

**UCSD Underrepresented Faculty Task Force
Final Report – October 30, 2004**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Task Force on Underrepresented Faculty was charged to review the campus' efforts with respect to the recruitment, careers, and retention of underrepresented faculty, including opportunities for professional development and academic advancement. The group evaluated a significant amount of quantitative data from systemwide and campus documents including policies, guidelines, and reports written by other groups previously charged to assess these issues. Recognizing that quantitative data would tell only a part of the story, the Task Force interviewed underrepresented faculty to gauge their perception of their UCSD experience, and also surveyed department chairs and academic deans to better understand the challenges and opportunities that exist in meeting the campus objective to diversify the faculty. The group's investigation has culminated in the recommendations summarized below. It is important to note that during its deliberations the Task Force was mindful of Proposition 209 and its impact on the State Constitution, and that the recommendations contained in this report are intended to be consistent with State and Federal law and University of California policies.

Primary Recommendations

General

- Future studies on underrepresented faculty should acknowledge the work of all the groups that have studied the issue at UCSD previously. In keeping with those studies we concur that the main area of focus ought to be native-born African Americans, Chicanos/Latinos (including Puerto Ricans), and Native Americans, i.e., historically underrepresented minorities (HURMs).
- Proactive measures must be undertaken to raise awareness at all levels of the administrative and faculty ranks about UCSD's objective to diversify the faculty and the specific behaviors necessary to meet that objective.
- A high level Diversity Officer should be appointed from the faculty to advise the Chancellor and Academic Vice Chancellors on faculty diversity issues.
- The administration should apply diversity criteria and expectations for Vice Chancellors, Deans, Chairs, and CAP.
- UCSD should explore opportunities to expand its intellectual and cultural connections to San Diego communities associated with historically underrepresented minority groups.

- UCSD should establish an interdisciplinary committee of faculty to help with the recruitment, professional development, and retention of underrepresented faculty.
- The university must intensify its efforts to recruit a diversified undergraduate and graduate student body. In addition to strengthening the intellectual base and educational experience at UCSD, this will make the institution more attractive to underrepresented faculty.
- Vice Chancellors, academic deans, and department chairs should explore opportunities to diversify research, teaching, and service programs that contribute to the academic diversity of the campus, and commit the necessary funding to ensure their success.
- The campus' fundraising priorities should reflect a commitment to diversity issues and programs.
- The Chancellor should develop and administer a climate survey to all faculty, and attempt to improve that climate, with special attention to the issues and concerns of minorities.

Recruitment

- Expand the pipeline of graduate students, available faculty recruits, and the institutions from which they come.
- Further explore the pool of President's Postdoctoral Fellows as a potential source of faculty applicants.
- Explore the UC Berkeley Chancellor's Postdoctoral Fellows program to determine whether a similar program should be instituted at UCSD.
- Examine the Ford Foundation and UCOP Dissertation Fellows programs as potential sources of faculty applicants.
- The SVCAA should consider expanding the FTE Reserve Pool, so that departments may take advantage of unexpected opportunities.
- Understand that talented underrepresented faculty are in great demand, and make them early and competitive offers.
- Promote "cluster hires" as a way to recruit and build a critical mass of underrepresented faculty and/or other faculty devoted to minority issues.

- Provide appropriate and legal incentives to departments that demonstrate a commitment to diversity.
- Provide briefings to CAP members, academic deans, provosts, department chairs, department search committees, and department academic personnel, to expose them to the laws and policies, departmental goals, historical faculty appointment and separation data, and best practices relative to diversity issues.
- Ensure that search committees have inclusive representation in terms of sex and ethnicity.
- Continue to expand and monitor best practices, such as the use of personal networks, to improve diversity in all applicant and interview pools.

Retention

- Improve the implementation of mentor programs for underrepresented and other faculty. Vice Chancellors and academic deans should ensure that mentor programs are effectively managed.
- Departments should distribute annually department specific salary information (averages, by rank) to all faculty.
- UCSD should develop and distribute a Faculty Handbook that explains discipline-specific information about a variety of academic personnel policies and practices. It might also be useful to provide a faculty handbook that explicitly addresses the myriad special issues faced by minority faculty, such as low numbers and a difficult climate on and off campus.
- Enhance rewards for service contributions to diversity. In particular, explore ways to recognize these contributions in the promotion and tenure process.
- Take early action in retention cases to send an unequivocal message that keeping talented faculty is a priority at UCSD.
- Conduct exit interviews, with opportunities for anonymity if necessary. Use the information to improve practices that are detrimental to stated diversity goals.

In summary, the Task Force believes that although the overall figures for underrepresented faculty at UCSD are unacceptably low, there exists an especially urgent situation with respect to the recruitment and retention of historically underrepresented faculty. The numbers of historically underrepresented minorities (HURMs) are woefully insufficient in general and even worse in some segments of the university in particular.

For these minority groups, recruitment and retention deserve extra attention, although recruitment remains the more pressing issue. We believe that focusing on recommendations that expand the applicant and interview pools, improve objectivity in the recruitment and selection process, and creatively allocate limited resources will have the most immediate impact. However, attention must also be focused on improving the UCSD experience for HURMs. To ignore issues of climate (feelings of isolation and under appreciation, of being over burdened by service demands, etc.) will retain the revolving door, where significant effort on the recruitment front is frequently negated by the premature departure of excellent colleagues. Rapid action on multiple fronts is required to address a mounting crisis of faculty diversity at UCSD.

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

In carrying out its assigned charge [Attachment 1] the Task Force on Underrepresented Faculty focused its efforts on three primary goals:

- Address the questions of why so few underrepresented faculty are recruited, and recommend ways to improve their numbers.
- Understand the careers of underrepresented faculty at UCSD. Address questions about how these faculty progress through the tenure and subsequent review process, and recommend ways to improve the effectiveness of support systems.
- Examine the retention of underrepresented faculty, and recommend ways to improve the success rate.

