

Theme 4: Multi-campus projects

In Years 4, 5, and 6, multi-campus partnerships blossomed, building on the AFD community of practice that facilitated such collaboration. The UC Merced and UC Davis faculty learning community lead the way in Year 4, as noted above. In the following year, UC Merced partnered with UC Santa Cruz on an innovative Recruitment project. Even though it’s hard to expand a Recruitment project beyond campus boundaries, the two campuses did this

with a focus on training and workshopping: “The goal of the multi-campus DEI Faculty Working Group is to build capacity for diversity, equity, and inclusion workshops at our respective campuses. The DEI Working Group will increase faculty knowledge and implementation of best practices in DEI processes related to recruitment and hiring” (Attachment 1, p. 6).

In fact, multi-campus engagement was the lead story of Improved Climate and Retention funded awards in Year 6, with four multi-campus projects involving eight campuses. There were two projects with three campus partners, the first being the research-project on student teaching evaluations cited above. The second was DEIBlueprint, a collaboration among PIs at UC Berkeley, UC Davis, and UC San Francisco. The project web page summarizes the work as follows: “DEIBlueprint seeks to make departments more inclusive for all by providing a step-by-step approach that includes a customizable climate survey ‘question bank’ assessment tool to identify climate issues, and a standardized, affordable ‘toolkit’ to help departments appropriately implement solutions to identified challenges.” In my estimation, this DEIBlueprint project epitomizes the spirit of AFD by taking advantage of “systemness” through its goal of making sophisticated tools easily available to departments that recognize they have challenges in climate or equity.

There were two other effective multi-campus partnerships. In year 6, UC Santa Cruz and UC Merced followed up on their Year 5 Recruitment project with a Year 6 Improved Climate and Retention project in which they partnered on Equity Advisor/Equity Advocate programs at the two campuses, with “cross-over EA training” and the use of similar evaluation metrics at both campuses. The other partnership involved UCLA and UC Irvine, who partnered to create a well-received Summit on issues of retention and climate in May 2022, as described earlier in this chapter.

In addition, several other single campus projects had goals of developing processes, materials, and training for use at all UC campuses, also a foundational goal of AFD. Here is a brief summary of four exemplary programs.

- First, in Year 4 UCLA developed a “Data Leadership” program in which they designed “EDI Scorecards” for departments. The PIs summarized the scorecards in the abstract, “By providing these next generation data mirrors not only to leadership, but also to faculty, UCLA expects to make it easier to hold deans and departments accountable for their performance, especially at formal reviews, and to strengthen the voice of rank-and-file faculty who feel unheard, by providing them with useful facts and more information” (Attachment 1, p. 12).
- Second, in Year 5 UC San Francisco developed the Leadership Equity Advances Diversity (LEAD) program to provide resources

for departments seeking to make equitable the process of internal leadership appointments (vice chair, division chief, etc.). Such resources are posted online and available for all UC Health Professional Schools to emulate.

- Third, UC Berkeley developed the Faculty Link program “a faculty-led program designed to build connections and community across campus through events, career mentoring, and support. The program has four components: on demand one-on-one advising, forums, conversations, and identity gatherings.” (It provided all campuses a process for building an extended topic-based mentoring program.)
- Fourth, UC Davis developed FRIENDS (Faculty Retention and Inclusive Excellence Networks) to address issues of associate professor retention by putting together four teams who competed for \$100K that would support the intervention the winning team developed. The winning team proposed “the creation of a faculty-led Workplace Climate Action Group (WCAG) designed to provide early, constructive, in-house intervention to struggling departments in order to engender a university culture that helps recruit and retain women and under-represented minorities among the faculty and students.” Again, the competitive process the PIs put together provides everything another campus would need to approach climate issues through teamwork. I would note that at the public presentations of the four FRIENDS team proposals, it was clear that the competition was in no way divisive but had worked to build a healthy conversation across many parts of campus. Notably, one of the three teams that did not “win” submitted a proposal to the AFD Year 6 call for proposals and was awarded \$175K for its work, “Solutions to Disruptive Speech in the Learning Environment.”

Other promising Year 6 programs that were designed to serve all UC campuses included a UC Riverside program on mentoring at the department level and a UC Santa Barbara program that used the practice of “artistic residencies” as a catalyst for dealing with climate issues (Attachment 1, p. 17).

Theme 5: Creating space, time, and community and acknowledging the disproportionate service burden

By the sixth year of the AFD program, a couple of other themes surfaced multiple times as programs found certain practices to be effective in meeting the needs of diverse groups of faculty. One of these was the fairly simple task of creating space and time for faculty to make progress on their research publi-

cations. This effort was supported by 1–2 day writing retreats, creating blocks of time (sometimes on Zoom), and/or by securing the services of writing coaches. These events and services were best exemplified by the UC Davis “Professors Leveraging a Community of Engagement with CAMPSSAH (Center for the Advancement of Multicultural Perspective on Social Sciences, Arts, and Humanities),” the PLACE project, with both short and long-term writing communities at its core (Year 5); and by the UC Irvine “Thriving and UCI: Interventions to Support Leadership, Scholarship and Service Equity for Underrepresented Faculty” with an “U See I Write” component that dedicated space for scholarly writing and connection (Year 5). PIs Ilona Yim and Nina Baldelj will soon publish a paper documenting the positive outcomes of the project.

While many of the projects recognized the problem of service loads for women and faculty of color, at least three projects focused on producing information and research on the issue. The “Thriving and UCI” program mentioned above sought to reach more equity in service by taking “inventory of visible and invisible service activities to develop and implement a service matrix aimed to improve transparency, accountability and credit for service contributions” (Attachment 1, p. 14). Parallel work was a part of the Year 5 project at UC Santa Barbara, “Data Leadership and Intervention Strategies for More Equitable Faculty Service Workloads.” As summarized in the abstract, “This project proposes to collect and analyze comprehensive data on service workloads and climate more generally, as well as on modified workloads under family accommodation policies, to rectify the dearth of available information” (Attachment 1, p. 15). One product of these UCSB efforts was the first ever report on the use of the “active service modified duties” policy for UC faculty. This analysis of UCSB data was shared with the campus in 2022 and provides a model for other UC campuses. A paper has also been published on use of this data in one of the UCSB departments. This project also drew from initial work on issues of service work at UCSB—“low- and high-promotability tasks” in the Year 3 UCSB award in the Improved Climate and Retention program.

I hope the above review of these themes and patterns in years 4, 5, and 6 provides a sense of some, if not all, of the important work undertaken in these years. The work on 38 new awards in these years involved hundreds of faculty, staff, administrators, and students on all campuses. The campus chancellors and executive vice chancellors/provosts are invariably thankful when they receive new funding from AFD. It acts as a supplement to work the campus itself funds, with the added emphasis on thinking beyond campus and unit-level goals.

Reporting to the UC Regents

In May 2022, Academic Affairs at UCOP reported to the UC Regents on the first five years of AFD. It was the first comprehensive, multi-year report on the program and an important part of public accountability for the use of funds. The report is posted on the UC Regents website and offers a succinct history of the program, including its goals and defining features. It also offers brief summaries of each funded pilot and program in the first six years of the program (from 2016–2017 through 2021–2022) in Attachment 1.

The most important new information in the report is the summary of the first five years of AFD, both its distribution of funds and its outcomes. Here are key details from the report that further clarify the shape and effectiveness of the program in its first five years:

- A total of 146 new Ladder-rank and equivalent faculty were hired through the 20 Recruitment awards in the first five years. Among those 146, 33.6% were under-represented minorities (URM) compared to a hiring rate of 18.7% URM for non-AFD hires. Among those 146 hires, women were 49.3%, compared to 45.7% for all other hires (non-AFD). While there are many ways to measure the success of the AFD Recruitment awards, these hiring results do show that AFD interventions correlate with UC's goal to build a faculty that serves the students and citizens of California. Additional information on hiring outcomes appears on pp. 13-14 of the Regents item.
- There is no equivalent five-year accounting for successes or challenges in the 20 Improved Climate and Retention programs, since each of the 20 set up evaluative metrics to fit the components of the individual program. Thus, only individual program reports capture the details of how the goals were met. The Regents item does, however, provide select detail from the most recent two years of the Faculty Retention and Exit Survey, detail which serves as a reminder that there are differences by gender, race/ethnicity, and family status (dependents and partners) that play important roles in retention (p. 18). All of the Improved Climate and Retention programs attempt to address these differences and to promote the success of all faculty.
- In the first five years, \$15M was dedicated to the program, \$8.5M directly allocated by the state and \$6.5 coming from the UC President. Funds awarded by campus range from \$2,121,335 (UC Davis) to \$560,000 (UCLA).
- Of the funding dedicated to Recruitment awards, 67% went to start-

up costs for the new faculty hired through the initiative; another 21% to personnel costs and the rest to outreach, advertising, campus visits, and miscellaneous. The focus on start-up costs for the Recruitment awards suggests how the faculty involved in these innovative recruitment processes prioritized supporting the next generation of faculty (who received the start-up funds). Existing faculty did not receive funding for their efforts but were willing to commit the time it took to change practices, including new ways of assessing the experience and skills of potential faculty.

- Of the funding dedicated to Improved Climate and Retention awards, 58% went to personnel costs; 27% to event costs (food, speakers, travel, etc.); and 15% to other costs. The focus on personnel costs for the Improved Climate and Retention awards was often a sign (and a concern) that campuses were constrained in their ability to fund ongoing personnel for the kind of work supported by the awards.

The Future of AFD

This Chronicle ends with July 1, 2022, which was the beginning of Year 7 for AFD.⁹ Below, I offer a few final details about the program as of July 1, 2022, and about two AFD events at the end of Year 7. This allows me to end with a focus on how the program continues to adapt and to lead.

Dedicated Staff

As of early 2022, APP had its first employee dedicated full-time to administration of the AFD program. Until that point, APP staff and I had carved out time from our other responsibilities to do the AFD management and planning. Given the growth of AFD, this overload work had become untenable as early as Year 4. We had to wait until 2022 (Year 6) to receive approval for a new staff member dedicated to the program. Funding came out of the \$3M allocated by the President to the program. Such staff support will allow APP to compile and curate the resources campuses have long sought from AFD. As a first step in that direction, an AFD website became available in early 2023.

9. Information about awards for year 7 are available on the APP AFD website.

Program Review

In the spring of 2021, we partnered with Dr. Amal Kumar to help UC plan a program review of AFD. As reported in the Year 5 report,

In spring of 2021, UCOP contracted with Harvard University scholar Dr. Amal Kumar to assist in preparing for the review. The assessment and subsequent report provide a sense of what is needed to complete a retrospective evaluation of the AFD program. The assessment provides some recommendations for structuring an evaluation. A key point Dr. Kumar makes is that the fundamental principle upon which he believes any AFD evaluation should be based is “nothing about us without us,” meaning that any evaluation of the Advancing Faculty Diversity program “must center the voices of the faculty affected by, and the campus-level staff administering, the funded pilot projects. UCOP’s next steps will be to contract with someone who will conduct the evaluation sometime in the coming months” (Year 5 AFD First Year Report, p. 26).

Given that the program is now heading into its eighth year, a comprehensive review continues to be important. AFD has been very successful but will profit from an outside assessment of its accomplishments and the ways in which it can even better serve UC.

Core Partnerships Needed for AFD Success

After six years of guiding and managing the AFD program, I believe a key element of its success is the close involvement of both campus academic personnel/academic affairs vice provosts/vice chancellors and campus chief diversity officers/vice chancellors. In addition, a partnership between academic affairs and the Academic Senate remains crucial since lasting change will only come when faculty leadership is strong. Each campus has its own configuration of responsibilities for academic diversity work, but sustained change in policy, practice, and culture will take the involvement of the chief diversity officers and the Academic Senate as well as the executive vice chancellors/provosts and academic personnel/academic affairs vice provosts/vice chancellors.

Spring 2023

In the spring of 2023, I was able to take part in two AFD events. Now “outside looking in,” I found in these events the community and ingenuity that continues to define the AFD program.

The first event was at UC Davis. The Year 6 Recruitment project at UC Davis, “Fostering crucial conversations and building opportune consensus on the use of contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion statements for faculty recruitment,” has been focused on creating two documentary films, one about faculty perspectives on statements of contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion and a second one about student responses to the use of such statements. While the films are still in development, a first step in the focus on student attitudes has taken shape as experimental theatre. Spring 2023 performances of “Diversity Statements . . . Hear Us,” a “choral documentary drama,” took place in the Arena Theatre on the Davis campus in April and May 2023. The piece involves student performers who “tell their stories of the intent and impact of the Diversity Statement policy for UC Davis faculty applications. The interwoven narratives expose the complexity of DEI policies, their impact on students and the afterlife of the policies in society” (14 April 2023 email invitation to “Diversity Statements . . . Hear Us”). In a small, “black box” theatre, an audience of 60 joined a racially diverse troupe of student actors delivering a powerful collection of words, sound, movement, and reflection. The presentation focused on social and historical conditions—like the racist covenants in Davis housing during the 1950s—as well as on students’ experience at Davis. The students of color often spoke about not “seeing themselves” in UC Davis professors. The audience received a “worksheet” on which to create their own contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion statement, and the performance was followed by a student-led discussion with the audience: one faculty member talked about the challenges of being among the first women in her science department and another talked about her research into health inequities. This was my first student-focused engagement in the conversation about C2DEI statements, a conversation which underscored UC’s goal to build a faculty which better reflects and serves the diverse student population. Importantly, the performance opened up a space for reflection and dialogue not unlike the “interactive theatre” featured in the “Fostering Inclusive Excellence” seminars for department chairs and deans (Chapter Four).

The second event was the spring 2023 AFD convening, held at UC San Diego on 24 and 25 April 2023. Over two days, the convening brought together the community members key to AFD—AFD PIs, faculty, department chairs, deans, vice provosts, executive vice chancellors/provosts, chief diversity officers, and staff. The event appropriately took place in the Design and Innovation building, a new space that welcomed interaction and conversation, surrounding participants with a wall of windows to connect us to the campus (and its students and faculty) outside. Keynote speaker Dr. Stella Flores (University of Texas, Austin) spoke about “ensuring equity in uncertain times.” AFD PIs reported on a range of efforts in mentoring, assessment of student

evaluations of teaching, and building resources for department involvement in improving climate. One participant talked about the need for those doing the work of DEI to be “conflict confident” and ready to engage with those unsure about the focus on diverse faculty or a change in recruitment practices. Another participant found it important to distinguish between “process conflict” and “relationship conflict.”

I found the current status of the AFD program perhaps best captured in the presentation on “Promoting Institutional Change Through Inclusive Cluster Hiring” by Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Elizabeth Simmons and Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Becky Pettit. They discussed three years of well-designed and innovative efforts to hire new faculty, faculty who were recruited for their research expertise as well as for their culturally sensitive teaching and service commitments. The two spoke of 30 newly hired faculty, each with a social justice commitment and of a cross-department faculty cohort that is creating a welcoming, multiracial academy. They ignited a powerful community moment for the multi-campus audience; they also validated the role of AFD in their work—AFD had served as a necessary catalyst as it provided a framework and incentive.

