February 28, 2023

Jessica Cattelino, Chair
Academic Senate

RE: Promoting Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion at the UCLA Academic Senate

Dear Chair Cattelino,

At its meeting on February 9, 2023, the Committee on Committees (ConC) reviewed the letter from the Executive Board with suggestions to improve Promoting Diversity, Equity and Inclusion at the UCLA Academic Senate. This report conveys the efforts ConC has pursued to create balanced senate committees and slates with regard to areas of discipline, gender, and ethnicity/race. We will also report on some of the problems encountered in attempts to create diverse committees and suggestions for systemic improvements that could help ConC in its mission to create balanced committees.

ConC is created as a representative committee for elected faculty from different areas across campus. If the committee is complete and there is equal participation from all member’s representatives, which clearly is not the case given some areas have stronger voices due to their representatives, there theoretically should be appropriate area representation from each constituency. My impression is this is not the case because of different representative knowledge of their communities and the differential individual efforts of members of ConC. Less straightforward has been the ability to select appropriate representation based on gender and race. And this is where issues have arisen regarding our knowledge and ability to identify appropriate candidates. First, let me review the recommendations that were discussed with ConC at the beginning of the year and any progress.

**Recommendations for the Committee on Committees (ConC)**

1. Identify and report to the Executive Board on the demographics (e.g. gender, race, ethnicity, school/division) of each committee and council and committees overall; track trends over time; document good faith efforts to diversify committees (e.g. how many asked/declined by gender, race, ethnicity); develop and report on strategies including the use of the volunteer list.

**Reply from ConC:** We consider this a good objective but the data needed to document diversity is often inaccessible or there is ambiguity as to an individual’s self-reported race and gender in existing databases. To form committees, we rely on personal knowledge from ConC committee members about their constituency and on web-based information which is often dated and sometimes just plain wrong—it is much better practice to base information on an individual’s self-reporting. We always try to equalize committees based on gender and this is an ask of the committee when considering the replacement of committee members (specifically what is the current gender balance, what genders are cycling off, what do we need to maintain the gender balance and has there been dominant one-gender leadership that needs consideration). This can be a problem with regard to individual gender identity and it may be something for further discussion (one committee would like a transgender faculty member to be appointed). Our
attempts to balance diversity in race and ethnicity have relied on committee-member knowledge and the internet. We did also try to garner appropriate information by modifying the volunteer application for Senate Committees (https://senate.ucla.edu/about/senate-service) with this additional question: “Please articulate what qualities you believe you could bring to an Academic Senate committee/council for inclusivity of faculty representation.” However not many faculty use this mechanism and we mostly rely on suggestions from our committee members.

Let me relay one example of an issue this year: I had nominated a female faculty member for the Graduate Council and when our analyst looked her up in the system she had access to it was the incorrect title. Apparently, this faculty of color was not eligible for senate service, so she was not considered during a committee meeting. After much digging at my ask, our analyst discovered she was indeed on the senate and so we had to go back to ConC to revisit the past vote for Grad Council and reverse a prior decision. This faculty member accepted the appointment and will increase diversity on this committee for 2023/24. I relay this just to reinforce the need for better access for ConC to accurate faculty data....

2. Document recruitment methodology for selecting members including the principles governing selection and measurements for DEI progress.

Reply from ConC: DEI awareness with regard to the area of expertise and gender I believe is strongly on ConC’s radar and considered at every meeting where faculty are nominated and ranked for committees. We now have included best practice training for members in initial ConC meetings. Racial and cultural diversity is discussed in this training. Recruitment methodologies have been confined to the committee members and the volunteer application form. Clearly, not everyone is known to the ConC members, and my strong impression is that those who are not known to their constituents have a low chance of selection for committee membership.

3. Review the efficacy of recruitment communications and internal processes.

Reply from ConC: We do now have training sessions at the ConC meetings at the beginning of the academic year. We have paired up ConC faculty liaisons to train new faculty on the liaison process. We have widely disseminated the volunteer portal and optimized the wording. We have templates for questions to be asked by the liaisons and ask that the liaisons speak with the Chair/co-Chair at different times from the Analyst and perhaps also communicate with other members of the committee if there are issues to which the liaisons were altered. Individual recruitment communications are faculty member specific but best practices are covered in our training sessions. Our analyst this year provided lists of eligible faculty in each constituency but I cannot judge how much this was utilized for decision making and pertinent information for DEI cannot be included. Liaisons are encouraged to research, in particular faculty from underrepresented groups, and personally invite them to be on committees, first having approached them for interest. There have been some responses from diversity faculty that relay sentiments of exploitation for service and to avoid this situation prior knowledge of interest would be important to be aware of.

4. In discussion with CAP (see below), reconsider the longstanding Senate practice of expecting CAP members to be Full Professors Step VI or higher.
**Reply from ConC:** I passed this report on to Chair Jessica Cattelino earlier this year. “With regard to point 4 and as mentioned above, there were only positive statements voiced to lower the professor step requirements for CAP and ClinCap committee members”. Unfortunately, we have not been able to have the Chancellor’s Office approve members below Professor step 5. We have written a letter to Vice Chancellor Levine to further consider this cut-off since ConC members have voiced arguments that faculty from underrepresented groups may have difficulty reaching this step because of variable paths taken during their faculty careers. Our compromise is to individualize this request based on alternate career paths and gaps e.g. parenthood, trauma, late starts to career, or changes in directions, and ask for flexibility and not a hard step cut-off.

**Suggestions and Discussion points:**

a) That future years there should be a formal ask from Chairs, ORUs, FECs, EDI, and Senate Committees for faculty suggestions for committee vacancies for subsequent ConC consideration. This is done informally between certain ConC members already but a formal process may be desirable.

b) I have issues with the word “service” which I feel could be changed. The culture should be consideration of senate committee “appointments” as a privilege. For this to evolve there needs to be a worth tab associated (point c)

c) Compensation, respect, or a leg-up for promotion would aid our recruitment processes and I believe encourage diverse faculty to accept appointments.

d) That step requirement e.g. for CAP and ClinCap be individually assessed by the Vice Chancellor of Academic Personnel after a justification from ConC and not be a hard cut-off at Professor Step 5.

e) Hurting our recruitment pools are the reputations of some committees where the workload is extremely high, and faculty convey frustration for little or no reward- UgC is one example.

f) Our analyst needs better access to current faculty databases for appointment accuracy, conflicts with other academic positions, and demographic information.

g) ConC is keen to recruit Latino/a, LatinX committee members— we don’t generally extend the same long-arm to recruit, Asian or South Asian candidates (who are, at least, covered by “race” concerns).

h) Currently unable to access LGBTQ +status except anecdotally through committee members’ knowledge of candidates.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this report. Should you have questions about ConC’s deliberations of this request, please do not hesitate to contact me at cevans@g.ucla.edu or via the Committee analyst, Renee Rouzan-Kay at rrounzankay@senate.ucla.edu

Sincerely,

Chris Evans, Chair
UCLA Committee on Committees, 2022-23

cc: Andrea Kasko, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
    Shane White, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
    Renee Rouzan-Kay, Senior Policy Analyst, Committee on Committees
    Members of the Committee on Committees