The issues studied by this group are not new. Over the years, other campus and UC systemwide committees have looked at similar issues. The Task Force examined the more recent of these efforts:

- *Diversity Council Recommendations*, prepared by the Diversity Council (2004) [Attachment 2]
- *UCSD and UC: Faculty Minority Hiring 1999-2002*, prepared by Ross Frank (2004) [Attachment 3]
- *Report Card on the University of California, San Diego: A Legacy of Institutional Neglect*, prepared by the UCSD Chicano/Latino Concilio (2003) [Attachment 4]
- *Diversity Ad Hoc Planning Committee Final Report*, prepared by The Allen Group (2003) [Attachment 5]
- *Report of the Chancellor's Commission on Diversity*, prepared by The Diversity Commission (1998) [Attachment 6]

Below are some specific findings from these groups:

- To strengthen the cohesiveness and impact of UCSD's diversity efforts, Chancellor Dynes in 1998 established the UCSD Diversity Council of faculty, staff, and students to bring diversity issues and opportunities to the chancellor's attention and to recommend policy changes to improve diversity on the campus. In 2003-04 the Council was asked to respond to The Allen Group report [see below] and ultimately recommended to Acting Chancellor Chandler that (1) "an Associate Chancellor should be appointed [from the faculty] whose principal role is to lead and coordinate in the area of campus-wide diversity," and (2) "an Associate Vice Chancellor should be appointed [from the senior faculty] who would assist the [Senior] Vice Chancellor – Academic Affairs particularly in the area of faculty diversity."

- The Frank Report was prepared for the UC Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD). The report defines *historically underrepresented* faculty as African American, Chicano/Latino, and Native American. Asians in all areas except Computer Science, Engineering, and Mathematics are also underrepresented at UCSD and generally at UC. *Minority* faculty are defined as the three groups noted above as well as Asians.

The report notes that viewing demographic data in the aggregate camouflages serious issues. For example, while it might appear that UCSD is outperforming the system because there are fewer white faculty on the campus (74% UCSD vs. 81% systemwide), when the numbers are disaggregated it becomes clear that this is not mainly due to the presence or addition of historically underrepresented minorities but rather of Asians. In fact, among new non-tenured faculty hired over the last five years, there has been little growth among African American, Chicano/Latino, and American Indian faculty, and Asians have trended up only slightly more during that time. However laudable, the growth in Asian hires took place in good part in the Computer Science, Engineering and Mathematics departments in which, according to Frank, Asian faculty are not typically underrepresented in the faculty. No such gains have taken place among historically underrepresented faculty at UCSD relative to total hiring.

Frank concludes that “there is a crisis at UCSD.”

- The Concilio Report Card acknowledged that UCSD has undertaken many reforms over the last several years but expressed concern that they may not all be effective, in part because they lack adequate resources and in part because some structural issues remain unchanged. The primary recommendation from the group was that a Chief Diversity Officer be appointed and imbued with “authority to intervene on issues such as faculty hiring and retention, student admissions, and campus climate.”
- The Allen Group concluded that the campus is fragmented and lacks accountability around issues of diversity, and suggested that work is needed to build a more cohesive community. The report recommended that the campus consider the development of a senior position for an officer of diversity with the power to assess, program, and provide oversight and accountability, and thus support all campus constituents in their efforts.

In sum, all reviewers have collectively arrived at the same place: unless additional proactive efforts are taken to significantly improve the campus climate and its recruitment and retention practices, UCSD will remain insufficiently diverse and could become less diverse over time.

II. DATA REVIEW AND DISCUSSION

The UCSD Office of Academic Affirmative Action provided the Task Force with a good deal of historical data on recruitment and retention activity relative to the four main ethnic groups defined as minorities systemwide—African Americans, Hispanics, Asians, and Native Americans.

Early in its deliberations, the Task Force agreed that limiting its review to ladder-rank faculty would eliminate from consideration significant portions of the academic communities at Health Sciences and Marine Sciences. Because there was concern that the expanded scope would slow down the review, however, the Task Force decided that it would begin work with the ladder-rank data already at hand and that the additional data would be reviewed when it became available. This report therefore concentrates on ladder rank faculty.

The group's review of underrepresented faculty was to include, according to Federal and UC definitions, four ethnic groups—Blacks or African Americans, Hispanics, Asians or Pacific Islanders, and American Indians or Alaskan Natives. Because there was concern that this net may be too broad and thus lead to a dilution of effort, the group discussed narrowing the search to "...Blacks, Mexican-Americans, Native Americans, and mainland Puerto Ricans"—a definition used by the Association of Medical Colleges (AAMC). The group did not finally decide on a narrower review, but there was consensus that the Hispanic and Asian data should be further disaggregated so that patterns would be more easily discernable.

The Hispanic subgroup was disaggregated to capture Chicano (Mexicans/Mexican-Americans), Latino (includes Central and South Americans and Puerto Ricans), and Other Spanish-American (primarily people of Spanish/Iberian ancestry) [see Attachment 7 – *Campus Ladder-Rank Faculty Appointments, 1998-2004*]. The Asian subgroup was disaggregated to capture Chinese, Japanese, South Asian, Pacific Islanders/Filipinos and other Asian-Americans. After analyzing these data, the Task Force did agree on the need to distinguish between all these groups together (referred to here as "underrepresented," "minorities," or "URMs") versus the subset of native-born African Americans, Mexican Americans/Chicanos, and Native Americans (referred to here as "historically underrepresented minorities" or "HURMs"), because of the distinctive experiences of these two categories. In this report, we have tried to be as consistent as possible in using this terminology, but different sources use different rubrics in different ways, such as "Hispanics" or "Latinos."