As these two events from Year 7 show, there is every sign that AFD will continue to serve UC in its efforts to build a UC faculty that fits its research and diversity missions. It will support and amplify the campus work at the core of faculty diversity efforts. The ongoing funding and support from UCOP leadership are, I believe, crucial in systemwide efforts to improve our diversity, equity, and inclusion practices. UCOP missed two prior opportunities to take advantage of its home-grown ingenuity and potential leadership, when it declined to fund a UC Institute for the Faculty of the Future and when it shut down the “Fostering Inclusive Excellence” seminars for deans and chairs. The outlook for AFD appears to be brighter.

Epilogue

When I arrived at UC in 2010, the representation of women on the faculty was just under 30% and the percentage of under-represented minority faculty was less than nine.¹ Coming from a Midwestern state that was overwhelmingly white, I was shocked at how familiar UC’s faculty statistics were, even with a much more diverse population in the state. While UC’s current faculty data are better—at the latest published count there are 38.2% women and 13.4% URM with hiring at rates of 47.2% women and 21.1% URM—we have a long way to go to boast of a faculty that draws sufficiently from the diversity of California.² For example, in 2021, 58% of California’s high school graduates were URM and 38% of new first-year undergraduates at UC were URM.³ This Chronicle adds to the record of how assiduously UC has worked to build a world-class public university faculty that represents the State of California and models excellence for public land-grant universities in the twenty-first century. But as I finish my term as the Vice Provost, the challenge remains pressing.

The UC Advantage

Let me stress again the great advantages UC possesses in its efforts to build a representative future faculty. To begin, there are over two decades of visible and meaningful support for such efforts from the UC Regents and the University’s presidents as well as from the State of California legislature. In

1. See Regents item B5, from September 2020: “Proposition 209: Primer on UC History and Impacts.”
2. Figures from the “Advancing Faculty Diversity—2022 Preliminary Report.” The headcounts are from the fall of 2021 and the hiring data are for the three years from 2018–2019 to 2020–2021.
3. See the UC Information Center.

addition, UC's faculty leaders have been consistently vocal about the need to diversify the faculty and have proposed multiple ways to achieve such transformation. And perhaps the most vocal of all have been UC students, who continue to be impatient with the make-up of the faculty and suspicious of the commitment of UC's leaders. As I saw in the 2023 theatre performance in Davis, the students continue to ask that the faculty look more "like me" (see Chapter Six). This hefty coalition of stakeholders means that dedication to values of diversity, equity, and inclusion in faculty recruitment and retention is alive and well in California. However, such dedication is not a given. In the summer of 2023, this set of values is under attack in states across the US, and we have US presidential candidates who are seeking to gain voter support by deriding DEI in higher education.

In addition to support from the University's stakeholders, UC has policies that establish a strong foundation for efforts to improve diversity, equity, and inclusion. I introduced this foundation in Chapter Two, but it deserves restatement here. UC Regents Policy 4400 makes clear that the academic mission is incomplete without such focus:

Diversity should also be integral to the University's achievement of excellence. Diversity can enhance the ability of the University to accomplish its academic mission. Diversity aims to broaden and deepen both the educational experience and the scholarly environment, as students and faculty learn to interact effectively with each other, preparing them to participate in an increasingly complex and pluralistic society. Ideas, and practices based on those ideas, can be made richer by the process of being born and nurtured in a diverse community. The pluralistic university can model a process of proposing and testing ideas through respectful, civil communication. Educational excellence that truly incorporates diversity thus 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.

Also, as noted in Chapter Two, the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) criteria for faculty achievement make the same point about academic excellence: "Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process, and they should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements" (APM 210-1-d).

In addition to wide stakeholder support and progressive policy, UC has also committed funding to support the mission of equity and diversity in faculty recruitment and retention. This Chronicle has shown that support for specific efforts in faculty diversity at the systemwide level has not always been prioritized and is, at times, subject to disruptive public pressures. But the Advancing Faculty Diversity program has established a more lasting foundation for efforts to recruit and retain a diverse faculty. Much more funding has been

committed to these efforts at the campus level, often in response to incentives provided by AFD, PFPF, and other visible systemwide efforts. Most recently, this commitment of funding includes the new membership of all campuses in the SEA Change initiative of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS).⁴

I would say that the final piece of UC's advantage is the strength of the system itself: ten eminent public research institutions whose scope and excellence are unparalleled in the US. All of the projects I have featured would not have been so effective without the multi-campus academic communities of UC. The size and excellence of the University provides notable power; but I am referring also to the generative power of continuing conversations about everything from student admissions to salary programs, to academic freedom, and, of course, to discussions of faculty equity and diversity. The system's unique combination of cooperation and competition is one-of-a-kind.

This Chronicle demonstrates how we were able to capitalize on the singular advantages UC offers. On this foundation, we have built a structure for the specific, grinding work of building a faculty that is both diverse and well-versed in the tenets of the UC community—equity and inclusion among them. As I look back over 12 years, I am particularly proud of four major projects detailed in Chapters Three through Six. I had the advantage of both a superior staff who were able to adjust to evolving conditions (and new work) and partners on all ten UC campuses eager to make time for transformational work.

The effect of such work is cumulative. A university can't transform its basic practices with a single program or initiative. But a continuing focus, through a variety of programs, seems to provide incremental but lasting advancement. PFPF remains an essential part of UC's faculty diversity work, and after nearly 40 years has become a vibrant multi-generational community at UC. But even PFPF is not sufficient to address one of the toughest, but most important "institutional transformations" needed in the academy—building a faculty of the future that is notably different from the past, not just in its gender and racial make-up but also in its methodologies, trans-disciplinary partnerships, multi-modal pedagogies, and training. PFPF's role as a key partner with AFD is solid evidence of the ways separate programs in faculty recruitment and retention can amplify the success of one another.

4. See Appendix C for a brief summary of UC's involvement in SEA Change (STEMM Equity Advancement [SEA] Change).

The Academic Mission and Faculty: The Role of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Work

I have also come to believe faculty diversity work was well placed within the organization of UCOP because it was located in the department with the specific mission of managing academic personnel and not, for example, in a department focused only on diversity, equity or inclusion or on human resources. UC's unique "academic personnel" program provides a stand-alone personnel structure that manages employment details (hiring, advancement, review, sabbatical, compensation, conflict of commitment, separation, misconduct, etc.) in the specific context of the academic mission—that includes research and teaching as well as UC's emphasis on academic freedom. The Academic Personnel Manual (APM) is the outcome of productive shared governance, with all changes in APM policy going through extensive faculty as well as administrative review. Perhaps most important, academic personnel at UC is distinguished by its rigorous faculty-led evaluation of faculty members regularly throughout their careers—at two-year intervals for assistant professors and early associate professors and at three- or four-year intervals for full professors. This time-consuming peer-evaluation process is, according to a former UC Provost, "the single most identifiable factor underlying the success and stature of the university" (Judson King, *The University of California: Creating, Nurturing, and Maintaining Academic Quality in a Public University*, p. 441). When academic personnel is the lead partner in faculty DEI efforts, such efforts develop as a part of—and not distinguished from—core academic work. A UC colleague has noted that "faculty centric" institutions like UC render DEI "optional." The comment acknowledges, I believe, the resistance to change in faculty-led practices and cultures; but when faculty embrace the "option" to change, the results can be both innovative and lasting.

Indeed, faculty members are the one indispensable element in successful DEI work, since they are the key players in faculty recruitment and advancement. The majority of UC's senior faculty are white; they, along with faculty of color, need to be a part of the coalition that tests new ways to conduct core business in faculty recruitment, evaluation, and advancement. UC is making progress in building a more diverse faculty because most UC faculty now see that a more diverse faculty is the primary way to preserve our excellence as an institution.

Because faculty play the key role in efforts to diversify their ranks, they must be rewarded for and supported in such work. While the focus of DEI work has necessarily been on the under-represented faculty we are seeking to attract and retain, I have also urged the University to pay attention to how those faculty doing the DEI work (majority and minority, women, men and

non-binary) are rewarded. First, this involves acknowledging that the work is time-consuming; ideally it should be rewarded during performance review and notably, APM 210-1-d makes that possible. Taking on commitments to build a more equitable and inclusive academic community should not be seen as a sidestep in a faculty career. Rather it should be a way to advance, just as is the case with effective teaching or ground-breaking research. It's also important to recognize that women and people of color are over-represented among those doing the diversity work (as well as other service work). This imbalance has become clearer than ever during the disruptions of COVID. I am very proud of the AFD projects that have devised interventions to address the service burden and have designed new ways to gather information on faculty service workloads and the distribution of leaves.

Rewards can be as straightforward as ensuring that individuals are compensated for their work. That may mean a course release to free up time, an administrative stipend, or summer compensation to support long range planning and research. With relatively small investments in those faculty committed to the work of building a productive and inclusive workplace, the campus avoids the high cost of managing toxic departments or replacing departing faculty.

In addition to such support of faculty committed to this work, faculty administrators (department chairs, deans, vice provosts, and provosts especially) must understand that this DEI commitment is a part of their leadership role. Our efforts to train chairs and deans in recognizing and combatting micro-aggressions was a successful attempt to underscore this responsibility (see Chapter Four). As UC's APM section on department chair responsibilities puts it, chairs are expected "to maintain a climate that is hospitable to creativity, diversity, and innovation" (APM 245, Appendix A). The policy message, again, is that DEI is a central part of core academic work.

The Importance of Community

I would like to end by underscoring the importance of building and maintaining a systemwide UC community actively engaged in the diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts to build a world-class faculty. One of the features of this work most tied to my own skills and values has been creating a transformative space, primarily in gatherings of those active in the campus-based work. Each time we hosted a roundtable, a leadership seminar, or a PI convening, I have worked to build a space in which members of this UC community are able to learn and imagine, but also to feel free to discuss their own achievements or to complain about the stubborn power of the status quo. Those present can wrestle with the viability of new ideas for change or acknowledge

the strategies that do not work, that do not advance the university's goals. A primary goal of these events is for attendees to find allies and to validate their choice to do this work.⁵

There remain fundamental disagreements that need to be debated and that are best addressed in person. I have felt these tussles most powerfully present in what I have experienced as “breakthrough moments,” moments where it may feel like something is broken but which also create privileged space for the new world we are working so hard to build. In our “Fostering Inclusive Excellence” seminars for deans and chairs, we used live theatre to create this liberated space. But in all of our major efforts, the goal was to shape an event so that we could embrace difficult conversations about the mission of the university; to find ways to hire, value, and learn from a more diverse faculty; and recognize that past practices and cultures were not just rigid, but also exclusionary. This glimpse of the new world is regenerative for some and uncomfortably new to others. As noted previously, some faculty continue to believe that the university's research enterprise is under threat from a set of priorities that rewards and prioritizes DEI work. Resistance, however, makes our work better, sharper as we seek the best ways to engage and critique.

Of course the programs didn't succeed in each moment or at every gathering. We were regularly reminded that not all projects, even those convincingly designed, will work. AFD has, for example, often served a “proof of concept” function for the university. AFD projects that failed did so because the design was process-heavy, the leaders were not empowered (or too embattled), or the design too ambitious. Our failure to get the Institute for the Faculty of the Future funded (Chapter Three) remains a great disappointment, since it would have provided something that APP and AFD do not have: a centralized, research-based location for UC to build the intellectual power of its DEI work in a coordinated fashion. I most regret leaving one piece of policy work unfinished—revising the APM 210-1-d-(2) section on “Research and Creative Work.” This APM language, describing the heart of a “research” university (its definition of excellent research) has not been substantively updated for decades. And my twelve-year journey has made abundantly clear that a rethinking of the many things we mean by “research” is long overdue.

By the time you read this, UC will have continued this work in still new ways. The US Supreme Court's dismantling of affirmative action in higher education in its June 2023 decision on student admissions will affect California less than some other states, given the existence and influence of California's Proposition 209 for over two decades. But that ruling will unsettle the national landscape and make the work in California even more useful for

5. I have written about this special transformative space in a related piece. See my 2023 essay, “Creating Transformative Spaces to Build our Future Faculty.”

those outside of the state. I am hoping that this court ruling will also energize even more people to take active roles in building strong universities where a diverse student body is served by a diverse and welcoming faculty.

Sources and References

Relevant UC Regents items and presentations, 2011–2022

This list collects relevant UC Regents items and presentations related to the APP faculty diversity, equity, and inclusion work from 2010 to 2022. These items only appear here and not in reference lists for individual chapters. All items are located on the UC Regents web page (<https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/>).

- “Biennial Accountability Sub-Report on Faculty Competitiveness.” UC Regents meeting, January 2011. <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/jan11/j1.pdf>, accessed 10 July 2023. Meeting minutes, <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/minutes/2011/joint1a.pdf>, accessed 10 July 2023.
- “Annual Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity at the University of California.” UC Regents meeting, January 2013. <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/jan13/e1.pdf>, accessed 10 July 2023.
- “University of California Campus Climate Study.” UC Regents meeting, March 2014. <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/mar14/e2.pdf>, accessed 10 July 2023.
- “Annual Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity at the University of California” (includes Appendix A: Brief History of UC Diversity Studies and Initiatives). UC Regents meeting, May 2016. <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/may16/e3.pdf>, accessed 10 July 2023.
- “Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity: Graduate Academic Student Diversity Outcomes.” UC Regents meeting, May 2017. <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/may17/a5.pdf>, accessed 10 July 2023.

- “Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity: Faculty Diversity Outcomes.” UC Regents meeting, September 2018. <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/sept18/a2.pdf>, accessed 10 July 2023.
- “Annual Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity: UC Health Sciences Diversity Trends and Outcomes.” UC Regents meeting, May 2019. <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/may19/a5.pdf>, accessed 10 July 2023.
- “Part II of the Annual Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity—Health Sciences.” UC Regents meeting, September 2019. <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/sept19/a2.pdf>, accessed 10 July 2023.
- “Faculty Recruitment, Retention, and Diversity.” UC Regents meeting, January 2020 and March 2020; no oral presentation at either meeting. <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/mar20/b5.pdf>, accessed 10 July 2023.
- “Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity: Staff Diversity Outcomes.” UC Regents meeting, July 2020. <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/july20/a2.pdf>, accessed 10 July 2023.
- “2020 University of California Accountability Report: Highlights and UC 2030 Updates.” UC Regents meeting, September 2020. <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/sept20/b3.pdf>, accessed 10 July 2023.
- “Proposition 209: Primer on UC History and Impacts.” UC Regents meeting, September 2020. <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/sept20/b5.pdf>, accessed 10 July 2023.
- “Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity: Systemwide Summary of UC Students, Faculty, and Staff Representation and Outcomes.” UC Regents meeting, September 2021. <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/sept21/a3.pdf>, accessed 10 July 2023.
- “Status Report on the Advancing Faculty Diversity Program.” UC Regents meeting, May 2022. <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/may22/a3.pdf>, accessed 10 July 2023.
- “Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity.” UC Regents meeting, November 2022. <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/nov22/a4.pdf>, accessed 10 July 2023.
- “Statements Describing Faculty Contributions to Inclusive Excellence.” UC Regents meeting, November 2022. <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/nov22/a3.pdf>, accessed 10 July 2023.