While the available data do provide some information about UCSD's performance in the area of diversity, the Task Force believed that meaningful and actionable information about the situation at UCSD would also come from actually speaking with underrepresented faculty on campus. To this end, a questionnaire was developed [see Attachment 8] and sent, over the co-chairs' signatures, to 168 ladder rank faculty

currently listed as underrepresented persons by the Office of Academic Affirmative Action. In addressing this population, the Task Force was aware that only 36 of the 168 subjects were African Americans, Chicanos, and Native Americans. Additionally, to understand the contributing factors leading to the departure of underrepresented faculty either for other academic institutions or for careers outside of academia, the Task Force contacted a few faculty who had left UCSD for reasons other than denial of tenure or retirement. We also received some unsolicited input from individuals on campus.

To assure confidentiality Task Force members were assigned interviewees from outside their division and were privy only to the names of those assigned to them. Each interviewer was asked to follow up with their designated interviewees to discuss the questionnaire that had been distributed. Many of those listed could not be reached or declined to be interviewed. Task Force members conducted telephone or in-person interviews with 74 or 44% of the persons listed. Another 9 people or 5% responded in writing. Since all interviews were confidential, feedback was reported to the entire committee only generally.

This qualitative approach yielded some interesting if sometimes contradictory results. While the information is subjective and based on a relatively small sample, these perceptions should not be discounted; the process identified consistent issues that the campus must address if it is to become a more welcoming environment for underrepresented faculty. Those issues that appeared to have broad consensus are summarized below:

Like their majority peers, underrepresented faculty choose to come to UCSD mainly because of the quality of its academic programs. In general, the feedback from underrepresented faculty suggests that most feel positively about being here, report being treated well, and have no plans to leave. Despite general satisfaction, many expressed a serious concern about the lack of African Americans and Chicanos/Latinos on the campus, including undergraduate and graduate students as well as faculty, giving credence to the findings of other reports. An important point of note is that the experiences of native-born historically underrepresented faculty are less positive *en toto* than that of foreign-born underrepresented individuals. Some foreign-born underrepresented faculty describe the university as “generally supportive of underrepresented faculty.” However, some native-born historically underrepresented faculty characterize the UCSD environment as too “elitist,” “hostile,” “intense,” or even “racist.” Asian-Americans, whether born here or abroad, generally reported they did not feel underrepresented or undervalued. In contrast with URM, HURM voiced more discontent.

We recommend that a climate survey, similar to the one undertaken for staff by Business Affairs, be developed and administered to all faculty. Issues and areas needing attention would be more clearly defined, and appropriate corrective action could then be taken.

The Task Force also determined that it would be helpful to understand the managerial perspective on the issues under consideration and so a survey was disseminated to 42 department chairs and academic deans across the campus. Because the questionnaire was distributed at the end of the academic year, the response rate was lower than hoped for (13 or 31%). Nevertheless, feedback from this group supports many of the findings from the data reviewed and reflects the thinking of many underrepresented faculty who were interviewed. Generally, the consensus is that the biggest problem is recruitment, not retention—although there is room for improvement in both areas.

Recruitments

Review of General Campus divisional and SIO *Tenured & Tenure-Track Workforce by Job Group, October 2002* report [see Attachment 9] shows that approximately 18 percent of the faculty are ethnic minorities in the broad terminology. On its face, this figure sounds presentable. However, when the data are disaggregated as described above, the group learned that Mexican-Americans represent fewer than two percent, African Americans 1.5%, and American Indians only .1% of the faculty. Some engineering and natural science units have no representation at all from HURMs; in contrast, the Asian groups are relatively well represented (e.g., Chinese are 5.5%) there. Indeed, of the 18 African-American ladder-rank faculty at UCSD in 2002, all but one were in Social Sciences or Arts and Humanities; of the 17 Chicano faculty, all but three were in the same two divisions, and the one American Indian was in the Physical Sciences. The report showed SIO's workforce was devoid of HURMs, although there were six URMs. From 1989 to 2002, UCSD lagged behind UC averages on African-American, Chicano/Latino, and Native American faculty on the campus, and made little progress [see Attachment 10, *University of California Full-time Ladder-Rank Faculty ~ Data for UC-wide and Each Campus, by Ethnicity*].

Data for the Health Sciences are no more encouraging. Because the bulk of the Health Sciences faculty are non-ladder rank positions, the Task Force agreed to expand the review beyond ladder rank for this population. The group reviewed Academic Senate series (ladder rank, clinical X, and in Residence) and non-Academic Senate series (adjunct, salaried clinical, visiting, and other) members. Non-whites represent 17% of the population. Again, when the data are disaggregated, the relatively good showing of Chinese and East Indian/South Asian is offset by the minuscule representation of Mexican-American (1%), African American (1%), and American Indian (<1%) [see Attachment 11, *Gender and Ethnicity Data for Health Sciences Faculty, 1998 - 2002*].

At Scripps Institution of Oceanography, the study was also extended. Research appointments and separations were reviewed (except project scientists and emeriti professors serving as researchers). The *SIO Research Workforce (10/31/02)* shows an underrepresented complement of two Latinos, three Chinese, and one Japanese. These data are particularly noteworthy because SIO's recent recruitment activity suggests that most of the hiring opportunities at SIO are in the researcher category. Of 14 research

appointments between 1999 - 2003, the data show that over 14 percent were filled by ethnic minorities. When the data are disaggregated, however, the Task Force notes that none of these positions was filled by African American, Chicano/Latino, or American Indian faculty. Two appointees—one Japanese, one Chinese—made up the underrepresented researcher complement hired at SIO in the last five years [see Attachment 12, *SIO Professional Research Appointments and Separations, 1998 – 2003*].