Chapter One: The Status of UC’s Work on Faculty Diversity in 2010

- “Information Center.” University of California. <https://universityofcalifornia.edu/about-us/information-center>, accessed 11 July 2023.
- Goulden, Marc, Karie Frasch, and Mary Ann Mason. “Staying Competitive: Patching America’s Leaky Pipeline in the Sciences.” 2009. <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/staying-competitive/>, accessed 11 July 2023.

- “Appointment and Promotion: Deans.” Academic Personnel Manual, Section 240. <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-240.pdf>, accessed 11 July 2023.
- “Appointment and Promotion: Department Chairs.” Academic Personnel Manual, Section 245. <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-245.pdf>, accessed 11 July 2023.
- “Appointment and Promotion: Review and Committee Appraisals.” Academic Personnel Manual, Section 210. <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-210.pdf>, accessed 11 July 2023.
- “Report of the UC President’s Task Force on Faculty Diversity.” Report and additional materials, 2006. <https://www.ucop.edu/faculty-diversity/resources/archives/presidents-task-force-on-faculty-diversity.html>, accessed 11 July 2023.
- “UC Regents Policy 4400: Policy on University of California Diversity Statement.” <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/governance/policies/4400.html>, accessed 11 July 2023.
- Carlson, Susan. “Faculty Profiles for the 21st Century: A white paper for the University of California.” March 2011. Included in Appendix A.
- Pister, Karl. “Report of the University-wide Task Force on Faculty Rewards.” 26 June 1991. <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/programs-and-initiatives/faculty-resources-advancement/report-of-the-universitywide-task-force-on-faculty-rewards.html>, accessed 11 July 2023.
- Lawson, Mark. “University of California President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program, Annual Report 2021-2022.” <https://ppfp.ucop.edu/info/documents/ppfp-annual-report-2021-22-final.pdf>, accessed 1 August 2023.
- President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program. <https://ppfp.ucop.edu/info/index.html>, accessed 16 July 2023.

Chapter Two: Contributions to Diversity and APM 210-1-d, 2005 and After

- “Appointment and Promotion: Review and Committee Appraisals.” Academic Personnel Manual, Section 210. <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-210.pdf>, accessed 11 July 2023.
- Academic Personnel and Programs. “Evaluating Contributions to Diversity for Faculty Appointment and Promotion Under APM – 210.” The 2017 version is not available on line, but the earlier 2011 version is: <https://www.ucop.edu/faculty-diversity/advancing/evaluating-contributions-to-diversity-for-faculty-appointment-and-promotion-under-apm-210-2015.pdf>, accessed 11 July 2023.
- Powell, Robert. Letter to Susan Carlson. 11 April 2013. https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/files/reports/RLP_SCarlsonreAPM2101d_FINAL.pdf, accessed 11 July 2023.

- Gilly, Mary. Letter to Susan Carlson. 3 May 2015. https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/files/reports/mg2carlson_apm2101d-revision-march2015.pdf, accessed 11 July 2023.
- Gilly, Mary. Letter to Susan Carlson. 28 May 2015. https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/files/reports/documents/MG2Carlson_APM210-1-dFinalRevEndorse.pdf, accessed 11 July 2023.
- Thompson, Abigail. "The University's New Loyalty Oath." *Wall Street Journal*, 19 December 2019.
- May, Gary S. and Renetta Garrison Tull. "UC Davis Defends Its 'Diversity Statements.'" *Wall Street Journal*, 26 December 2019.
- UC Davis Senate resolutions on diversity, equity, and inclusion statements. 2020. Available through UC Davis Academic Senate Office.
- Soucek, Brian. "Diversity Statements." *UC Davis Law Review* 55:4 (April 2022): 1989-2062. SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4087555>
- Soucek, Brian. "Diversity Statements." 5 May 2021. Web video presentation to the UC Center Sacramento. <https://law.ucdavis.edu/people/brian-soucek>, accessed 11 July 2023.
- May, Robert. Letter to Michael T. Brown. 25 February 2019. <https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/files/reports/rm-mb-divchairs-use-of-dei-statements.pdf>, accessed 11 July 2023.
- Horwitz, Robert. Letter to Michael T. Brown. 4 May 2022. <https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/files/reports/rh-division-chairs-recommendations-dei-statements.pdf>, accessed 11 July 2023.

Chapter Three: "Meeting the California Challenge": UC ADVANCE PAID Program, 2011–2014

- UC ADVANCE PAID: Meeting the California Challenge—Women and Under-represented Minority Faculty in STEM. Proposal to NSF. <https://www.ucop.edu/ucadvance/files/advance-grant-proposal.pdf>, accessed 13 July 2023.
- UC ADVANCE PAID Program. Program materials, including event agendas and materials, annual reports, and evaluation. <https://www.ucop.edu/ucadvance/index.html>, accessed 13 July 2023.
- "Project Outcomes Report." UC ADVANCE PAID: Meeting the California Challenge. https://www.nsf.gov/awardsearch/showAward?AWD_ID=1106712, accessed 13 July 2023.
- "UC Recruit Project Site." <https://sites.uci.edu/ucrecruit/>, accessed 13 July 2023.
- "Annual Report: Year 1. University of California ADVANCE PAID." NSF HRD 1106712. <https://www.ucop.edu/ucadvance/files/advance-paid-annual-report-year1.pdf>, accessed 13 July 2023.

- Goulden, Marc. "Final Evaluation." Attached to the Final Project Report, "UC ADVANCE PAID: Meeting the California Challenge—Women and Under-represented Minority Faculty in STEM." NSF HRD 1106712. On file with author.
- Ward, Kelly. "Systemwide Roundtable Report: Wednesday October 17, 2012 [Roundtable 2]." <https://www.ucop.edu/ucadvance/events/past-events/roundtable-oct-2012.html>, accessed 13 July 2023.
- Malcolm, S. H., P. Q. Hall, and J. W. Brown. "The Double Bind: the Price of Being a Minority Woman in Science. Report of the American Association for the Advancement of Science." 1976. ERIC number: ED130851, <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED130851>, accessed 13 July 2023.
- Ong, M., C. Wright, L. Espinosa, and G. Orfield. "Inside the Double Bind: A Synthesis of Empirical Research on Undergraduate and Graduate Women of Color in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics." *Harvard Educational Review* 81.2 (2011): 172-208.
- "Annual Report: Year 2. University of California ADVANCE PAID." NSF HRD 1106712. <https://www.ucop.edu/ucadvance/files/advance-annual-year2-sm.pdf>, accessed 13 July 2023.
- Rogers, Laura E. "Systemwide Roundtable Report: Friday, October 23, 2013 [Roundtable 4]." <https://www.ucop.edu/ucadvance/files/roundtable-4/roundtable-4-report-web.pdf>, accessed 13 July 2023.
- Rossi, Michelle. "Roundtable 5 Report: Wednesday April 23, 2014." <https://www.ucop.edu/ucadvance/files/roundtable-5/roundtable-5-report.pdf>, accessed 13 July 2023.
- Katehi, Linda and Judith Stepan-Norris. Letter to Janet Napolitano. 22 July 2014. On file with author.
- Napolitano, Janet. Letter to Linda Katehi and Judith Stepan-Norris. 3 September 2014. On file with author.
- Shaman, Kim and Susan Carlson. "Forging Partnerships to Achieve and Sustain Institutional Change." Association of Public and Land Grant Universities annual convention. Orlando, FL. 2 November 2014.
- Carlson, Susan. "Policies for Leveling the Playing Field." Women in Engineering Proactive Network Conference. Minneapolis, MN. 22 June 2014.
- Carlson, Susan, Douglas Haynes, Juan Meza, Yolanda Moses, Sheila O'Rourke, and Mau Stanton. "Meeting the California Challenge: The University of California's Partnerships to Advance Faculty in STEM." Panel presentation. Keeping our Faculty of Color Symposium. Minneapolis, MN. April 2013.
- Carlson, Susan. "UC ADVANCE PAID: Meeting the California Challenge." Poster session. ADVANCE PI Workshop. Alexandria, VA. March 2013.

Chapter Four: “Fostering Inclusive Excellence: Strategies and Tools for Department Chairs and Deans,” 2014–2015

- National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity. <https://www.facultydiversity.org/>, accessed 8 August 2023.
- Napolitano, Janet. Letter to UC chancellors. 28 January 2014. On file with author.
- Academic Personnel and Programs. “President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP) Initiative Report.” December 2015. On file with author.
- Roxworthy, Emily. *The Theatrical Professoriate: Contemporary Higher Education and its Academic Dramas*. London and New York: Routledge, 2020.
- UCI ADVANCE Program. “Equity Workshops Topics: New Materials for Mentoring” CD. Prepared by Professor Lisa Naugle. Irvine: University of California, Irvine, 2007.
- LaVaque-Manty, Danielle, Jeffrey Steiger, and Abigail J. Stewart. “Interactive Theater: Raising Issues about the Climate with Science Faculty.” In *Transforming Science and Engineering: Advancing Academic Women*. Abigail J. Stewart, Janet E. Malley, and Danielle LaVaque-Manty, Eds. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2007. 204-222.
- Evaluations of “Ready to Vote?” Performance, 9 October 2014. Claremont Hotel, Oakland, CA. On file with PPFP Office.
- “Fostering Inclusive Excellence: Strategies and Tools for Department Chairs and Deans.” Materials on file with author and in the APP Office.
- Solorzano, D. and L. Perez Huber. “Microaggressions, Racial.” In J. Banks (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Diversity in Education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2012. 1489-92.
- “Results of the 2016 University of Michigan Faculty Climate Survey on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion.” <https://diversity.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/DEI-FACULTY-REPORT-FINAL.pdf>, accessed 14 July 2023.
- Stewart, Abigail J. and Virginia Valian. *An Inclusive Academy: Achieving Diversity and Excellence*. Cambridge, MA and London, England: The MIT Press, 2018.
- Edith Ng, compiler. “Facilitator Guide: Ready to Vote?: UCB Leadership Seminar.” 19 August 2015. On file with author.
- Barbash, Fred. “The war on ‘microaggressions:’ Has it created a ‘victimhood culture’ on campuses?” *The Washington Post*. 28 October 2015.
- “What’s a microaggression?; the University of California’s memo on unacceptable phrases and questions goes too far.” Editorial. *Los Angeles Times*. 24 June 2015. <https://www.proquest.com/newspapers/whats-microaggression-university-californias-memo/docview/1690575635/se-2?accountid=14505>, accessed 14 July 2023.
- Carlson, Susan. Personal notes on UC Berkeley “Fostering Inclusive Excellence” Seminar. On file with author.

Chapter Five: Faculty Retention and Exit Survey, 2015 and After

Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education. <https://coache.gse.harvard.edu/>, accessed 14 July 2023.

“Instrument Development and Administration Process.” Included in materials for the June 2016 Symposium “Beyond Anecdote: New Tools to Decipher the Causes and Costs of Faculty Exit” Roundtable. UC Irvine. 28 June 2016. On file with author.

Various materials distributed to participants at “Beyond Anecdote: New Tools to Decipher the Causes and Costs of Faculty Exit” Roundtable. UC Irvine. 28 June 2016. On file with author.

Benson, R. Todd, De Paromita, Brent Maher, and Kiernan Mathews. “Faculty Retention & Exit Survey: The Pilot Study Briefing.” Cambridge, MA: The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education, 2016.

Mathews, Kiernan and Susan Carlson. “Exit, Voice, and Equity: Collaborating to Measure the Causes and Costs of Faculty Turnover.” American Association of Colleges and Universities Conference. San Francisco, CA. January 2017.

Chapter Six: Advancing Faculty Diversity (AFD), 2016 and After

Note on AFD references and reports

APP has a website devoted to the AFD program containing information on all funded projects as well as year-by-year reports. <https://www.ucop.edu/faculty-diversity/advancing/index.html>, accessed 14 July 2023.

In addition, AFD reports that were filed with the State of California are located at this website: <https://www.ucop.edu/operating-budget/budgets-and-reports/index.html>, accessed 14 July 2023.

AFD Preliminary Reports

Each fall, beginning in 2016, APP prepared a “Preliminary Report” including an update on the number and demographics of Ladder-rank faculty, hiring data over the most recent nine-year period, and comparisons to other AAU universities. Each also contained an abstract of the newly funded AFD pilots and projects for that year. Early “Preliminary Reports” are posted on the UCOP budget website cited above. The “Preliminary Reports” for Years 4-7 are posted on the APP website. <https://www.ucop.edu/faculty-diversity/advancing/reports/index.html>, accessed 14 July 2023.

AFD Year-end “Final” Reports

- (Year 1) “Final Report on the 2016-17 Use of One-Time Funds to Support Best Practices in Equal Employment Opportunity in Faculty Employment: Report to the State Legislature. Submitted by UC Office of the President.” 22 November 2017. https://www.ucop.edu/operating-budget/ files/legreports/17-18/Final_2016-17Use-ofOne-timefundstoSupportBestPracticesinFacultyEmployment-Nov-15-17.docx.pdf, accessed 14 July 2023. Referred to as “Year 1 Final Report.”
- (Year 2) “Final Report on the 2017-18 Use of One-Time Funds to Support Best Practices in Equal Employment Opportunity in Faculty Employment: Report to the State Legislature. Submitted by UC Office of the President.” 8 November 2018. (Dated December 2018 on report cover page.) https://www.ucop.edu/operating-budget/ files/legreports/18-19/final_2017-18bestpracticesfacultyemploymentlegrpt_11-14-18.pdf, accessed 14 July 2023. Referred to as “Year 2 Final Report.”
- (Year 3) “Final Report on the 2018-19 Use of One-Time Funds to Support Best Practices in Equal Employment Opportunity in Faculty Employment: Report to the State Legislature. Submitted by UC Office of the President.” 18 November 2019. (Dated December 2019 on report cover page.) <https://www.ucop.edu/operating-budget/ files/legreports/19-20/2018-19useofone-timefundseualemploymentfaculty-finallegrpt.pdf>, accessed 14 July 2023. Referred to as “Year 3 Final Report (Recruitment).”
- (Year 3) “Final Report on the 2018-19 Use of Funds to Support Improved Workplace Climate and Faculty Retention Outcomes.” January 2020. <https://www.ucop.edu/faculty-diversity/ files/reports/adv-fac-div-2018-19-climate-retention-final-report.pdf>, accessed 14 July 2023. Referred to as “Year 3 Final Report (Improved Climate and Retention).”
- (Year 4) “Advancing Faculty Diversity First Year Report of AY2019-21 Awards.” February 2021. <https://www.ucop.edu/faculty-diversity/ files/reports/adv-fac-div-2019-21-final-yr-1-report.pdf>, accessed 14 July 2023. Referred to as “Year 4 AFD First Year Report.”
- (Year 5) “Advancing Faculty Diversity First Year Report of AY2020-21 Awards.” March 2022. <https://www.ucop.edu/faculty-diversity/ files/reports/adv-fac-div-2020-21-final-yr-1-report.pdf>, accessed 14 July 2023. Referred to as “Year 5 AFD First Year Report.”
- (Year 6) “Advancing Faculty Diversity First Year Report of 2021-22 Awards.” March 2023. <https://www.ucop.edu/faculty-diversity/advancing/reports/advancing-faculty-diversity-year-6-2122-final-report.pdf>, accessed 14 July 2023. Referred to as “Year 6 AFD First Year Report.”