Availability

In discussing these low recruitment figures, the group realized that a significant problem, particularly in engineering and the natural sciences, was the availability¹ of qualified candidates. There was agreement that only a review of discipline-specific data could help illuminate this shortage. To this end the group studied the *2003 Briefing on the Academic Workforce and Recruitments* [see Attachment 13]. The availability data provided by UCSD's Office of Academic Affirmative Action bear out some anecdotal information:

- Chicano/Latino and African American candidates are in scarce supply (<2%) in Engineering, Physical Sciences, and Biological Sciences.
- The numbers improve somewhat (3-5%) in Social Sciences and Arts & Humanities.
- Despite the higher availability pools in certain disciplines, 2003 UCSD hires met a placement goal very infrequently, which suggests that availability alone, although very important, does not explain UCSD's performance toward placement goals.

An analysis by UCSD's Office of Academic Affirmative Action in 2003/04 found that the percentage of Asians in application pools often exceeded their availability, which was also quite high compared to African Americans and Hispanics, who exhibited low rates of availability and application.

The Task Force also reviewed the document *Doctorate Recipients from U.S. Universities: Summary Report 2002*² [see Attachment 14]. This document indicated an upward trend in the number of doctorates awarded to racial/ethnic minority U.S. citizens, by tracking race/ethnicity for the twenty-year period 1982 - 2002. Over this period, gains were shown among African Americans, Asians, and Hispanics; American Indians remained flat. In 2002, the data showed that these underrepresented groups earned doctorates in engineering (24%), education (23%), and professional/other fields (19%). Physical sciences and humanities were both represented at 15%. Not unexpectedly, the data show

¹ Annually, sex and ethnic data are collected on individuals who have earned Ph.Ds in order to provide a reasonable gauge of availability and thereby establish the expected diversity of the workforce. Availability is based on Ph.Ds awarded over a 20-year period.

² Source: <http://www.norc.uchicago.edu/issues/sed-2002.pdf> pp.14-18, and 52 (Table 8)

that of the underrepresented groups, Asians earned the largest proportion of Ph.Ds in physical sciences, engineering, and life sciences, representing over half of all minority members earning doctorates in those fields; Blacks earned the highest proportion of Ph.Ds in social sciences, education, and professional/other fields; and Hispanics earned the largest proportion of Ph.Ds in humanities.

The group expressed concern that these data overstated availability. For example, traditionally, Hispanics and African Americans have not entered the marine sciences in large numbers and thus would not be readily available in SIO recruitment processes. The numbers shrink further when one goes from the broader discipline to very specialized sub-disciplines. The Task Force did not have available sub-discipline data from the national pool, but the group reviewed national and UCSD doctoral recipient data by broad discipline [see Attachment 15, *UCSD Doctoral Recipients, 1992, 1998, and 2002*³]. The 2002 data show that UCSD grants Ph.Ds to Asians in physical sciences, engineering, and life sciences at two to three times the national rate (21% vs. 7%, 26% vs. 14%, and 21% vs. 8%, respectively.) The pattern was similar for Chicano/Latino and African American students in the Social Sciences and Arts & Humanities. Not surprisingly, at UCSD as with the national pool, Asians earn more Ph.Ds in the hard sciences while African Americans and Chicanos/Latinos earn most of their doctoral degrees in the Social Sciences and Arts & Humanities.

In his survey of availability pools Ethnic Studies Associate Professor Ross Frank reviewed with the group a report [see Attachment 3] he had prepared in his capacity of Chair – UC Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD). Frank developed the presentation, based on workforce data for 2000 - 2003, in an attempt to provide a clear methodology for interpreting the aggregate UC and UCSD data relative to underrepresented minority faculty⁴. The primary finding was that neither UC generally nor UCSD specifically was doing all it could to improve the numbers of underrepresented minority faculty who are being recruited.

According to Frank (*Presentation to the Task Force*, May 2004):

- One charge against hiring data compared to national availability pools has been that UC hires 70% - 80% of its faculty from just 12 universities and that availability pools may be smaller in the top programs from these institutions. Frank reported that UCOP had also compared UC hiring data to the availability pools of only these 12 providers of the bulk of UC faculty and found little difference in the results. The national availability pool data have also been adjusted where possible to reflect the specific hiring areas of each department.

³ Source: UCSD Office of Graduate Studies and Research.

⁴ Note that Frank's terminology "underrepresented minority faculty" is used interchangeably with the Task Force's "historically underrepresented faculty." Data sources: Availabilities – National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, US Department of Energy, National Endowment for the Humanities, US Department of Agriculture, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Survey of Earned Doctorates; UC Faculty Data – Corporate Personnel System, October 2002.