Other Sources Cited in Chapter Six

- Stacy, Angelica, Marc Goulden, Karie Frasch, and Janet Broughton. “How to Diversify the Faculty: New Data Highlight Promising Practices.” Poster at UCOP/COVC Retreat. 4 April 2017. https://ofew.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/covc_research_poster_final.pdf, accessed 15 July 2023.
- Mathews, Kiernan, R. “Scaling Opportunity: Systems Thinking on Academic Climate and Faculty Retention.” March 2019. On file with author.
- Brown, Michael T. “Advancing Faculty Diversity through Improved Climate and Retention: Request for Proposals (RFP) for 2020-22.” 2 March 2020. On file with author.
- Carlson, Susan. “Advancing the Intellectual Work of the University. Summary Report: Advice from UC Campuses on Systemwide Efforts in Faculty Diversity.” April 2019. Included in Appendix B.
- Welcome and Presentation. “Comparing Relevant Equity Advisor Tools to Empower (CREATE).” AFD Year 6 (UC Irvine). 27 April 2022. <https://inclusion.uci.edu/event-recordings/>, accessed 15 July 2023.
- Conference materials. “Comparing Relevant Equity Advisor Tools to Empower (CREATE).” AFD Year 6 (UC Irvine). 27 April 2022. <https://inclusion.uci.edu/event/comparing-relevant-equity-advisor-tools-to-empower-create/>, accessed 15 July 2023.
- “Multi-Pronged Initiatives to Address URM Faculty Retention and Climate.” AFD Year 6 (UCLA and UC Irvine). <https://apo.ucla.edu/advancing-faculty-diversity-program-multi-pronged-initiatives>, accessed 15 July 2023.
- “Status Report on the Advancing Faculty Diversity Program,” Attachment 1. May 18, 2022. <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/may22/a3.pdf> (referred to as “Attachment 1”), accessed 15 July 2023.
- Covarrubias, Rebecca and Katherine Quinteros. “Calling out Whiteness: Faculty of Color Redefining University Leadership.” AFD Year 3 (UC Santa Cruz). https://cpb-us-e1.wpmucdn.com/sites.ucsc.edu/dist/0/245/files/2021/06/Covarrubias-Quinteros_FOC-Leadership_Under-Review.pdf, accessed 15 July 2023.
- “Institutionalization of Inclusive Hiring Best Practices.” AFD Year 5 (UC Santa Cruz). <https://academicaffairs.ucsc.edu/afd-workgroup-merced/index>, accessed 15 July 2023.
- “DEIBlueprint: Building healthy academic climates.” AFD Year 6 (UC Berkeley, UC Davis, UC San Francisco). <https://ofew.berkeley.edu/data-and-initiatives/deiblueprint>, accessed 15 July 2023.
- “Leadership Equity Advances Diversity (LEAD) program.” AFD Year 5 (UC San Francisco). <https://diversity.ucsf.edu/programs-resources/faculty-recruitment/lead>, accessed 15 July 2023.
- “Berkeley Faculty Link Program.” AFD Year 4 (UC Berkeley). <https://ofew.berkeley.edu/support-faculty/faculty-link>, accessed 15 July 2023.
- “Initiative to Engage Faculty in Faculty Retention and Inclusive Excellence Networks—Designing Solutions (FRIENDS).” AFD Year 4 (UC Davis). <https://diversity.ucdavis.edu/friends>, accessed 15 July 2023.

“Winning team in FRIENDS 2021 competition.” AFD Year 4 (UC Davis). <https://diversity.ucdavis.edu/news/culture-shift-developing-meaningful-and-proactive-workplace-climate-reviews>, accessed 15 July 2023.

“UC I Write Faculty Writing Initiatives.” AFD Year 5 (UC Irvine). <https://ap.uci.edu/resources/facultydev/useeiwrite/>, accessed 15 July 2023.

“Data Leadership and Intervention Strategies for More Equitable Faculty Service Workloads.” AFD Year 5 (UC Santa Barbara). Heather Stoll, Michele McLaughlin-Zamora, and Sara E. Anderson. “Concrete Diversity Initiatives in Political Science: A Faculty Workload Intervention Program.” *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 2022 56 (1): 137-142.

“Diversity Statements . . . Hear Us: A choral documentary drama.” Arena Theatre, UC Davis. 28 April 2023. Performance a part of “Fostering crucial conversations and building opportune consensus on the use of contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion statements for faculty recruitment.” AFD Year 6 (UC Davis). <https://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/2021-2023-fostering-crucial-conversations-and-building-opportune-consensus-use-contributions>, accessed 15 July 2023.

Epilogue

“Advancing Faculty Diversity—2022 Preliminary Report.” <https://www.ucop.edu/faculty-diversity/files/reports/afd-2022-2023-preliminary-report.pdf>, accessed 16 July 2023.

UC Information Center. <https://universityofcalifornia.edu/about-us/information-center>, accessed 8 August 2023.

“Regents Policy 4400: Policy on University of California Diversity Statement.” <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/governance/policies/4400.html>, accessed 30 June 2023.

“Appointment and Promotion: Review and Committee Appraisals.” Academic Personnel Manual, Section 210. <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-210.pdf>, accessed 11 July 2023.

King, Judson. *The University of California: Creating, Nurturing, and Maintaining Academic Quality in a Public University*. Berkeley: Center for Studies in Higher Education, 2018. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6rj182v7>, accessed 16 July 2023.

“Appointment and Promotion: Department Chairs.” Academic Personnel Manual, Section 245, Appendix A. <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-245.pdf>, accessed 11 July 2023.

Carlson, Susan. “Creating Transformative Spaces to Build our Future Faculty.” Guest column, Collaborative on American Careers in Higher Education blog, September 2023. https://coache.gse.harvard.edu/sites/projects.iq.harvard.edu/files/gse-coache/files/coache_transformative_spaces_2023.pdf, accessed 28 October 2023.

Appendix C. Other Programs, Initiatives, and Partnerships from 2010–2022

- Lawson, Mark. “University of California President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program, Annual Report 2021-2022.” <https://ppfp.ucop.edu/info/documents/ppfp-annual-report-2021-22-final.pdf>, accessed 1 August 2023.
- “Campus Faculty Salary Equity Studies.” <https://www.ucop.edu/faculty-diversity/resources/campus-faculty-salary-equity-studies/index.html>, accessed 16 July 2023.
- Chalfant, Jim. Letter to Aimee Dorr. Including University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity recommendations on future faculty salary equity studies. 27 October 2016. <https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/files/reports/JC-AD-salary-equity-study-recommendations.pdf>, accessed 16 July 2023.
- “[UC systemwide] Campus Climate Study.” 2014. <https://campusclimate.ucop.edu/index.html>, accessed 16 July 2023.
- Winnacker, Martha Kendall. Letter to chairs of Senate Divisions and chairs of Senate Standing Committees. Includes Faculty Diversity Working Group’s “Briefing Paper: Promising Practices for Faculty Diversity.” 16 April 2012. https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/files/underreview/Reviewrequest_FacDiversityReview.pdf, accessed 16 July 2023. Additional materials are also available in the Jorge Mariscal papers in the Special Collections of UC San Diego.
- “Task force seeks more inclusion for LGBT community.” Announcement of UC Task Force and Implementation Team on LGBT Climate and Inclusion. *UCNet*. <https://ucnet.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/2012/6/task-force-seeks-more-inclusion-for-lgbt-community.html>, accessed 16 July 2023.
- “President Napolitano to Appoint Systemwide Advisory Group on LGBT Issues.” Includes recommendations of UC Task Force and Implementation Team on LGBT Climate and Inclusion. *UCLink*. <https://link.ucop.edu/2014/06/03/uc-task-force-makes-recommendations-for-increasing-lgbt-inclusion/>, accessed 16 July 2023.
- “Systemwide/campus efforts.” Listing of faculty diversity efforts. <https://www.ucop.edu/faculty-diversity/efforts/index.html>, accessed 16 July 2023.
- “Achieving Equity and Diversity in Faculty Recruitment: Research and Practice.” National conference sponsored by Evaluating Equity in Faculty Recruitment and UC Davis. 25-26 April 2019. UC Davis. <https://events.trustevent.com/templates/index.cfm?fuseaction=templates.home&eid=3213>, accessed 16 July 2023.
- Stewart, Abigail J., and Virginia Valian. *An Inclusive Academy: Achieving Diversity and Excellence*. Cambridge, MA and London, England: The MIT Press, 2018.
- “Achieving Equity and Diversity in Faculty Recruitment: Research and Practice” Conference Report. https://events.trustevent.com/public/003213/EEFR_ConferenceReport_final.pdf, accessed 16 July 2023.
- “Center for Research, Excellence and Diversity in Team Science” (CREDITS). <https://credits.ucsb.edu/>, accessed 16 July 2023.

“Mentoring Advisory Group in California” (MAGIC). <https://nrmnet.net/>, accessed 15 February 2023.

“APLU INCLUDES 2018 Summit Report.” APLU iChange Network and Aspire: The National Alliance for Inclusive and Diverse STEM Faculty. <https://www.aplu.org/wp-content/uploads/2018-aplu-includes-summit-report.pdf>, accessed 16 July 2023.

STEM Equity Advancement (SEA) Change. American Association for the Advancement of Science initiative. <https://seachange.aaas.org/>, accessed 16 July 2023.

Acknowledging My Community

My work at the University of California, and on this project in particular, has been all about people and community. Consequently, it is incumbent on me to thank those who have partnered with me during the dozen years I served as Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Programs. In fact there are hundreds, and possibly thousands, who have contributed substantially to the activities I describe in this Chronicle. I can only do justice to them by acknowledging that the efforts of a great many have been required to make UC the singular place it is.

In an effort to create a record of faculty diversity work that will both substantiate our accomplishments and foster further developments, I have created an account that is primarily descriptive and easily discoverable in public records. Nonetheless, I have also drawn my own connections and made independent conclusions, which are, of course, the result of my own analysis and not attributable to my colleagues.

I have asked key partners in the specific programs and initiatives detailed in the Chronicle to review sections of the text to verify, to the best of their ability, the accuracy of the information they are familiar with. Reviewers have included Marc Goulden, Amal Kumar, Mark Lawson, Kiernan Mathews, Pamela Peterson, and Emily Roxworthy. I am thankful for their careful review.

In the final stages of completing this Chronicle, I have collaborated with UC's eScholarship publishing. I am especially indebted to Catherine Mitchell, Justin Gonder, and Amanda Karby for their enthusiastic partnership. I have long been a fan of the groundbreaking work of the California Digital Library, especially its mission to make the research and materials of UC and the State of California available to the world. I am pleased to publish

this Chronicle on the eScholarship open access platform, especially since the Chronicle highlights efforts relevant across the vast expanse of higher education.

Finally, my family members, with their wide-ranging passions for rhetorical inquiry, investigative journalism, and quantum materials, have aided and shaped this Chronicle in more ways than I can detail. I dedicate this book to the three of them, an acknowledgment of their generous love and support.

Appendix A

Background

The University of California has long been a leader in modeling faculty roles, responsibilities, evaluation, and excellence. The rank-and-step system of promotion and merit review is unparalleled in the nation in mandating frequent peer review, and has allowed the university to secure its position as the best public research university while planning rapid growth. Periodic innovations in policy have allowed the University to be a leader in building flexibility into the definition of faculty positions to aid in recruitment and retention; among the more notable are the active service modified duties policy and the development of other policies supporting childbearing and childrearing (APM – 760 and APM – 220 – Appendix B), culminating in the UC Family Friendly Edge (<http://ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu/>), and the integration of responsibility for diversity into standard review of faculty work (APM – 210). The University also uses a range of faculty titles outside of ladder-rank faculty professorial titles to define multiple combinations of faculty roles and responsibilities; these include titles such as lecturer, lecturer with security of employment, adjunct professor, professor in residence, professor of clinical X, and health sciences clinical professor.

The Academic Personnel Manual (APM) includes guidance on evaluating faculty with such varying profiles and responsibilities. For example, policy states that those reviewing faculty with a non standard mix of teaching, research, and service, should “exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing when the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another” (APM – 210-1-[dl]). In the evaluation of faculty on part-time appointments, policy

defines scaled expectations for faculty accomplishment: “If a part-time appointee is held to a full-time expectation for scholarly productivity, then a part-time appointment is not truly part time, but represents a ‘buy-out’ of teaching and service expectations” (APM – 220-Appendix B).

Policy further distinguishes between temporary and permanent part-time appointments and accounts for extensions of the tenure-clock, stating that “the normal period of review may be extended by mutual agreement to allow for scholarly productivity to meet the normal expectations for a merit review” (APM – 220-Appendix B).

Such innovation in policy and practice has built up over the decades and has been supported by faculty and administrators as well as by grants from the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, and the Elsevier Foundation.

A compendium of current issues mandates consideration of further innovation in faculty roles, responsibilities, and rewards that will allow UC to remain eminent as a research university. These issues include the following:

- Severe cuts in state support of the University have forced campuses to continue responsibilities in teaching, research and creative activity, professional activity, and university service with fewer faculty and resources.
- The University faces stiff competition in recruiting new faculty, and research shows that incoming faculty seek a more flexible paradigm for faculty work; they value interdisciplinary and collaborative work, integration of professional and personal lives, and a diverse academic community (see Trower).
- Faculty retirements are increasing, resulting in both the need to recruit new faculty and to recall retired faculty for particular needs. Both faculty and administrators are interested in a fuller range of appointment options for late-career faculty.
- UC remains challenged in its goal of increasing the diversity of its faculty by gender, race and ethnicity, and research shows that women and under-represented minorities are often attracted to the presence of more than a single career path within a research university. (See *Beyond Bias and Barriers*; Golden, Frasch, and Mason.)
- Discussions of teaching delivery and of increasing the breadth of instructional revenue streams (on-line instruction, self-supporting graduate programs, increased teaching responsibilities) are stretching traditional concepts of faculty roles and priorities.
- The nature of scholarship is changing in many disciplines—electronic

publication is pervasive, new forms of peer evaluation are developing, and traditional formats of article, book, and conference presentation are morphing. Disciplinary societies are issuing guidelines for review that provide evaluation standards for such new formats (see, for example, MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion).

- Many faculty separate from the university for personal (i.e. not academic or monetary) reasons, including partner accommodation, family responsibilities, and a desire for more flexibility in career paths (Office of Academic Personnel recruitment and retention data, August 2010).