- Reviewing UCSD data for 2002 tenured faculty (Health Sciences excepted), Frank found that among tenured faculty while five areas (Engineering, Physics, History, Fine Arts (Visual Arts), and Communication) were significantly better than the availability pool, four areas (Chemistry, SIO (Geographical and Related Sciences), Psychology, and Education) were significantly worse, and Chemistry, SIO, and Education had no underrepresented minority faculty at all.
- Review of newly-hired tenured faculty data from 1999/00 to 2002/03 shows that UCSD has hired three HURM faculty (or 6.5%) in 46 searches in Science and Engineering departments. This compared to 8.7% HURM hires in the same areas University-wide, even though 59% of UCSD hires were made in the Science and Engineering departments against 50% for all of UC.
- Frank also looked at UCSD's non-tenured faculty workforce data for 2002. He noted that nine of 16 areas (Biological Sciences, Engineering, Mathematics, Chemistry, Physics, SIO, Other Physical Sciences⁵, Visual Arts, and Other Humanities⁶) that conducted searches had hired no underrepresented minority non-tenured faculty, and four areas (Physics, Other Physical Sciences, Visual Arts, and Other Humanities) had no minority faculty at all.
- At UCSD in 2002, three departments (Ethnic Studies, History, and Communication) provided 37% of all HURM non-tenured faculty—success that masks the lack of progress in much of the rest of the campus⁷.
- Between 1999/00 and 2002/03, eight of 16 areas with searches hired no underrepresented minority non-tenured faculty, and three areas (Other Physical Sciences, Psychology, and Visual Arts) hired no minority faculty at all. During this timeframe, approximately 31% of all new UCSD underrepresented minority non-tenured faculty were hired by Ethnic Studies, History, and Communication. Over this period, UCSD has hired a significantly lower percentage of HURM faculty than has UC as a whole.
- Recently, UC began to emphasize hiring at the junior ranks in order to maximize the availability of women; because of improving availability pools, this tactic

⁵ Astronomy and Astrophysics, Environmental Sciences, Oceanography, Marine Sciences, and Meteorological Sciences.

⁶ American Studies, Philosophy, and Religion. The disciplinary categories in the UCOP tables from which Frank drew data do not match UCSD's departmental organization and nomenclature.

⁷ This finding does not align with UCSD data which show a number of HURMs in the Literature Department. In the UCOP data charts used in Frank's report, UCSD's Literature Department appears under the Letters and Foreign Languages and Literature rows. It is difficult to disaggregate this data to isolate the UCSD Literature Department. However, adding Literature to the mix would suggest that Frank's 37% figure undercounts the extent to which a few departments are compensating for the others who are not hiring HURM faculty.

should have a positive effect on minority faculty as well. In general, this has not yet proven to be the case at UCSD.

Both Frank's work and the *Doctorate Recipient Summary* data belie the argument from at least some departments that availability is an insurmountable barrier to expanding the base of underrepresented faculty at UCSD. Apparently, a great deal depends not only on availability but also on motivation and effort within a particular department.

Pipeline

The *Doctorate Recipients from U.S. Universities Summary Report* and *UCSD Ph.D* report were also helpful to a discussion on pipeline, providing information relative to which institutions were producing the nation's Ph.Ds. The group learned that three California institutions – UCLA, Berkeley, and Stanford – and two Massachusetts institutions – Harvard and MIT – provided 18% of the doctorates awarded to Asian Americans. Nova Southeastern University and Howard University awarded the most doctorates (8%) to African Americans; the largest percentage of Hispanics earned their doctorates primarily from institutions in the southwest and in Puerto Rico; and Oklahoma State University awarded the largest number of doctorates to American Indians. Knowing the institutions where minority candidates earn their doctorates can help UCSD increase the range and depth of its outreach for recruitment purposes.

The UC President's Postdoctoral Fellows and Ford Foundation Fellows programs are other examples of sources of potential faculty candidates. The *President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program* gives special consideration to candidates whose record of scholarship and service will contribute to the diversity of the academic community. *The Ford Foundation, through its program of Diversity Fellowships*, seeks to increase the diversity of the nation's college and university faculties by increasing their ethnic and racial diversity, to maximize the educational benefits of diversity, and to increase the number of professors who can and will use diversity as a resource for enriching the education of all students.

Search Committees

An important part of the recruitment process for faculty is the use of search committees. The Task Force discussed the need to document and disseminate to all academic departments best practices related to recruitment and selection activity. One source document for best practices is the *UC Affirmative Action Guidelines for Recruitment and Retention of Faculty* (2002) [see Attachment 16]. This system-wide publication suggests appointing search committees that “represent a diverse cross section of the faculty and include members who will monitor the affirmative action efforts of the search committee. ... Departments that lack diversity should consider appointing faculty outside the department ... or develop other alternatives to broaden the perspective of the committee and increase the reach of the search.” Of course, prior to the establishment of a search committee, adequate analyses that address availability and identify the placement goals

for women and underrepresented faculty in a particular department should occur. The Task Force was pleased to note that this practice was instituted at UCSD two years ago. Staff from the Office of Academic Affirmative Action now meet with search committees to review the department goals, relevant antidiscrimination laws and policies, and the sources of potential candidates.

Although some Task Force members were familiar with some of these practices, several others report having served on search committees but never having access to or being apprised of the department's historical hiring information as it relates to underrepresented faculty. Further, they recall no discussion of diversity goals at the start of the process, no apparent mechanism for monitoring the committee's effort with respect to these goals, and no clarity about what is permissible under Proposition 209. And, the group learned that often a search committee discussion that raises the issue of diversity is countered with comments that include caveats of "quality" or "academic excellence." Reportedly, similar automatic comments are seldom made about non-minority candidates. Thus, there is a perception among some faculty that different standards are employed in search processes across the campus and that UCSD's academic culture promotes the notion that diversity and excellence are incompatible goals. **The Task Force recommends that all faculty should routinely be made aware of their departments' historical hiring information and diversity goals.**

Other Best Practices

As noted above, broadening the applicant pool is a must to give the campus an opportunity to meet its diversity goals. Position descriptions should be reviewed at the beginning of the search process to ensure that they not only reflect the needs of the department, but are drafted as broadly as possible to attract the largest available pool of qualified applicants. To avoid any perception that UCSD is not interested in applicants whose research is focused on "minority issues," **position descriptions and advertising language should be carefully written to reflect the department's interest in attracting candidates whose teaching, research, or service activities contribute to the academic diversity of the campus.** Advertisements should be placed in various forums, including national publications, listservs, mailing lists, and professional and academic conferences. Outreach to publications, websites, and lists should include those that target underrepresented candidates. Personal contacts with individuals known to excel in their disciplines and with institutions known to produce likely candidates are also advisable. **Departments may also consider partnering with various UCSD staff and student associations** during the recruitment process. Staff and students form part of the critical mass of underrepresented members on campus and provide an important link to San Diego's historically underrepresented communities.

Additionally, at some comparable institutions across the nation, **departments are required to prepare a full diversity plan that describes, minimally, the underutilization and availability of underrepresented candidates in the field,**

methods of recruitment and advertising, the position description, and the selection criteria.

Systems should be structured so that there is accountability. For example, according to the *UC Affirmative Action Guidelines for Recruitment and Retention of Faculty* it is "... consistent with University policy to review the applicant pool prior to beginning the selection process ... If women and minority applicants are not present in the pool at about the rate of their estimated availability in the field, then departments should review whether recruitment and outreach procedures were sufficiently broad..." Similarly, if the search committee process ends with a recommendation to hire a candidate in a different specialty than was advertised, a review should be undertaken to assure no qualified candidates were denied an equal opportunity to compete for the position. **The Task Force noted that although these reviews of the pool and the process are currently carried out by the campus' divisional deans, they could be more rigorous.**

To help assure accountability, a commitment to diversity as demonstrated by service and/or other practices should be a criterion in selecting the academic leadership on the campus. Indeed, greater diversity within the campus' Senior Administration would set the tone for the rest of the campus. Further, monitoring progress on diversity goals should be a specific component of the annual performance review of each academic dean and vice chancellor.

Above all, the Task Force recommends that a high-level Diversity Officer be appointed from the faculty to report to the Chancellor and Senior Vice Chancellor on faculty diversity issues across the university. Whether this should be a Chief Diversity Officer or a separate appointment we leave to the Administration, as well as the precise allocation of duties vis-à-vis other campus officials tasked with diversity. However, at a minimum this person should be responsible for oversight, articulation, planning, facilitation, consultation, coordination, and accountability on faculty diversity. Indeed, this person could help implement many of the recommendations in this report, such as raising consciousness, organizing briefings, and improving climate.

Another best practice is to **design research, teaching, and service programs around issues related to ethnicity, and to allot FTEs to such programs through the use of "cluster hires."** This strategy allows multiple recruitments in related areas. If successful, as was the case with California Cultures in Comparative Perspective—an interdisciplinary initiative begun in 2001—there is a high likelihood that the campus can begin to build a critical mass of underrepresented faculty and/or regular faculty devoted to minority issues.

The Task Force also examined the issue of departmental incentives. There were suggestions that "free" FTEs should be provided to departments who make significant progress toward diversity goals and that such departments should be provided additional resources for graduate student support, start-up packages including relocation allowances, and/or visiting or adjunct faculty. **The Task Force recommends that the**

administration determine the kinds of incentives that can be deployed within the legal limitations of Proposition 209, and implement these practices.

The Task Force is aware that UCSD already embraces a number of the best practices described above, including the preparation of annual academic affirmative action plans and departmental briefings on workforce and recruitment activity. However, the group saw value in highlighting them here to ensure consistent dissemination and effective implementation across the campus.

Faculty Observations

The Task Force also discussed feedback from interviews with underrepresented faculty and surveys to department chairs and academic deans. Some general themes are noted below:

- Respondents suggest that the recruitment process could be enhanced. **Annual discussions of diversity goals and plans, review of applicant/interview pools by the deans, and educating search committees about the “dos and don’ts” of Proposition 209 all need greater emphasis.**
- Attempts to recruit and retain underrepresented faculty are seen as a threat to UCSD’s high standards by some faculty. In the eyes of some minority faculty, this mantra of “excellence” is often a cover for practices and values that exclude or discourage many excellent underrepresented scholars. There is also a perception that the bar is raised (tougher research and publication standards) for underrepresented minorities. **We recommend that the SVCAA require faculty participating in search committees to receive training that focuses on search committee behaviors that will ensure an equal opportunity to every applicant, including underrepresented candidates.** This might be accomplished by incorporating a briefing that covers diversity issues and best practices at the first meeting of each search committee.
- There is frequently a mismatch between the area of specialization for which the department is trying to recruit and the qualifications of top underrepresented candidates. To overcome this, **department members must work their personal networks to get qualified candidates to apply.** Additionally, respondents suggested a “modified [target of opportunity] TOP” where the **Senior Vice Chancellor-Academic Affairs would expand the reserve pool of FTEs currently used for spousal hires, special upgrades, and unexpected opportunities so that more would be available to departments that encounter the opportunity to hire a topnotch candidate (underrepresented or not) whose research may not be a direct fit for the recruitment underway.** This would allow departments to acquire new expertise and interests that broaden the curriculum.

- The best underrepresented candidates are in great demand. There is a perception among respondents that UCSD frequently loses underrepresented candidates in the recruitment process because **the campus is unable to offer competitive compensation packages in a timely manner**. To assure that UCSD has a better chance of successfully recruiting some of these individuals to the campus, we should review recruitment process/schedules and **be prepared to act expeditiously**.
- Many of the campus' efforts related to increasing diversity among the faculty focus on making sure the applicant pool and its sources are diverse. However, a diverse applicant pool frequently does not translate to a diverse short list or a diverse hire. **Best practices that impact the short list, within the bounds of Proposition 209, should be explored.**
- Several respondents commented on the lack of an adequate pipeline of underrepresented candidates, even though it is getting marginally better. Programs that **introduce underrepresented undergraduate students to graduate education and increase funding for graduate student support** could improve the pipeline.