This white paper highlights key examples of innovation in faculty roles and rewards at UC and outlines options for future consideration so that UC can remain the leader in shaping policy and practices to recruit and retain the most accomplished faculty for the 21st century.

A History of UC Leadership in Faculty Roles and Rewards

In 1990, UC President David P. Gardner appointed a “University-wide Task Force on Faculty Rewards,” consisting of thirteen faculty members and chaired by Dr. Karl Pister. Dr. Pister summarized the Task Force report this way:

Our overriding concern was to ensure that the “proper work of faculty members” was fully supportive of the broad mission of the University and that meritorious achievement by faculty in pursuit of the mission was both encouraged and appropriately rewarded. If I were to paraphrase our recommendations, it would be this: we must restore a more appropriate balance among the traditional categories of scholarly activity of the faculty, and we must exercise more judiciously the flexibility in evaluation of faculty performance that is currently available in our Academic Personnel Manual, yet infrequently utilized. (letter of transmittal, June 26, 1991)

The report prompted robust discussion on all campuses, and divisional responses to President Gardner ranged from supportive to skeptical. The discussion in the report and on the campuses focused on foundational issues about faculty roles and rewards and seems to have clarified values and practices. Some APM changes followed as well, such as expansion of the discussion of teaching in APM – 210-1-d. While many key facets of faculty roles and rewards were debated, four issues contribute useful background for UC some twenty years later:

- Campuses affirmed the research mission of the University but had varied opinion about whether more flexibility in defining faculty responsibilities and review was a threat to that mission.
- Most campus responses indicated a willingness to explore term “contracts” for individual faculty who desired to change the mix of responsibilities in teaching, research/creative activities, and service so that they could devote time to outreach programs, applied research, pedagogical innovation, mentoring, and/or scholarship in the public sector and be rewarded for such work in standard review processes.
- Much of the report and ensuing discussion focused on various issues related to the University’s teaching mission—could a faculty member decide to focus more on teaching than was standard in his/her discipline? Should peer review of teaching be mandatory? Was scholarship of teaching recognized appropriately in review?
- Perhaps the most pivotal word in the report—“flexibility”—was a guiding principle threading through all recommendations as well as the report summary: “We cannot over emphasize and we insist on implementing the flexibility which is written into University policy” (Findings and Recommendations, p. 1). In sync with this summary, the response from the Divisional Senate at UC Davis noted a need for “reliable rather than occasional, unpredictable flexibility.”

Not coincidentally, this discussion of fundamental academic values came at a time of deep budget cuts, and there was a general recognition that the review of new approaches was timely. With this report and the ensuing discussion, UC was one of the first campuses in the nation to fully engage Ernest Boyer’s argument for more expansive ways of defining and rewarding scholarship.

In the two decades since the report, UC has continued to take leadership in this arena of faculty roles and rewards, although not in such a comprehensive way. A few brief examples suggest the range of engagement with defining faculty roles in an evolving academy:

- Chancellors Birgeneau (UC Berkeley) and Denton (UC Santa Cruz) served on the Committee on Maximizing the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering, producing *Beyond Bias and Barriers: Fulfilling the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering* (2006) published by the National Academy of Sciences.
- Chancellor Cordova (UC Riverside) was a member of the National Panel of Presidents and Chancellors that published “An Agenda for Excellence: Creating Flexibility in Tenure-track Faculty Careers”

(2005), a call to action for universities to build more flexibility into faculty roles and rewards so that research universities can continue to attract the best and fully diverse faculty to their ranks.

- Several UC campuses have been awarded NSF and NIH funding to create, test, and analyze changes in institutional policy and practice to manage faculty roles and rewards more effectively. UC Irvine, UC Merced, a 5-campus consortium (UC Irvine, UCLA, UC Riverside, UC San Diego, UC Santa Barbara), and Hastings School of Law have all secured NSF ADVANCE funding to increase the diversity of STEM faculty. Researchers at UC Davis have current NIH funding to study the effect and use of flexible policies among health sciences faculty.
- UC health sciences disciplines regularly use the full range of faculty titles (professorial, in residence, adjunct, clinical, etc.), and senior faculty and administrators counsel new faculty into the most appropriate track for their interests and skills. Faculty in early career stages in UC health sciences disciplines often move from one title series to another as they change their mix of research and clinical activities and as they balance work and family responsibilities.
- Among general campus faculty, there are occasional cases of ladder-rank faculty moving to lecturer or senior lecturer with security of employment titles to focus on teaching responsibilities and reduce responsibility in research.
- The University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) and the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) have also engaged with these issues regularly, playing a key role in policy development and review. A workgroup out of UCFW is currently looking at policies for part-time faculty appointments by ladder-rank faculty. UCAP is discussing the evaluation of faculty in book-based disciplines.
- The Academic Council Special Committee on a Plan for the University of California “Final Report and Recommendations” (2011) states the following, “An environment that supports teaching and research in pursuit of the public good remains an important element in attracting faculty to service at the University of California” (p. 7), and seeks a workable mix of current and new practices to maintain the quality of the institution.
- UC Berkeley and UC Davis shared an Alfred P. Sloan Foundation grant to develop innovative programs in work-life management. Resulting products included a program of “Faculty Advisors for

Work-Life” (UC Davis, <http://academicpersonnel.ucdavis.edu/work-life>) and “Creating a Family Friendly Department: Chairs and Deans Toolkit” with guidance to administrators on supporting flexibility in faculty careers (UC Berkeley, <http://ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu/toolkit.html>)><http://ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu/toolkit.html>).

- UC Berkeley and UCOP are participating in two current studies of late-career and retiring faculty, studies funded by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation: “Aging, Work, and Retirement among Late Career Faculty at the University of California,” coordinated by UC Berkeley, and “Supporting the Culminating Stages of Faculty Careers” coordinated by the American Council on Education.
- UCLA’s Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) has played a prominent role nationally in developing and administering a survey to assess the relationship among assignments, evaluation, and policy on the one hand and faculty satisfaction and diversity on the other hand.
- UC Berkeley researchers (Mason, Goulden, Frasch, Stacy, Hoffman, et al) have used rich data sources at UC to document faculty, graduate student, and post doctoral concerns about the over-extended nature of faculty careers and about the difficulties faculty face in managing work and family responsibilities. Preliminary data from UC Berkeley surveys of faculty in 2003 and 2009 show that faculty at various career stages having differing opinions about how faculty review criteria should and do “count” in evaluation. Early career faculty, for example, place more importance than their senior colleagues do on collaborative co-authored work, teaching, mentoring, and community-based service.
- UC Santa Cruz is currently discussing a proposal for recruiting Chancellor’s Fellows, a four-year postdoctoral appointment with a mix of teaching and research responsibilities. This would allow the campus to hire high quality newly graduated PhDs and enhance faculty quality and vibrancy in a time when permanent FTE commitments are not feasible.
- Various UC reports and summits on faculty diversity have pointed to the inflexibility of faculty roles and rewards as a barrier to increasing faculty diversity, including the following:
 - UC President’s Summit on Faculty Gender Diversity (2003)
 - Regents-UC President’s Task Force on Faculty Diversity (2005-2006)

- Summit on Faculty Diversity in the Health Sciences (2007)
- Systemwide Advisory Committee on the Status of Women Report (2010).

This is not an exhaustive list, but it documents that UC has been a leader in this area, in both policy and research. This rich history suggests that UC has a solid foundation for further consideration of policy and practice to meet current challenges at UC.

Academic Personnel Manual

For decades, UC has recognized the need to develop and maintain strong policies in this area. There has also been recognition that policy change is a way to encourage evolution in campus priorities, goals, and practices. The following is a partial list of relevant policy in selected APM sections:

APM – 190-Appendix E, The Faculty Recruitment Allowance Program

APM – 190-Appendix F, Policy on the Use of Non-19900 Fund Sources to Support Ladder-Rank Faculty

APM – 191, Endowed Chairs and Professorships

APM – 200-22, Recall Appointments for Academic Appointees

APM – 200-Appendix A, PreRetirement Recall Guidelines for Faculty Recalled for Post-Retirement Teaching

APM – 200-Appendix B, UCRP Reappointment Guidelines for Rehired Retirees (letter from Executive Director of HR, September 11, 2003)

APM – 210-l(d), Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Appraisal

APM – 220-10, Appointment and Promotion-Criteria

APM – 220-16, Restrictions-normally full time

APM – 220-Appendix B, Guidelines for Part-Time Appointment and Reduction in Percentage of Time of an Appointment to Accommodate Family Needs

APM – 210, 240, and 245, language added to specify faculty and administrator responsibility for diversity work and to allow credit for such work during merit and advancement review (language applies to faculty, chairs, deans)

APM – 710, Leaves of Absence/Sick Leave/Medical Leave

APM – 711, Reasonable Accommodation for Academic Appointees with Disabilities

APM – 715, Leaves of Absence/Family and Medical Leave

APM – 760, Family Accommodations for Childbearing and Childrearing

Policies under development:

APM – 205, comprehensive re-call policy

APM – 668, negotiated salary program

National Conversations

Other ideas for expanding the paradigms for faculty roles and responsibilities have circulated nationally and may help UC meet the challenges of recalibrating faculty roles and rewards.

- Resources on Faculty Work and Workload & Balancing Family and Academic Work. The AAUP has several positions and documents that speak to the issues of faculty roles and rewards and the importance of recognizing the conflicts of work and life for faculty members. See these two summary web pages:
<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/facwork/resources.htm>
<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/WF/>
- Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life. Imagining America (IA), a compact of 75 universities and colleges (including UC Davis, UCLA, and UC Santa Barbara) supports colleges and universities to animate and strengthen the public and civic purposes of humanities, arts, and design through mutually beneficial campus-community partnerships that advance democratic scholarship and practice. IA strives to ensure that the knowledge and art created in public collaboration is valued and rewarded. See <http://www.imaginingamerica.org/index.html>.
- On and off ramps. Research shows that campuses can support faculty vitality and diversity by easing transitions in and out of full-time positions and in and out of the tenure track over the course of a faculty member's career.
- Results-Oriented Work Environment (ROWE). Some organizations are experimenting with new work environments in which the expectation of on-site, 8-to-5 presence is replaced with mutual understanding of goals and results. While this has been more fully suited for non-academic workplaces, current technologies are already enabling faculty to do their teaching and research from multiple locations.
- Extended tenure-clocks. UC has policy to allow pre-tenure faculty to extend the tenure clock to accommodate family issues, in particular the arrival of a child. Other research universities have had recent debates over flexibility in the tenure-clock, including Michigan and

Brown. These discussions have been driven not only by work/life issues but also by concerns that the standard tenure timeline does not equally fit professional development in all disciplines (e.g., those with lengthy time-to-publication lags or those with funding expectations).

Discussion

The following discussion items should be considered for further action at this time as ways UC could meet its present challenges and maintain excellence and prominence. The University can use policies and practices already on the books to address issues of faculty appointment, roles, and rewards. It may also want to explore new policies and initiatives to continue its leadership.

- Current flexible policies. UC should further publicize the flexible policies it has and enable and encourage departments, colleges, schools, and campuses to use them in planning, recruitment and retention. When budgets constrain hiring, retention becomes more pressing, and UC has policies and practices that can be mobilized for retention. Successful retention of UC faculty recruited by other universities contributes to morale, climate, and reputation. In other words, we should do more to use and promote the policies we have.
- Variety of faculty titles and responsibilities. UC should call on its variety of faculty title series to meet current challenges. This includes using the flexibility in ladder-rank professorial titles that allow more than a single paradigm for faculty accomplishment. Careers develop in more than one way, and UC will have the most productive faculty if the University can accommodate and reward various career paths. UC should identify barriers to flexible use of the titles in place and possible need for additional titles.
- Faculty responsibilities in research and teaching. UC should review current assumptions about the relationship between teaching and research. While research must remain the most prominent responsibility for most faculty, teaching may play a larger role (either temporarily or for the long-term) in the assigned responsibilities of a portion of the ladder-rank faculty. Current policy can accommodate such change, but the University needs to discuss optimal ways to handle such variability.
- Use of teaching-intensive appointments. Does the University have the right mix of faculty to meet its research and teaching goals? Are

we hiring enough faculty into lecturer and lecturer with security of employment titles? Could we develop new titles for faculty who have some research expectations but who have more intensive teaching assignments? Or do the right titles already exist but with impediments to greater utilization?

- Connecting faculty responsibility to compensation. If faculty can “buy-out” of teaching, can they “buy-out” of research? If off-scale salaries are regularly awarded for accomplishments in research, can they be awarded for accomplishments in teaching? Do we want or do we have appropriate monetary rewards for teaching, outreach, and/or engagement as well as research?
- Phased retirement and other late-career options. Should the university develop a phased retirement program for faculty? Are there other ways to support late-career faculty?
- Campus variability. Should we encourage campuses to approach these issues in different ways to meet their varying circumstances?

Relevant UC Research and Reports

Frasch, Karie, Mary Ann Mason, Angy Stacy, Marc Goulden, and Carol Hoffman. 2007. “Creating a Family Friendly Department: Chairs and Deans Toolkit.” <http://ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu/>

Goulden, Marc, Karie Frasc, and Mary Ann Mason. 2009. “Staying Competitive: Patching America’s Leaky Pipeline in the Sciences.” UC Berkeley Center on Health, Economic, and Family Security and the Center for American Progress. http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/11/pdf/women_and_sciences.pdf

Hurtado, Sylvia. 2010. “Strengthening Faculty Diversity Efforts: Rationale and Evidence from National Data.” Keeping Our Faculties of Color conference. Minneapolis, MN.

Mason, Mary Ann and Marc Goulden. 2002. “Do Babies Matter: The Effect of Family Formation on the Life Long Careers of Academic Men and Women.” <http://ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu/babiesmatter.pdf>

Report of the Universitywide Task Force on Faculty Rewards. 1991. University of California (Pister report). <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/pister.html>

Joan Williams. 2000. *Unbending Gender: Why Family and Work Conflict and What To Do About It*. Oxford University Press.