In summary, recruitment activities present the best opportunity to augment faculty diversity at UCSD. The Task Force agreed that for any diversification effort to be successful there must be a commitment to fresh ongoing, purposeful, and proactive efforts in a number of areas, both in the central and academic administrations and in academic departments.

Retention

Part of the charge for the Task Force was to review the campus' treatment and retention efforts relative to underrepresented faculty and their careers. The Senate and Administration are interested in learning whether underrepresented faculty advance academically at a rate equal to that of their peers and whether the climate at UCSD is supportive of these groups. The Task Force studied separation data in an effort to determine trends or identify retention problems that may have a negative impact on faculty diversity. Between 1998/99 and 2002/03 there were 141 separations at UCSD [see Attachment 17, *Women and Minority Ladder-Rank Faculty Workforce, Appointments, Separations ~ 1998 - 2002*]. Thirty-two, or 22.7% of these were underrepresented faculty. In the same time period, underrepresented faculty made up 22.3% of ladder-rank appointments and just over 17% of the workforce. Of those who separated, eight were African Americans, eight were Hispanic, and sixteen were Asian; there were no American Indians. The data are disturbing because they show that

historically underrepresented faculty⁸ separated at a faster rate than they were appointed—5.7% compared to 3.6%

Between 1998 and 2002, of the eight African Americans who left UCSD three were recruited to other academic institutions, two left academia altogether, two retired, and the whereabouts of one is unknown. Of the eight Chicanos/Latinos who left, four were denied tenure (at least two of whom have been hired by other academic institutions), three were recruited to other academic institutions, and one retired. Among Asians who separated, the distribution is as follows: one was denied tenure, six were recruited to other academic institutions, one left academia, seven retired, and the whereabouts of one is unknown.

In the same five year period, UCSD processed 80 retention transactions [see Attachment 18, *General Campus Retention Efforts ~ 1998-2002*]. Of this number, 66 (83%) were successful. Eleven of these transactions involved underrepresented faculty; eight (73%) were successful (five of five Asians, three of four Hispanics, and zero of two African Americans).

Although in reviewing the data presented this study found no significant problems for minorities generally as they advanced through the academic ranks, interviews with underrepresented faculty suggest a perception that historically underrepresented faculty may have a more difficult time achieving tenure.

Task Force members expressed concern that the University was not often proactive enough when faced with the possibility of losing a talented underrepresented faculty member. Some extant practices appear to run counter to the stated goal of diversification. For example, in most cases the University will not engage in negotiations with a faculty member who is thinking of leaving UCSD until that person has a bona fide job offer in hand, and unless the offer is made by an institution that UCSD considers comparable in stature. This practice is implemented across the board, often without consideration of the individual involved. Although these practices may be appropriate in most cases, the upshot is that the campus may lose someone who is highly respected in his/her field. Additionally, by refusing to engage until a bona fide offer letter is in hand, UCSD may send a message to faculty that they are dispensable. That is, there is little sense of urgency and the individual may feel so neglected and bruised by the process that by the time the written offer from the new institution is extended the individual has already emotionally separated from UCSD and thus is more likely to accept it. This can be a special problem with underrepresented faculty who already feel underappreciated and who are in high demand.

Some of our interviewees agreed that administrators are not proactive enough in attempts to retain underrepresented faculty who are being wooed away. The lack of a critical mass

⁸ In this instance HURM refers to African Americans and Hispanics only. For the time period under review there were neither appointments nor separations of American Indians.

of underrepresented faculty and students at UCSD, and the apparent inertia of the Administration to systemically address issues of diversity, discourage those who are here. There need to be better mechanisms for monitoring retention efforts at the departmental or divisional level so as to identify and address problem areas. **We recommend that administrators review their practices relative to retention efforts so that a strong message can be sent early and unequivocally that keeping meritorious individuals is a UCSD priority.**

Compensation

The issue of pay was raised in the context of some underrepresented faculty feeling inadequately prepared for the negotiation process. Although their experiences may not differ from those of other faculty, they report not having sufficient information presented about the parameters for the salary, the housing market, the resources for start-up packages, etc. If this lack of preparation or even discrimination translates to a lower starting salary, these faculty could be at an economic disadvantage for their entire careers. Given the findings of the campus' recent Gender Equity Study on the payment of women, the Task Force decided that a similar compensation analysis should be undertaken for underrepresented faculty. There was a general expectation that the group would not find significant differences in salary between underrepresented faculty and their non-minority counterparts, but we wanted to be sure.

Using the Gender Equity model, Professor McCubbins undertook the review and found there is no effect for any ethnic breakdown on annual salary, starting salary, steps, or promotions. In fact, the data show URMs are promoted faster than non-URMs, but this difference is not statistically significant. Further, he found no ethnic-generational effects and no gender-ethnic effects [see Attachment 19].

Information about salaries and equity issues is not widely available. Faculty are often unaware of what average salaries are in their departments or disciplines. Some individuals expressed concerns about equity in accelerations or off-scale awards. **The Task Force supports the Gender Equity Study recommendation that all faculty be informed annually about average salaries, by rank, in their departments.**

Committee Service

The issue of service is a difficult one to evaluate, particularly for underrepresented faculty who often feel pressure to help their communities. Some underrepresented faculty believe that they counsel and mentor underrepresented students (both graduate and undergraduate), serve on a committees that deal with issues of diversity, and serve on departmental search committees at a much higher rate than their non-minority peers, in large part because their numbers are so small. On the other hand, the perception of department chairs and academic deans is that, in general, they do not believe

underrepresented faculty serve at rates far beyond others. The Academic Senate Office was able to provide data that show Senate committee service over the last three years; the data appear to support the administrative perspective.