Other Relevant References and Resources

- American Association of University Professors. Resources on Faculty Work and Workload. <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/facwork/resources.htm>
- American Association of University Professors. Balancing Family and Academic Work. <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/WF/>
- American Council on Education, Office of Women in Higher Education. 2005. "An Agenda for Excellence; Creating Flexibility in Tenure-track Faculty Careers." Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Anderson, W. A., U. Banerjee, C. L. Drennan, S. C.R. Elgin, I. R. Epstein, J. Handelsman, G. F. Hartfull, R. Losick, D. K. O'Dowd, B. M. Olivera, S, A. Strobel, G, C. Walker, I. M. Warner. 2011. "Changing the Culture of Science Education at Research Universities." *Science*, vol 331.
- Boyer, Ernest. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Clark, R. L., and J. Ma, Eds. 2005. *Recruitment, Retention, and Retirement in Higher Education: Building and Managing the Faculty of the Future*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Gappa, J. M., A. E. Austin, and A.G. Trice. 2007. *Rethinking Faculty Work: Higher Education's Strategic Imperative*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Harley, Diane, Sophia Krzys Acord, Sarah Earl-Novell, Shannon Lawrence, and C. Judson King. 2010. *Assessing the Future Landscape of Scholarly Communication: An Exploration of Faculty Values and Needs in Seven Disciplines*. CSHE 1.10.
- Helms, Robin Matross. 2010. "New Challenges, New Priorities: The Experience of Generation X Faculty." A Study for the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education. Cambridge: The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education.
- Jackson-Weaver, Karen, Ernestine B. Baker, Michael C. Gillespie, Carlos G. Ramos, and Anne W. Watts. 2010. "Recruiting the Next Generation of the Professoriate." *Peer Review* 12:3. www.aacu.org/peerreview/pr-su10Recruiting.cfm.
- Johnson, Richard W. Senior Fellow, the Urban Institute. 2010. "Phased Retirement and Workplace Flexibility for Older Adults: Opportunities and Challenges" (conference paper, Alfred P. Sloan Foundation). http://workplaceflexibility.org/images/uploads/program_papers/johnson_phased_retirement_and_workplace_flexibility.pdf
- MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion. 2006. *Report of the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion*. <http://www.mla.org/pdf/taskforcereport0608.pdf>

- National Academy of Sciences. 2006. *Beyond Bias and Barriers: Fulfilling the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Schiebinger, Londa, Andrea Davies Henderson, and Shannon K. Gilmartin. 2008. *Dual Career Academic Couples: What Universities Need to Know*. Michelle R. Clayman Institute for Gender Research: Stanford University.
- Smith, Gilia C. and Jean A. Waltman. 2006. "Designing and Implementing Family-Friendly Policies in Higher Education." University of Michigan: Center for the Education of Women.
- Szybinski, Debra and Trace Jordan. 2010. "Navigating the Future of the Professoriate." *Peer Review* 12:3. <http://www.aacu.org/peerreview/pr-su10Navigating.cfm>
- Trower, Cathy A. 2010. "A New Generation of Faculty: Similar Core Values in a Different World." *Peer Review* 12:3. <http://www.aacu.org/peerreview/pr-su10NewGen.cfm>
- Turner, C, J. Gonzalez, and J. Wood. 2008. Faculty of Color in Academe: What 20 Years of Literature Tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 1(3): 139-168.

Appendix B

Advancing the Intellectual Work of the University Summary Report: Advice from UC Campuses on Systemwide Efforts in Faculty Diversity (2019)

Susan Carlson

This report is a summary of visits to the ten UC campuses by Vice Provost Susan Carlson (ten campuses), Vice Provost and Interim Vice President Yvette Gullatt (two campuses), and PFP Director Mark Lawson (eight campuses). The goal of the visits was to gather information on faculty diversity efforts: on the way Advancing Faculty Diversity pilots have succeeded, on the way systemwide offices and programs can support campus efforts (especially in light of President Napolitano's commitment of \$7.1M new dollars to support the diversification of the UC faculty), and on issues that the campuses are facing in recruitment and retention of a more diverse faculty and in building inclusive and productive academic units.

Between February 5 and March 20, over 300 campus faculty, administrators, staff, and students took part in the conversations. Campus participants included a chancellor, all Executive Vice Chancellors/Provosts; all Chief Diversity Officers and Vice Provosts for Academic Personnel/Academic Affairs; Academic Senate leaders and committee chairs; deans and department chairs; Academic Personnel Directors; students; leaders of diversity efforts and members of diversity, equity, and inclusion committees and programs; those involved in Advancing Faculty Diversity (AFD) pilots; new faculty, several hired through the AFD pilots; Faculty Equity Advisors; and others whose responsibilities include faculty recruitment and those who conduct research or teaching related to issues of equity and academic climate. We also met with several systemwide groups including the Chief Diversity

Officers, the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity (UCAADE), and the Advisory Group for the Advancing Faculty Diversity (AFD) program. All were gracious about making time for these conversations and welcomed the discussions about the future shape of systemwide programs on faculty diversity.

Advice and Input: “Diversity Work is an art”

A highlight of the conversations was the creative and reflective thinking that was generated by group discussion and reflection. The participants were eager to engage in conversations about what was best funded and managed systemwide and what their most urgent needs are. The visits were truly inspiring. Those consulted were asked for advice on the best role for the Office of the President and on the best ways to administer the President’s current programs (UC-HCBU, UC-HSI, PFP) as well as the new programs she is supporting (Advancing Faculty Diversity [AFD] and programming in retention and academic climate).

Key advice. There was consensus that we are on the right track but that our overall goal should be transformational work.

- The Office of the President (UCOP) has an essential role to play in advancing our efforts to build the 21C faculty that UC needs. Being a system provides unparalleled opportunities to experiment, partner, and learn from one another. Faculty and administrators see these joint efforts as a strong example of UC leading the way in the nation.
- Efforts to improve faculty diversity need to be seen as a part of our intellectual work. We need a model of “epistemological inclusion” and not one that sees this work as an add-on to research, teaching, outreach, and service.
- The hiring culture needs to change. AFD has allowed departments and schools to venture into new hiring practices that allow us to prioritize contributions to diversity. We are bringing these hiring practices in line with our mission and the work is difficult as well as rewarding.
- We have an urgent need to develop successful practices and standards for retention of faculty and for improving academic climate in many units.

- The President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP) continues to offer a model of evaluation and recruitment that allows UC to recruit top-flight post-doctoral fellows and hire a diverse and committed faculty. The program is increasingly helping us to re-shape the process of department-level recruitment.
- As we build new programs, we must maintain the urgency that has been attached to the AFD funding from the State, including accountability to UCOP.
- Every campus is concerned about the “invisible labor” that often accompanies commitment to diverse students and diversification efforts, with the load often falling disproportionately to those under-represented by gender, race, and ethnicity.
- We need to develop more sophisticated ways to track our progress and to define our focus on race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, citizenship status, academic discipline and other differences that are factors in our success as a research and teaching enterprise.

One campus administrator summed it up by saying that “the structure of diversity work is an art.” The rest of this report is organized by issue and serves as a compendium of the advice and input.

Design of systemwide programs. We compiled much advice on the best ways to shape the programs that are being funded by the President. Some advice was specific to an individual program, and so listed later in this report, but much was more broadly applicable.

Role of UCOP. At each location, we collected substantial input on the best ways UCOP can add value to campus efforts on faculty diversity.

- There was general agreement about some of the best ways UCOP can add value: funding pilot projects; preparing, analyzing, and sharing data; compiling, curating and rewarding best practices; developing an asset mapping of all campuses; facilitating networks and communities of practice; convening systemwide meetings on particular topics; and developing training (including professional development training). We heard repeatedly about the need to convene the Faculty Equity Advisors (or equivalent) and to hold a symposium about the inequities in service load.
- UCOP is in the best position to encourage and support cross-campus and multi-campus programs and efforts. We were advised to use the

system to let potential UC faculty develop as grad students, post-docs, and faculty, through training at more than one campus.

- Faculty and administrators felt that they could convince their faculty to try new approaches if they can say that another UC is doing something similar (and succeeding). UCOP facilitates the sharing of such efforts and pilots.
- Campuses do feel that leadership at UCOP is aligned on this issue and that this support is useful validation of campus-based efforts. The President and UC Provost should be very public in their support of these efforts, for example, making a statement about invisible service and enabling faculty to get credit and not penalties for this work. If UCOP gave course releases for service, it would hold more weight than having a campus do it and would not have to be balanced against other campus needs.
- The value of the center is to get experiments to happen and collect and share the results: “hoover it up” and share back out.
- UCOP should coordinate conversations about the UC definition of diversity: Can we expand what we mean by diversity within the framework of these Presidential programs?
- Could UCOP create a central web-site for potential faculty candidates to learn more about the University? Could UCOP hire recruitment experts who would identify strong, diverse candidates nationwide for the system? Many suggested that a robust, curated systemwide web site would be helpful on all of these issues.
- We must guard against skepticism about this work. It is very important that UCOP sustain this program; we were asked, especially by senior faculty of color, to prevent this from being an effort that invokes the response, “here they go again.”

Advice on programming for graduate students. Participants were eager to talk about enhancing our efforts at the graduate level, in an effort to build our own UC pipeline to the faculty. There was consensus that we are not doing enough at this level.

- Graduate admissions evaluation needs to move to holistic scoring, and to move away from a model in which single people are sometimes making the decisions.
- Develop “Preparing Future Faculty” programs.
- Bring HBCU graduates who are from California back here for their

graduate study.

- Consider recruiting out of UC masters programs (including “terminal” or professional masters programs) and into PhD programs.
- Recognize that building the pipeline varies dramatically by discipline.
- Hold special discipline-based conferences and seminars for grad students we want to recruit. Several campuses could share the task.
- Consider re-instating a program for bringing in dissertation-year fellows from around the country. Explore funding for this effort from foundations.

Advice on programming for undergraduate students. While we were not specifically seeking input on undergraduate programming, it was often mentioned.

- Many participants were excited to expand post-bac programs as a way to build student skills for application to PhD programs. Such programs often offer new BS/BA students equal access to research opportunities.
- Begin cultivating undergrads, including transfer students, to think about being faculty.

Other input on future Requests for Proposals (RFPs) coming from UCOP

- Continue the systemwide competition and encourage more work across campuses. Alternatively and when appropriate, participants suggested that UCOP distribute funds to the campus for competition at their level.
- Consider an RFP that focuses on certain topics or interventions. That would allow us to create communities of practice.
- Be cognizant of various possible approaches; for example, should we focus on those who do not embrace these diversity goals (and who may put up barriers) or do we focus on partnerships with those who do embrace the work?
- Campuses should be asked to provide some kind of matching support for any systemwide award.
- Consider expanding the focus beyond ladder-rank faculty so that units can design projects that fit their configuration. The health sci-

ences have also been largely excluded by the focus on the ladder-ranks. Humanities and social sciences have been under-represented in awards to date, so consider whether the programs exclude them by design.

- A single year is not sufficient time for a program to be established and effective.
- Recognize the role of students and staff in these efforts.

Data, information, metrics. There is strong agreement that we need to manage and track our efforts carefully. We need data and information to define the issues we are facing and to record progress or the lack of it. When data can replace anecdote, we can build stronger coalitions. Much of the advice below was premised on the idea that the system can often operate more efficiently than can campuses in this realm.

- Scrutinize our collection of diversity data in light of Federal and State requirements, and also consider other issues, like LGBTQIA, intersectionality, and other types of under-representation: for example, Filipinos in health sciences, men in nursing, Asians in philosophy, etc. Additionally, some participants felt that we were too focused on diversity and are lacking analysis of data on equity and inclusion.
- Create an institutional scorecard on EDI and treat each of the three (equity, diversity, inclusion) differently in terms of governance: departments could decide to work on one at a time. Ask deans and chairs to participate in developing metrics for their own performance review. Several campus central offices already provide deans, chairs, and hiring committees with longitudinal data on past hires and current demographics. Let the department choose its own benchmark: AAUDE, Comparison 8 Peers, disciplinary peers, US, California, etc.
- Draw from innovative models on the campuses.
- There was strong support for systemwide administration of the Retention and Exit Survey, to provide better longitudinal data on those who choose to leave and choose to stay. Explore other ways to collect data in this realm as well.
- We need to develop better ways to measure climate, preferably across units and campuses.
- UC Recruit provides unprecedented recruitment data; how can we leverage that data even more to inform our strategies in recruitment?

- Retain the focus on salary equity; continual attention helps to address issues of equity and climate.
- Look at generational faculty turnover, especially among URM faculty: how many established URM faculty are we losing compared to those assistant professors we are recruiting?
- How much is race/ethnicity and gender at play in inter-campus faculty recruitment and transfers?
- Let's harness virtual reality; for example, explore the use of Apps to capture instant review of climate.
- Talk about Senate faculty and not "ladder-rank and equivalent."
- Do a study of "critical mass" and disciplinary differences; how does critical mass track with issues of retention, climate, and equity?
- There was much enthusiasm for a systemwide web page that provides resources for this work.

Research on issues of faculty recruitment, retention, advancement, and academic climate. Many parties recommended using funds to support UC research into these issues of faculty recruitment, retention, advancement, and academic climate. Some advised additional support for applied research that could be used in designing training and education for UC faculty, academics, and leaders.

- UC researchers can help us develop metrics and frameworks for our diversity pilots and programs. Research is especially needed in understanding and measuring climate.
- While some current research is assessing the effectiveness of contributions to diversity, more is warranted.
- Some assert that there is a cultural taxation on those faculty in ethnic and cultural studies disciplines: could early career awards to support their research help us build an academy conversant in issues of diversity and equity?
- Humanities use a holistic approach to DEI because they deal with the intellectual and research side of issues of equity and difference. Let's support these faculty whose standard research can inform our program design.
- Participants positively mentioned cluster hires multiple times, but definitions differ and the outcomes of such hiring, with regard to diversity, is unclear. We could fund research into such issues at UC.

- Several participants suggested that we fund a research project on exit interviews or on interviews with job candidates who turn down our offers.
- Could we use our Multi-campus Research Units (MRUs) to do some of the research that is needed? Could funding go to a specific center dealing with related research on diversity, equity, inclusion, or faculty advancement?

Input on the President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP). On every campus, we had robust conversations about PFPF. The support for the program remains strong, although we received excellent input on making it even more effective and more visible. In the course of the visits, it became clear that PFPF teaches us what will work in all searches in which we value contributions to diversity: broad, open searches work; because they provide flexibility, clusters of hires work; strategic planning over several years enables a more flexible approach to individual hires.

- Participants on every campus expressed enthusiasm for start-up funding to support fellow hires into the faculty, especially in disciplines with large start-up costs. Partial funding of start-up packages seemed to resonate as a solution.
- There were several suggestions that PFPF staff could help campuses in setting up campus-based networks for fellows and PFPF faculty hires.
- There was concern voiced for continued peer and senior mentoring of fellows after hiring into the faculty to provide support through tenure. There were some suggestions that PFPF could improve engagement with fellows beyond hiring.
- There was strong support for additional professional development for fellows, especially once they join the faculty. One group suggested two-week orientation sessions for fellows in the summer before they begin faculty positions.
- We heard about the need for clearer descriptions of the fellowship application and award processes as well as the faculty hiring incentive. While everyone we talked with was aware of the program, many had less than a full understanding of how it actually works. Many did not understand the rigorous review of fellow applicants, for example, how UC faculty are involved in final decisions, or the role of mentors in the fellowship period.
- Ideas for future communications included developing a video of for-

mer fellows now in a UC leadership role; encouraging more faculty to consider serving as mentors for potential fellows; and finding more venues to share general information about PFPF. One participant talked about the need for a “cheat sheet” about PFPF. Others suggest that we do more to clarify the quality of the fellows.