In 2002/03, the last year for which complete data is available, the Academic Senate Committee on Committees extended 329 invitations to effect 229 appointments to divisional standing committees and affiliated subcommittees⁹. Forty-seven (14%) invitations went to underrepresented faculty. Twenty-seven (11%) underrepresented faculty were placed on Senate committees and subcommittees. If Asians are omitted from the count, it is apparent that historically underrepresented faculty served at a rate of almost 3%; their representation among Senate faculty and in the ladder-rank workforce that in 2002-03 was 5%. Similarly, 86 invitations were extended to fill 59 Chair and Vice Chair positions. URMs made up over 16% of those invited; again, if Asians are excluded approximately 14% were HURMs. HURMs filled about 5% of these slots.

The Task Force recognizes that these data do not capture full service loads of the faculty. In particular, HURMs may be called to serve on non-Senate committees that deal with a variety of academic and campus climate issues, to mentor junior faculty and students, and to serve in various capacities in their historically underrepresented communities. This may account for the disparity in actual service loads as measured by Senate service and the perception by HURMs that they are over burdened.

Faculty Support Systems

The faculty we interviewed claim that some departmental mentor programs are either non-existent or ineffective, both at the pre-tenure and subsequent stages. More senior faculty lament that the mentor programs that do exist focus principally on pre-tenure faculty. Junior faculty would like to see better matches. **We recommend that more program coordination occur at the academic dean or vice chancellor level to assure a more even implementation of mentor programs. We also strongly support the newly created campuswide program that would allow a faculty member to be paired with a mentor outside of his/her department. Indeed, we think there should be an interdisciplinary committee of underrepresented faculty available as mentors and resources to underrepresented faculty in any department and as recruiters for underrepresented candidates in any department.**

According to several of our interviewees, discipline-specific information on policies or practices important for promotion and tenure is not readily available or well understood. There is also a perception that advancement within the academic ranks may be relatively

⁹ Source: UCSD Academic Senate. Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor; Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor of Clinical X; Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor-In-Residence; Lecturer with Security of Employment; Acting Professor (Senate eligible); and various associated emeritus and emeritus recall titles. Note that Academic Senate appointments made in 2002-03 are effective in 2003-04.

more difficult for underrepresented faculty not only because of inadequate information about the process and misunderstandings about priorities, but because of heavy service loads. The Task Force is pleased to note that there has been an emphasis recently on new faculty orientations that are designed to address some of these issues. However, as new faculty orientations improve, the younger recruits may be privy to information unfamiliar to their more senior colleagues. **We therefore support the Gender Equity Study recommendation that a handbook be developed that describes a variety of academic personnel actions and the process by which they are achieved. A general handbook on broader issues, such as climate and community, specifically for underrepresented faculty, might also be a good idea.**

In some cases, underrepresented faculty worried that the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) often lacks diversity, which could lead to stereotypical judgments toward some minorities. For example, they feared that the research interests of underrepresented faculty—particularly to the extent they are in non-traditional or ethnic-related fields—might be undervalued. They also saw a danger that contributions other than research, such as service to professional organizations, will be discounted. The impacts of this bias can be devastating to an individual both professionally and economically. Dr. JoAnn Moody, in her book *Faculty Diversity: Problems and Solutions*¹⁰, points out several behavioral pitfalls of review committees. **We recommend an increasingly diverse presence on all committees that focus on academic personnel actions. We also urge the Administration to provide more training, such as that offered by Moody, which would target CAP members, academic deans, provosts, department chairs, search committees, departmental academic personnel staff, and other relevant actors, exposing them to diversity issues and experts.**

In the experience of many HURMs, they are likely to be treated as both super-visible (e.g., overloaded with diversity-related service work) and invisible (e.g., professional opinions discounted), depending on the circumstances. This creates psychological dissonance and is an unfair burden on these individuals. Faculty administrators must be more attuned to these circumstances and be held accountable for providing an environment where all faculty can thrive. For example, **departments may want to implement practices that ensure that faculty not be asked to assume major departmental responsibility as they prepare for a promotion or other major step evaluation.**

University service (mentoring, counseling, committee work) is given very little weight in the promotion and tenure process. Thus, faculty who do this work feel penalized. **We recommend that the SVCAA develop a tangible reward system to recognize faculty who work to improve campus diversity. Individual and departmental incentives, when permissible within the parameters of Proposition 209, should be explored.**

¹⁰ Moody, JoAnn. *Faculty Diversity: Problems and Solutions*. RoutledgeFalmer, 2004, pp. 186-190.

UCSD may not always be perceived as an environment where careers can be built by HURMs. The lack of a critical mass of underrepresented faculty and students, uneven mentor programs, and a paucity of recognition for some service activities all contribute to this perception. By the same token, the broader San Diego community is not viewed as an environment where underrepresented faculty can thrive easily, because of demographics, housing, etc. **Building links with other higher education institutions and communities associated with HURMs might mitigate these problems.**

Interestingly, some respondents expressed a lack of knowledge about why underrepresented faculty choose to leave UCSD. This suggests that **exit interviews are not widespread** and presents an opportunity to expand a mechanism that allows the campus to capture this information.

In summary, the *UC Affirmative Action Guidelines for Recruitment and Retention of Faculty* [see Attachment 16] remind us that Federal regulations require the University to “make good faith efforts to address any racial or gender based disparities that may be reflected in [the] data” relative to promotions, transfers, and resignations. The Administration should review this report’s recommendations and actively pursue a variety of opportunities aimed at improving campus climate for and the academic advancement experience of all faculty, but particularly those who are historically underrepresented.

In conclusion, it is the view of this Task Force that rapid action on multiple fronts is required to address a mounting crisis of faculty diversity at UCSD.