- There remains considerable misunderstanding about how the hiring incentive works and, in particular, there is lack of clarity about whether hiring a fellow will be a “free FTE” or “count against future FTEs” for the department. Some felt that pushback about PFPF fellows being offered faculty positions was often not verbalized. Faculty respond positively when they think they are getting a new FTE through the hire, and more negatively when they anticipate a diminution in the number of future searches. Different campus practices contribute to this lack of clarity, but the program can play a greater role in sharing best practices around the system.
- There were several suggestions about ways to highlight the research of fellows during the fellowship period: have them do 1- or 2-week residencies on other UC campuses; have the department chair ensure that all faculty in the department know when a PFPF or CFP fellow is with them. There was enthusiasm for inviting cohorts of fellows to campus for small, disciplinary-based symposia, expanding current practice. Could the systemwide PFPF office support this?
- One participant defined the need to work on the gatekeepers who may keep PFPF fellows from giving talks in the first place.
- Other comments and questions included the following: Are humanities getting enough of the fellowships? Could PFPF offer fellowships to those with non-PhD terminal degrees (MFA, JD)? Could the fellowships be longer than two years? Is this program at odds with some campuses’ practice to not “hire their own”? Could there be more than one calendar for the application process, since all disciplines don’t fit well into the current calendar?
- There were suggestions that PFPF could partner with other postdoctoral training fellowships on individual campuses to expand awareness and encourage application by candidates from URM groups.
- PFPF serves the nation: so some participants explored how PFPF could serve as a model for a companion program completely focused on the UC Pipeline. In a similar vein, some suggested that we should create additional post-doc networks beyond PFPF. For example, could the hiring incentive be available to potential faculty chosen in other processes?

Input on recruitment generally and on the Advancing Faculty Diversity (AFD) program more specifically. A significant share of our conversations was focused on recruitment, conversations generated in part by the AFD program, but also coming from a shared recognition that we are still not doing all that we could to hire an innovative, top-notch faculty who prioritize contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion. As one STEM chair noted, “we are tumbling around in a turbulent river.”

Comments on AFD

- AFD has created exciting new communities, especially when it operates outside of standard units (departments, schools). Disrupting the regular recruitment process is very helpful in testing new recruitment models. Practices have been liberated and this leads to more diverse results. Perhaps we should put aside slots to run more open searches, since that has proven so successful in the AFD pilots.
- AFD really did jumpstart change on UC campuses and now we need to figure out how to sustain the change. In some disciplines, there is now a positive national buzz on social media.
- Alternatively, one campus leader asked whether AFD might work against us in national rankings. Will others agree with us that we are maintaining quality through the new processes?
- With its severe one-year timeline, AFD has provided urgency. While no one likes the timeline, they recognized its positive impact.
- Diverse new faculty hired through AFD are excited to be a part of these new efforts and like seeing the institution on the path to transformation.
- AFD helps to involve students in this work.
- Conversations about the best ways to use contributions to diversity (C2D) statements have expanded. Many faculty are appreciative of the new evaluation rubrics that have been put in place to ensure equitable consideration of top candidates.
- There was general agreement that the incentives made a major difference, that the incentives did motivate experiments with new processes. They recommend keeping such incentives.
- Those involved in AFD have seen that we need to build more flexibility into our hiring processes and not narrowly define the disciplines and sub-disciplines in which we hire.
- Several suggested that future awards include at least a two-year

time-line: a year to prepare for the search and a second year to do the active recruitment.

- Several suggested that UCOP should make the search committee chair survey mandatory for future awards (the survey is already available in UC Recruit, but is mandatory on only a handful of campuses). This would allow UC to continue to collect data on which search practices correlate with improved hiring outcomes.
- The cluster hires in many of the AFD pilots were touted as models for future use.
- One dean whose college had a very successful AFD pilot noted that going forward we should only be hiring faculty with a career commitment to DEI.
- Is the name (Advancing Faculty Diversity) misleading, given prop 209?

Comments on recruitment more generally

- Many believe that growth in faculty numbers must be the foundation for measurable change in our faculty diversity. But is that really true? Do those hiring in large numbers hire more diverse faculty? APP plans to check out the “growth theory”.
- What if OP could fund 1/3 of an FTE? This would be a great motivator to many units and could equalize efforts across all campuses.
- How broad does a search have to be to entice more diverse candidates?
- We need clear understanding of what it means to hire at the senior level: this was clear in several conversations where the assumption was that the new practices of AFD would be inappropriate for senior hires. Other campuses talked about targeting senior hires or endowed hires who brought leadership to the issues of diversity and equity on their campus. These practices seem to vary largely by discipline.
- One participant suggested putting the rubrics for evaluation into the UC Recruit system.
- Discussion of candidates: one department manages discussion of job applicants by allowing those who spent the most time with the candidates to speak first and to hear comments at the end of the discussion from those who were unable to meet candidates in person.
- Could we recruit UC faculty from the faculty at HBCUs?

- Start-up challenges came up in these discussions of recruitment as they did in the more specific discussions of PFPF. Lab space is a constraining factor.
- All campuses are struggling in how to deal with partner hires. Participants indicated a willingness to partner with UCOP and other campuses on sharing successful practices and seeking possible policy changes.
- Health sciences schools face a particular challenge: most have no new FTE or are currently in a situation with negative FTE.
- Many spoke supportively of a concierge approach in recruitment: hire staff to do the work of locating a diverse candidate pool and then getting faculty and their families situated in new jobs, homes, and communities.

Designing a new program on retention and academic climate. There was consensus that we have significant work to do in the area of retention and climate and that we would profit from a research based framework for building our capacity to address such issues; the need for a framework was characterized as urgent by several. The information below captures general thoughts about the issues as well as some specific interventions that merit consideration. While parties were pleased that the President has chosen to support such efforts, many felt that \$1M a year was a modest beginning.

- We heard from many of their belief that we need deep structural change to make improvements in our academic communities. We will need programs to support the time it takes to do culture change.
- CDOs are in a position to create a space for discussion about issues of retention and climate; they need to play a key role in these efforts.
- We need to think about retention as an equity issue: all populations should get equitable treatment. All populations do not have the same information about academic careers: how can we level the playing field, make the process equitable? Our goal should be to build an equitable working environment: let's ask the question, "What is preventing a department from having an equitable environment?"
- Can we train chairs and deans in how to handle retention issues, particularly with URM or women faculty? If we can be more transparent about individual retention actions for all faculty, it will help us build a sense of equity.
- You have to be deliberate about community. How do we develop competencies among community members that will contribute to a

healthy, productive climate? The challenge is steep; as one dean put it “if you are burned out, that is your climate.”

- We need to help URM faculty deal with the constant stray comments they receive about race. We also need to have programming to help the majority change understanding and behavior. Both efforts are seen as necessary.
- Many of those we talked with described successes in funding projects focused on pedagogy as a way of making issues of diverse populations a standard part of department conversations. Others argued that we should make it easier for new URM faculty to design new courses: some new faculty had experienced resistance to the curricular change that they felt they had been brought in to lead.
- Data and research are powerful in helping us convince faculty about the issues surrounding retention and climate. To begin to flesh out the particulars of climate, we need exit surveys. We also need to survey those who turn us down in recruitment.
- There is strong support for continuing the *Retention and Exit Survey* we have done for the last four years. We were advised to make it mandatory and include health sciences.
- One participant suggested providing funding for a data scientist to draw from current, successful campus-based practices and take successful data approaches around to all campuses.
- Mentoring and networking were proposed as viable strategies in many conversations. For example, we should consider mentoring across campuses and for the entire career. External mentoring is also a proven strategy. In addition, many mentioned the need to train mentors: perhaps as a systemwide function. White faculty need to learn how to mentor faculty of color; majority faculty need more critical conscientiousness of the issues that under-represented faculty face. Could we develop an App to identify mentors?
- Peer mentoring should be supported and is really about networking as well. What about establishing a society of fellows as at least one campus has done? How about building a concierge strategy for new faculty on every campus?
- We need to reward mentoring in our review processes.
- We should build more programs in pedagogy that is based on research-based approaches to our diverse student body. Faculty are learners so they are usually responsive to learning how better to teach our diverse students. Training faculty in the context of the

learning environment seems to work.

- Training was also mentioned multiple times and a variety of strategies were offered: in-person training is seen as most successful; one campus offers a diversity education certificate and another trains academic personnel staff in bias awareness. Many think that training modules could be developed centrally. Suggestions for faculty training included a focus on bias and evaluation or on micro-aggressions. Peer-to-peer faculty training works best on several of our campuses. One administrator quipped that anti-bias training is the “Trojan Horse to get change.” Participants felt that both faculty and academic administrators need such training on a regular basis.
- A host of issues surrounding family and work-life tensions were mentioned. Housing is an urgent issue and we need to do more with MOP loans as well as Faculty Recruitment Allowances (FRA). We should consider loan forgiveness programs and caregiver support. Childcare availability and cost is a major issue for faculty with young children. And partner accommodation is a challenge in most faculty hires.
- Several suggestions focused on advancement and merit review. One school found that having an associate dean who does both diversity and academic review is a powerful connection; another cited examples he uses to show that seemingly neutral job criteria can exclude certain under-represented populations. Another tracks merits that are “up” and “down” and can document a gender difference. We heard from several faculty members that they felt qualitative research is not sufficiently valued. There were also worries that we do not always equitably credit certain kinds of interdisciplinary work. Several mentioned that UC should pilot special cohort programs for stalled associate professors. We need to be more deliberate about tending to our associate professors and providing them pathways to advancement.
- Affinity groups provide psychic income. In addition, focus groups by discipline seemed a good idea to many, since climate issues can vary by field. For example, could we build on our several Mellon grants on diversity in the humanities? Could we fund a pilot including all similar departments (say all psychology departments) across campuses?
- Should we require chairs and deans to provide their evaluation of C2D for all faculty review cases?
- UCAADE offered a list of their top recommendations for retention

and climate: compensate for heavy service loads with fellowships, endowed chairs, and/or teaching buy-outs that support research. Offer grants for GSR support and manuscript development. Offer better childcare support and housing support. Provide leadership development.

- In future competitions, could we entertain a proposal from a Committee on Women or from an affinity group?
- Let's find the success stories and learn from them. And let's do more to celebrate the successes we have had. How about an award for those who succeed in improving climate?

Leadership development. Leadership was a common topic of discussion and there was agreement that all leaders need to be held accountable for progress in diversity, equity, and inclusion. There was also consensus that we need to train a diverse set of future academic leaders, including women and URM.

- Should leaders be ready to talk about their own identity? Should they be able to self interrogate? Do we share the personal identities of campus leaders on the web to raise awareness?
- Leaders have choices: we should prepare them for choices involving diversity through a coaching approach.

Academic Personnel Manual (APM) changes.

- Some recommended a systemwide taskforce to work on revisions to criteria for professorial ranks. Maybe a blue-ribbon panel would be warranted. Suggested policy changes included the following: we should consider redefining excellence in position responsibilities, particularly in teaching and service; we should ensure that mentoring successes are credited as a part of teaching; and we should consider whether teaching evaluations introduce bias into the merit process and whether inclusive pedagogy is appropriately rewarded.
- At least two campuses are developing new statements to guide CAP/merit review in light of contributions to diversity (C2D). And all have taken notice of the Academic Council's recommendation for more integration of C2D in all aspects of faculty recruitment, review, advancement, and leadership.
- On service, we also should consider awarding "credit" outside of merit review, since it is so slow. Should we consider more awards, extra sabbatical credits, teaching relief, etc. for particular successes?

Faculty retirement and possible contributions from Emeriti faculty. Several participants suggested that we need stronger programs to ensure faculty who might want to consider retirement understand the full range of options for engaging with the university once they have emeritus/emerita status. We should consider Emeriti Academies and other supportive structures for emeriti.

Key issues and challenges, And then there is everything else we heard that does not fit neatly into the categories above. In this final category, readers should recognize the passion and commitment that is broadly shared on these issues as well as the concern about our missteps, challenges, and slow progress. Much work remains but there is shared commitment to addressing the issues. Indeed, many argue that addressing these issues should be a priority for UC to maintain its eminence as a public research university.

- This work on faculty diversity, equity, and inclusion IS the intellectual work of the university. We heard again and again that diversity should not be seen as a moral issue separate from quality and excellence. In addition, we were reminded that we should not make diversity a “branding issue” only. When administrators are perceived to be “performing diversity,” skepticism about programs and commitments grows. Many feel that the HSI status of most of our campuses should be leveraged to define next steps and some suggested a systemwide hiring initiative tied to our HSI status.
- One participant described our “moon shot” as providing more than one career arc for faculty; another, in the health sciences, sees diversity as the AIDS crisis of our times and urges reimagining the health professions to save lives, regardless of race, gender, or socio-economic status.
- Many referred to the need for sensitivity to the needs of each underrepresented group. For example, issues for African American faculty and students are different from those for Latinx, Asian, and Native American students, faculty, and communities. Ethnic and cultural studies faculty can be enlisted to help navigate these issues.
- In the course of our discussions, we heard some concerns about the campus-level administrative structures for engaging faculty diversity work. Each campus must determine what works best within their organization, but it is clear that it takes deliberate effort on the part of all offices to work together— Chief Diversity Officers, EVC/ Provosts, Vice Provosts for Academic Affairs/Academic Personnel as well as Academic Senate leaders and others working in this

sphere. Others felt that a central diversity committee would help with partnerships on their campuses.

- Many told us that in this work, there is often a tension between deans and chairs and between faculty and administrators. Negotiating these issues in the academic hierarchy is often time consuming.
- There is still a belief that Prop 209 stands in our way. At the same time, faculty want to know about the race of a candidate to aid in their assessment of C2D statements. How do we educate our community on the nuances of Prop 209?
- Faculty Equity Advisors (FEAs) do important work for UC. At the same time, some FEAs report how hard it is to get buy-in from their faculty. Faculty talk about the pipeline, for example, to emphasize that diverse candidates are not available in their disciplines. Others outside of the FEA positions suggested that we should find ways to measure the effectiveness of FEA programs.
- Administrators with primary responsibility in EDI are poised to help, and they are ready to be involved in all issues, not just diversity initiatives.
- The university retains responsibility for supporting faculty who do diversity work. Some faculty of color report that they serve as “life rafts” for their graduate students and that they are “hyper-visible.”
- Health Sciences schools face these challenges in a different context: on one campus, 10% of faculty are LRF and 60% of voluntary resignations are in Health Science Clinical Professor titles. And the greatest diversity challenges are in basic sciences. Some health science departments now have more non-senate than senate faculty. In addition, some perceive a disconnect between UCHealth and the academic review process. The soft money environment adds to these other diversity issues.
- How do we incentivize change, some asked: Do we motivate through shame or greed?
- Communications remains important. We need to get our successes into the Higher Ed news.
- Campuses are partnering with the APLU iChange initiative and with the AAAS Sea Change initiative. These are promising ways to connect UC work nationally and internationally.

Appendix C

Other Programs, Initiatives, and Partnerships from 2010–2022

In addition to the signature programs centered in APP and outlined in Chapters Three to Six as well as APP's serving as the home for PFPF, APP has participated in several additional systemwide efforts and national partnerships directly connected to UC's commitment to faculty diversity, equity, and inclusion. In order for this Chronicle to record the full scope of APP's initiatives, this Appendix provides brief summaries of these other efforts. For convenience, I have grouped the summaries into three areas: efforts within APP, UC systemwide council and task force work, and national partnerships and federally funded activities.

Additional APP Efforts

The location of PFPF within APP has served as an anchor for recent efforts, like those featured in this Chronicle. At the same time, PFPF has continued to be a national leader in efforts to build strong and diverse faculties in higher education. Some of PFPF's most recent efforts include partnering with individual UC campuses to focus on recruiting in targeted discipline-specific initiatives. This includes efforts like the UC Irvine Criminology, Law, and Society Chancellor's Fellowship; the UCLA Chancellor's Postdoctoral Fellowship at the Ralph J. Bunch Center; the Chancellor's Fellowship in Critical Mission Studies, at UCLA, UC Santa Barbara, and UC San Diego; and the UCLA-Mellon Digital Humanities Fellowships. Beginning in 2021, PFPF also started an innovative collaboration with the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation whose \$15M award to the UC Office of the President is allowing PFPF

to increase hiring of fellows into UC's Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs). And finally, PFPF has also been adopted as a model program by the NSF in its efforts to impact postdoc-to-faculty transition (the NSF INCLUDES RISE-UPP Alliance).

Another key undertaking in APP during the period of the Chronicle was leading President Yudof's focus on establishing faculty salary equity studies on all campuses and in all disciplines. At the urging of the Academic Senate, in the fall of 2012, Yudof required all campuses to conduct faculty salary equity studies. Some campuses had already been conducting such studies, either annually or periodically, but all were now required to conduct studies by 2015 and to post the findings online. The studies were listed on the APP website, and most were ongoing as of 2022.

APP provided the systemwide facilitation of this equity process, ensuring that campuses met several deadlines set by Presidents Yudof and Napolitano as well as the UC Provost and Executive Vice President. APP also produced a summary of the findings of the ten campus studies which was then distributed to all campuses as well as to Academic Senate leaders for review.

The Senate's UCAADE provided careful analysis of these studies; and, as a result, Council Chair Jim Chalfant made recommendations to Provost and Executive Vice President Dorr about future studies. Subsequently, APP and the Academic Senate partnered to host a seminar on faculty salary equity studies on 31 October 2018. The meeting was attended by Senate leaders, UCOP Academic Affairs (including Provost and Executive Vice President Brown), UC researchers working in this area, and campus faculty and faculty administrators. The day included presentations by faculty and administrators as well as group discussions leading to suggestions for future studies. While there was not complete agreement about how to move forward, there was a consensus that continued analysis of faculty equity in compensation was needed and that some combination of systemwide and campus-based data would be valuable. The day was full of thoughtful, insightful discussion and exchange; however, no action came out of the meeting and APP had no staffing capacity to actualize suggested next steps.

Related Systemwide Councils, Working Groups, and Task Forces

In addition to the diversity, equity, and inclusion work in APP, there were several concurrent systemwide efforts to deal with similar issues for all UC populations. The two most influential efforts that included faculty are summarized here:

President's Advisory Council on Campus Climate and Inclusion (2010–2013)

In 2010, President Yudof appointed an Advisory Council on Campus Climate and Inclusion (CCCI) to research and report on climate and inclusion issues affecting the UC community. He also charged each chancellor with setting up a campus-level council. One significant result of the CCCI was President Yudof's commissioning of the first systemwide climate study with results posted online.

The CCCI had five working groups, one on faculty diversity, which Professor Jorge Mariscal (UC San Diego) and I co-chaired. Our working group issued a set of recommendations to the President in 2011 which urged him to take action on the recommendations of the previous systemwide Task Force that had studied faculty diversity (the 2006 Task Force discussed in Chapter One). The key message was that the prior recommendations were still in need of implementation. The Working Group report is included in Senate Executive Director Martha Winnacker's 2012 letter to the campuses.

President's LGBT Task Force (2012–2014)

In June of 2012, President Yudof appointed the UC Task Force and Implementation Team on LGBT Climate and Inclusion, in response to one of the CCCI recommendations. The Task Force was co-chaired by Vice Chancellor Barbara French (UC San Francisco) and Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Ralph Hexter (UC Davis) and a report was issued in June of 2014. One significant outcome of the Task Force's work was the establishment of systemwide collection of self-reported information on sexual orientation and gender expression for students, faculty, academic appointees, and staff. Information on the Task Force and Implementation Team is available on UCOP websites listed in sources of information.

National Partnerships and Federally Funded Efforts

The initiatives recorded in Chapters Three through Six were enriched by other efforts at the national level as well as by UC efforts funded by external agencies. Below are the most significant efforts that involved APP. Some of the information here also appears on the APP website on systemwide diversity efforts.

Evaluating Equity in Faculty Recruitment (EEFR)

The most significant engagement (through external funding) was the Evaluating Equity in Faculty Recruitment (EEFR) research team, funded by the National Science Foundation (#1535509 and #1535435) and the Spencer Foundation. The PI and co-PIs included Kim Shauman (UC Davis), Catherine Albiston (UC Berkeley), Marc Goulden (UC Berkeley), Victoria Plaut (UC Berkeley), and Susan Carlson (UCOP).

The research team grew directly out of the Research Scholars Advisory Board (RSAB) that was part of the NSF-funded “Meeting the California Challenge” program detailed in Chapter Three, since Shauman, Albiston, Goulden, and Carlson were all working on or with the RSAB. It was clear from RSAB discussions that UC Recruit provided an unrivaled opportunity to research what happens during the faculty recruitment process. Provost and Executive Vice President Dorr officially endorsed the NSF proposal to establish EEFR, and a part of my role as a co-PI was to ensure that the Academic Senate leadership, the campus executive vice chancellors/provosts, the vice provosts/vice chancellors for academic personnel/academic affairs, and the assistant vice provosts/vice chancellors were all updated and consulted along the way. In addition, EEFR had an Advisory Board—designed with a majority of its members from the UC faculty—that reviewed the direction of the research and the appropriateness of publication, given the confidential nature of the research data. The research was approved through normal IRB processes at UC Davis and UC Berkeley, and a rigorous protocol was put in place to ensure that the use of the information was secure and that the identities of individuals were protected at all times.

The first, long step in this project was constructing a database that would allow analysis of certain key aspects of the faculty recruitment process. In essence, there were two parts to the database. First, there was the “recruitment level” information, some of which was exported from the UC Recruit platform. This included information on the position description and advertisement process, the search committee membership, the demographic information about the department faculty, and the national availability data for the discipline(s) of the search. Second, there was the “application level” information, including CV data, applicant statements on research, DEI, and/or teaching, and recommendation letters. It is important to note that this database is NOT the same as UC Recruit, although certain parts of the EEFR database come from an annual updating of data supplied by UC Recruit managers. The database began with data from academic year 2013–14 and has been updated annually since then.

The EEFR research team has pursued a variety of projects drawing from analysis of the recruitment data, with research ongoing in the following areas: dictionary development; diversity in the hiring pipeline; job advertisement language; C2DEI statements in faculty hiring; differences in C2DEI statement content; pool diversity and hiring outcomes; gender, race-ethnicity, and network connections in the faculty job market; and testing for differences by gender and race-ethnicity in letters of recommendation for STEM faculty job applicants.

In addition, some of the products of the EEFR collaboration have been adapted for use by UC faculty and academic administrators as tools for understanding the history of faculty recruitment by campus and, in some cases, by disciplinary groups. For example, the team prepared extensive, campus-level information on the representation of women and men as well as various racial/ethnic groups during different stages of recruitment so that vice provosts could clarify which campus units were succeeding and failing in recruiting a diverse pool and capitalizing on the diversity in their semi-finalist and finalist pools. The current EEFR recommendation to APP is for this administrative information to be generated by APP when future staffing levels can provide sufficient support.

The original plan for the EEFR partnership included a national conference, which was held at UC Davis on 25 and 26 April 2019, funded, in part, by the NSF and co-hosted by UC Davis and UCOP. Comprehensive materials from the conference—“Achieving Equity and Diversity in Faculty Recruitment: Research & Practice”—are posted on the APP website.

This site contains the agenda, abstracts of presentations, presentation slides, and speaker bios. There is also a detailed report on the April 26 full-day’s events which offers a concise summary of each presentation and gives a sense of the rich discussion which was a key part of the day’s design. The event was carefully crafted around three goals, as stated on the agenda, “This conference convenes members of the national community of researchers, faculty, and administrators seeking to ensure excellence, equity, and diversity in faculty recruitment to 1) share insights from empirical studies of the factors that may generate inequalities in faculty recruitment and interventions aimed at increasing equity; 2) translate the empirical evidence into actionable information for faculty hiring policies and practices; and 3) facilitate on-going communication among members of the community.”

The first day of the conference (April 25) was a half-day, by-invitation “Researcher Workshop,” which included contributions by eight researchers who shared working papers ahead of the conference. EEFR researchers joined colleagues from around the country in brief presentations and extended discussion. There were just under twenty researchers in attendance. The conven-

ing of those doing ground-breaking research in the area of faculty recruitment met the strategic goal of ensuring that the two-day event would be grounded in research and analysis.

On the second day of the conference (April 26), we had over 120 in attendance, from all UC campuses and across the country, from both public and private universities. The day was structured around four panels and a keynote, with ample time for discussion and exchange. The four panels began with a review of the latest research and moved on to presentations on institutionalizing research-based actions:

- Session 1: Evidence of Bias in Academia
- Session 2: The Use of Diversity Statements in Institutional Profiles and Faculty Recruitment
- Session 3: Translating Research to Policy and Practice—What Works?
- Session 4: How to Institutionalize Research-Based Policy and Practice.

The keynote by Professor Abigail J. Stewart (University of Michigan) came in the middle of the day and gave the audience access to the just-published research in *An Inclusive Academy: Achieving Diversity and Excellence* (co-authors Abigail J. Stewart and Virginia Valian). Stewart zeroed in on definitions of merit, as summarized in the conference report: “Dr. Stewart proposed that fair judgments of merit are a fundamental precondition of access to and inclusion in education institutions. Thus, before we can achieve equal access and inclusion, we must rethink our definitions of merit.” She detailed effective practices “to design contexts and situational constraints that encourage evaluators and decision-makers to focus on and methodically evaluate merit” (“Achieving Equity and Diversity in Faculty Recruitment” conference report, pp. 6-7). The day also featured the work of AFD, with presentations about pilots at UC Berkeley and UC Irvine and through lively discussion that included AFD PIs, co-PIs, and sponsors. In my closing comments, I reaffirmed the urgent need to rethink merit and noted that responsibility for faculty recruitment efforts needs to be “distributed” among leaders at all levels: faculty, department chairs, deans, vice provosts, chief diversity officers, and executive vice chancellors/provosts.

Center for Research, Excellence and Diversity in Team Science (CREDITS)

In 2015, the NSF awarded UC and the California State University system (CSU) a five-year grant to establish the Center for Research, Excellence and Diversity in Team Science (CREDITS), an integrated research and training program aimed at increasing and enhancing the capacity, effectiveness, and excellence of team science efforts at both UC and CSU (NSF #1464064). The most effective parts of the CREDITS activities were weekend retreats for early-career faculty and postdoctoral scholars in STEM and for the academic administrators (deans, vice provosts, etc.) who work to support their career advancement. Faculty, scholars, and administrators from both UC and CSU attended. This effort continued an extended partnership in faculty diversity for UC and CSU. Barbara Endemaño Walker, (UC Santa Barbara) was the PI and I was one of several co-PIs, a group that included both CSU and UC faculty and administrators. I was responsible for reporting on UC faculty diversity at the retreats, usually held at the UCLA Lake Arrowhead Resort.

MAGIC: Mentoring Advisory Group in California

MAGIC is a project of the National Research Mentoring Network (NRMN), a project in which UC, under the leadership of Professor Mitchell Feldman (UC San Francisco) developed a “train the trainer” event on mentoring a diverse population in the bio-medical fields at all levels in higher education: undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral scholar, and faculty. I served as an advisor for the group and, on behalf of UCOP, participated in MAGIC events and training.

APLU's iChange

In 2016, the Association of Public and Land Grant Institutions (APLU) was awarded an NSF seed grant to develop a national network to diversify the faculty at a national level (NSF #1649214 and #1741276). I served on the Faculty Diversity Subgroup from 2016-19, representing UC and UCOP, as we designed what became *Aspire: The National Alliance for Inclusive & Diverse STEM Faculty*. At the September 2018 iChange Summit, a team from UC (UC Berkeley, UC Davis, UC Irvine, and UCOP) presented information on how UC Recruit collected information on the diversity of applicants and hires in the faculty recruitment process. Here is the summary of that presentation from the Summit report:

Partner UC Recruit presented *Collecting and Using Data to Enhance Equity and Diversity in Faculty Recruitment* with Susan Carlson, Kimberlee Schauman [sic], Marc Goulden, and Max Garrick. UC Recruit is a web platform used by all ten University of California campuses to manage the full faculty recruitment process: from search plan development and advertising the position description, to submission of job applicant materials and letters of recommendation, to search committee review and candidate selection, procedural review and approval, data archiving and institutional analysis of faculty recruitment efforts. Key partners in the UC Recruit partnership described the core capacity of the online recruitment management system; the power of collecting data across campuses; the use of administrative reports to understand hiring patterns, successes, and challenges; and the opportunities the data opens for empirical studies of equity in faculty recruitment and the effectiveness of presumed “best practices” in recruiting a diverse faculty (Summit Report, p. 8).

Several UC campuses remain active in this national network.

AAAS’s SEA Change: STEMM Equity Advancement (SEA) Change

Under President Drake’s leadership, the UC system became a member of the SEA Change initiative of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). Here is the summary of this partnership as presented to the Regents in the November 2022 Regents “Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity”:

In May 2022, UC became the first university system in the country to join the STEM Equity Advancement (SEA) Change initiative that seeks to improve diversity, equity, and inclusion in science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and medicine (STEMM) fields. SEA Change was established in 2017 by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. As part of SEA Change, UC campuses collect in-depth data regarding campus diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts and identify barriers for underrepresented students, faculty, and staff. Campuses will use this data to develop five-year plans for advancing equity. Campuses will also support professional development for STEMM faculty to develop and communicate plans and strategies to eliminate historical, institutional, or structural barriers to access. This will include the use of instructional technology and principles of inclusive course design to improve student outcomes (p. 11).

This partnership was established in the final months covered by this Chronicle and represents an important next stage for UC. Notably, the AAAS does not award funding to support this alliance, but requires UC, and its other SEA Change members, to pay to support the partnership. It thus represents a strong commitment from the President and UC’s ten chancellors.

About the Author

Susan Carlson is Vice Provost Emerita of the University of California Office of the President. From 2010 to 2022, she held responsibility for building coalitions and communities as detailed in *The Art of Diversity*. In a variety of leadership roles, she led major initiatives focused on faculty excellence and equity. Her research and teaching has centered on dramatic comedy as a site for transformation, scholarship that fully informed her administrative effort.

